AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday, June 5, 2014
9:10 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

Action
9:10 – 9:15
1. Approval of Minutes of May 15, 2014 meeting

Information/Discussion
9:15 – 9:25
a. Chair of the Graduate Council
9:25 – 9:35
b. CCGA Representative
9:35 – 9:40
c. Graduate Student Council Representative(s)
9:40 – 9:50
d. Dean of the Graduate Division

Action
9:50 – 9:55
2. Announcements
9:55 – 9:59
3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee

Action
9:50 – 9:55
1. Approval of Courses:
   1. EE 233 (NEW)/ME 220 (CHANGE) – Optimal Control and Estimation
   2. ME 238 (NEW)/EE 238 (CHANGE) – Linear Multivariable Control
   3. ME 239 (NEW)/EE 239 (CHANGE) – Optimal Control
   4. SOC 232 - Proseminar in Sociology – CHANGE

Courses previously returned by C&P for changes/corrections indicated:

1. CEE 225V – Physical-Chemical Treatment Processes – NEW – C&P returned course in January, 2014 and requested that the same language approved for the other “V” courses is used, especially the language pertaining to exams. The approved language has been added in CRAMS.
2. CEE 226V – Biological Unit Processes – NEW - C&P returned course in January, 2014 and requested that the same language approved for the other “V” courses is used, especially the language pertaining to exams. The approved language has been added in CRAMS.
3. CEE 241V – Aquatic Chemistry – NEW - C&P returned course in January, 2014 and requested that the same language approved for the other “V” courses is used, especially the language pertaining to exams. The approved language has been added in CRAMS.
4. CEE 243V – Advanced Water Treatment Technologies – NEW - C&P returned course in January, 2014 and requested that the same language approved for the other “V” courses is used, especially the language pertaining to exams. The approved language has been added in CRAMS.
5. EE 237 (CHANGE)/ME 237 (NEW) – Nonlinear Systems and Control – C&P returned course in May, 2014 and asked program to add meeting schedule to syllabus and provide more detail about the projects. This information has been added in CRAMS.
B. Program Changes:

1. Music – request to change normative time to degree – PhD - Ethnomusicology
2. Statistics MS proposed change effective Fall 2014 – removal of the Program Proposal exam portion of MS requirements
3. History course requirement changes to MA in Public History and PhD

Program Changes previously returned by C&P for changes/clarifications indicated:

1. English proposed change in course requirement options – C&P returned in October, 2013 and requested clarification about how students will take two of the ten required English courses from another department on campus. The proposal was also lacking a justification. C&P requested that a justification be added that includes the rationale for this change.

Discussion/Action
10:10 – 10:30 4. New Presidential Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Discussion/Action
10:30 – 10:45 5. Graduate Program Reviews
A. Sociology graduate student questionnaire responses – vote to officially close-out internal review from 2012
B. Political Science response to F&R – vote to close review

Discussion/Action
10:45 – 11:00 6. Grade Appeal – Tan Truong
Present:
Lynda Bell, History, Chair
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering, Vice Chair
Rick Redak, Entomology, Secretary
Wendy Ashmore, Anthropology
Malcolm Baker, Art History
Chris Chase-Dunn, Sociology
John Kim, Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages, CCGA Rep.
David Lo, School of Medicine
Rene Lysloff, Music
Rollanda O’Connor, GSOE
Tom Payne, Computer Science & Engineering
Daniel Schlenk, Environmental Sciences
Jing Shi, Physics
Jorge Silva-Risso, SoBA
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Preston Williams, GSA Representative

Guests:
Linda Scott, Graduate Division

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the April 17, 2014 meeting were unanimously approved as written.

Chair’s Announcements
Chair Bell informed the Graduate Council that the final meeting of the academic year will be on Thursday, June 5th.

Chair Bell announced that next year’s Graduate Council leadership will be Professor Rene Lysloff as Chair and Professor Tom Payne as Vice Chair. Professor John Kim will continue on the committee as the CCGA representative for Fall and Winter. However, he will be out of the country in the Spring and will need a replacement. Chair Bell asked the members returning next year to think about serving in John’s place.

CCGA is stepping up to try to monitor contentious graduate education issues such as self-supporting programs (SSPs). The current CCGA Chair intends for CCGA to become the clearing house for all matters related to SSPs, and to be the final word on how the policy should develop.

Chair Bell informed the committee that she will be attending the Senate Division meeting on May 27th to present the Doctoral Dissertation Mentor Award. Professor Zhang, Chair of the
Fellowships Subcommittee, announced that the subcommittee selected Professor Ashok Mulchandani from Chemical and Environmental Engineering as this year’s recipient.

Vice Chair Tuncel discussed the Chemistry and Geological Sciences graduate program reviews that occurred May 6-7\textsuperscript{th} and May 13-14\textsuperscript{th}.

Chair Bell mentioned that Sarah is already working on vetting the lists of potential reviewers for next year’s graduate program reviews. Chair Bell discussed the vetting process and indicated that one reviewer is already confirmed for next year’s Dance review. In order to review and close all scheduled graduate program reviews within one academic year; the reviews should take place from late November through late March.

Chair Bell discussed the Libraries Strategic Plan and the fact that a lot of CHASS faculty are upset about the Library’s deaccessioning of books. Senate Vice Chair Hughes has asked Senate Chair Wudka to intervene immediately with a forceful letter to the Librarian. Professor Ashmore indicated that the Library Strategic Plan Subcommittee is scheduled to meet at the end of the quarter.

Chair Bell mentioned that a rumor is circulating that the UCR medical school may take over management of the Riverside County Hospital; however, it is not clear if this will be the UCR medical school hospital. It is still being discussed.

Composite Benefits have been decided and Senate Chair Wudka is happy with the decision as it is what the Senate suggested.

There will be a massive revision to the SAT, specifically removing the writing portion. BOARS and UCOP wrote a joint statement about the importance of the writing portion of the exam for admissions.

**Other Announcements**

*John Kim, CCGA Representative* – Composite Benefits rates – Chair Jacobs moved to adopt Ohio State University’s model.

UC Graduate cohort survey (1944 – 2013 graduates) – there was a 33% response rate from UCR graduates. The number of satisfied students (1969 – 2008 cohort) now in tenure track positions was 42%. Professor Kim will share the PowerPoint containing the data with the committee.

The parallel program to the UCHBCU program for Hispanic serving institutions is going to the Graduate Deans. They have decided to expand it to Native American tribal colleges within the framework of the Hispanic serving institutions.

CCGA is trying to encourage President Napolitano to raise money for graduate studies since most of advancement currently focuses on undergraduate studies.

*Preston Williams, GSA Representative* – GSA is currently transitioning leadership.
Survey of the library – a lot of students were fine with the deaccessioning of physical books as long as the books are accessible as e-books. More subscriptions were desired, but students are ok with interlibrary loans as an option.

Tobacco-free policy not being enforced – graduate students were asked to enforce the tobacco free policy on other graduate students which made a lot of students feel uncomfortable. They are working on finding better enforcement options.

Graduate Dean Joe Childers – Graduate Division is considering using cohort money as flexibly as possible (for research/travel grants) and wants to spend the funds down as much as possible. Typically, they have funds that are unused and returned each year. This would not be a lot of money, approximately $30-$40k. These funds would supplement Earle Anthony funds. There will be consultation with GSA about who to fund.

Graduate Division awarded 310 total GRMPs and DYFs. Dean Childers always encourages Graduate Advisors to talk to him about this process. Philosophy did not receive any dissertation fellowships this year which is unusual. Sociology improved greatly this year.

We have 18 NSF Fellows and recruited three others. UCR will have 21 new NSF Fellows on campus next year. Graduate Division’s push to train students to do this is working. Since the program was implemented, UCR has received 63 or 64 NSF Fellows in the past five years. Before the program was implemented, UCR received about one per year. The campus is closing in on $8 million in total support and has only spent about $100k.

ASC negotiations – ASUAW is now in mediation. There have been some elections so the composition may be different.

Graduate Division has received a 9% increase in applications; over 6100 paid admissions; an 8% increase in admits; and a 2% decrease on SIRs which has a lot to do with AGSM. This is not a concern because AGSM tends to have their SIRs much later in the year.

Dean Childers’ NRT plan which will pay NRT for students as long as they are within normative time to candidacy is still alive. Dean Childers will wait for the new Provost to start before the program is rolled out. Systemwide’s decision about NRT will also have an effect on the program. Dean Childers is hopeful that the program will be in place by Fall. The program will not be retroactive and will be based on cohort, which may create some tension among students.

MD PhD MOU’s – agreements among particular programs who want to participate in double degree. Bioengineering and Anthropology have already approved it. Psychology is waiting for a faculty meeting to approve it. Biomedical Sciences is taking longer than expected to approve it. Some new faculty in Biomedical Sciences are unfamiliar with the process. The medical education committee is pretty much on board to approve it. Social Science combined degree will be the big highlight. Once MOU’s are approved, they will be advertised. Graduate Division is not expecting a landslide of students coming in – maybe a handful. There will be fellowship funds available for these students.
Graduate Division initiated a new award this year for commitment to graduate diversity. This award will be announced at commencement. Dean Childers would like past recipients and members of Graduate Council to help select future recipients. The first award recipient is Professor Brad Hyman. Award recipients will receive one quarter of fees paid for the student of their choice.

UCR just completed Grad Slam, a competition in which graduate students explained their research in three minutes to a panel of judges and an audience. The winner was a female student from Entomology. She received a $5k stipend. The runner up received $2500; third place received $1k; and honorable mentions received $100 each. Graduate Deans want to do a systemwide competition.

Dean Childers would like to obtain more funding for HVCU/HSI.

Dean Childers wants to put an industry/leadership series in place where people from outside come to talk to graduate students about what it is like to work outside of academia.

**Courses and Programs to be approved**

Graduate Council voted to approve/return the following courses as indicated:

5. MSE 200 - Graduate Studies in Materials Science and Engineering – CHANGE - approved.
7. RLST 200C* - Religions in Contact – CHANGE - approved.

Courses previously returned by C&P for changes/corrections indicated:

1. EE 236/ME 236 – State and Parameter Estimation Theory – CHANGE - ME 236 was returned for a syllabus in Jan., 2014. Syllabus is now in CRAMS - approved.

* Course is related to a new program or program change on the agenda.

Graduate Council voted to approve/return the following program changes as indicated:

1. Religious Studies program change to MA & PhD – addition of Professional Development requirement – approved.
2. Political Science - Proposal to change program’s normative time to degree to 6 years – approved.

3. Graduate DEs – Request for Adjustment to Requirements (Book, Archive and Manuscript Studies; and Science Fiction and Technoculture Studies) – approved. The Graduate Council will request an analysis of how this change has affected graduate student selection of each Designated Emphasis in three years’ time.

Program Review Process
Senate Chair Wudka attended the meeting for a discussion about the program review process. Chair Bell started by giving Chair Wudka some highlights from the Graduate Council annual report, most notably the closure of 13 graduate program reviews. Chair Bell also discussed the membership and duties of the Council’s two subcommittees. Chair Bell mentioned that Sarah has taken charge of the vetting process, assembling the review teams, and scheduling the reviews with occasional help from the Chair and/or Vice Chair. This year, Graduate Council started sending Dean’s memos that are specific to the details of the review in which the Deans should pay close attention to. Chair Bell discussed Dean Childers’ idea of Graduate Council meeting with the Deans and program leadership before the review as the program is preparing their review materials. This practice would involve Deans from the beginning and may increase their interest in the review and its outcome. Another committee member mentioned a suggestion that was made by one of the Chemistry graduate program extramural reviewers in which the Administration is asked to submit a report about what they have done to help the program since the program’s last review. This would help the extramural review team understand not only what the program has done, but also what the administration has done. Chair Bell argued that these necessary expansions to the review process are all achievable with more staff support.

The issue of combining graduate and undergraduate reviews was discussed. The consensus was that the undergraduate portion of the review would be glossed over as everyone wants to talk about their research. It would take a very good and committed review team to keep the faculty on track and ask that they talk about their teaching and courses. Most agreed that having the two reviews close in time is helpful though. Chair Wudka agreed that if departments find it useful to have the graduate and undergraduate reviews close in time, they can surely be scheduled that way.

Fellowship Subcommittee Report
Professor Zhang went over the Fellowships Subcommittee report with the Graduate Council.

Graduate Program Reviews
Review of Physics & Astronomy draft F&R – Graduate Council voted unanimously to send the draft F&R to the program for a response.

Philosophy response to F&R – Graduate Council voted unanimously to accept the program’s response to the F&R and close out the review.
# Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Music – Ethnomusicology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>Music/CHASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>May 12, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>June 2014 (ASAP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Contact:** Rene Lysloff  
**Email:** rene.lysloff@ucr.edu  
**Phone:** 951-907-6009

**Prepared by:** Rene Lysloff  
**Email:** rene.lysloff@ucr.edu  
**Phone:** 951-907-6009

## Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission requirements</th>
<th>Course requirements – course changes/new courses MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with program change/new program submission.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-to-degree</td>
<td>Other (please describe):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If the program change involves changes to any existing courses (deleting courses, changing existing courses, or adding new courses), the course changes MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with the program change submission so that Graduate Council can review all affected courses with the proposed program change.

2. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

3. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:** The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

**Faculty Approval Date:** Indicate the date of the faculty vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair / Program Director:</th>
<th>Please type name(s) as appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
<td>Please include signature(s) as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- [x] Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter.
- [ ] Completed Coversheet for Request for Approval To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements.
- [ ] Revised Catalogue/Website Copy in proper table format including Justification as indicated above. Must be signed and dated.
May 13, 2014

TO: Lynda S. Bell
Graduate Council

FROM: Paulo Chagas
Chair, Department of Music

RE: Request to extend normative completion for Ethnomusicology Ph.D.

The Music Department requests approval to extend the normative time for the Ph.D. program in Music—Ethnomusicology from 5 years to 7 years. Our Ethnomusicology Ph.D. students are required to conduct field research (often in a foreign country) for at least 1 year. We are finding that these students return from the field with little time remaining to prepare their dissertations. Below is a breakdown of average time for most of our students in the Ethnomusicology track:

Coursework to qualifying exam: 3 years
Field study: 1-2 years
Dissertation preparation: 2 years

We are finding that these students need at least 6 years for the Ph.D. Ethnomusicology programs at other U.S. universities have a longer normative time than 5 years. The program at UC Berkeley, for example, has a normative time of 7 years. UCLA requires 18 quarters for completion (6 years) but notes that students in Ethnomusicology “normally engage in a year of fieldwork/research and an additional year of writing the dissertation.”

Thus, we believe that 7 years would be a more reasonable amount of time for completion of the Ph.D. program, from graduate admission to award of the degree. With approval of the 7-year normative time for the Ph.D. in Ethnomusicology, we also request approval to apply it to students already in the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Time to Degree.</strong> 15 quarters for students entering with a B.A. degree; 12 quarters for students entering with an M.A. degree.</td>
<td><strong>Normative Time to Degree.</strong> For students in Digital Composition and Musicology: 15 quarters for students entering with a B.A. degree; 12 quarters for students entering with an M.A. degree. For students in Ethnomusicology: 21 quarters for students entering with a B.A. degree; 15 quarters for students entering with an M.A. degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The change above reflects the more realistic circumstances of graduate students in the Ethnomusicology Ph.D. program at UCR. Note that this revision only applies to doctoral students in Ethnomusicology. These students are required to conduct at least one year of field research and the seven years for completion puts our program in line with most other Ethnomusicology Ph.D. programs throughout the United States. Thus, this change will likely have a positive impact on recruitment of future students. Additionally, we wish to apply this change to all currently enrolled students as soon as it is approved. Finally, the Music Department ladder rank faculty has already approved this change and its application to all current ethnomusicology doctoral students.

Faculty Approval Date: April 02, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Chair</th>
<th>Paulo Chagas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>May 13, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>MS in Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>04/09/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Contact: Dr. Xinping Cui
Email: xinping.cui@ucr.edu
Phone: 22563

Prepared by: Dr. Xinping Cui
Email: xinping.cui@ucr.edu
Phone: 22563

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree
- Course requirements – course changes/new courses MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with program change/new program submission.
- Other (please describe):

1. If the program change involves changes to any existing courses (deleting courses, changing existing courses, or adding new courses), the course changes MUST be submitted in CRAMS simultaneously with the program change submission so that Graduate Council can review all affected courses with the proposed program change.

2. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

3. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter.
- Completed Coversheet for Request for Approval To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements.
- Revised Catalogue/Website Copy in proper table format including Justification as indicated above. Must be signed and dated.
April 9, 2014

To: Dr. Lynda S. Bell, Chair,
Graduate Council

From: Dr. Xinping Cui, Graduate Advisor
Statistics Graduate Program

Re: Proposed change in the M.S. Graduate Program Effective Fall 2014

Dear Lynda,

Purpose for change: The Master’s program does not require students to submit a Program Proposal in order to meet the Comprehensive Examination requirement. Instead, students need to take the Written Comprehensive Examination at the MS level, with no more than two attempts allowed to pass. Therefore, we request to remove the Program Proposal exam portion from the MS departmental requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Examination:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After completion of the required courses, the student takes a written comprehensive examination. This is generally offered twice annually, in the fall and spring quarters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Examination:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After completion of the required courses, the student takes a written comprehensive examination at the MS level, with no more than two attempts allowed to pass. This is generally offered twice annually, in the fall and spring quarters. A Program Proposal is not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed change would commence in fall 2014.

Sincerely,

Xinping Cui, Graduate Advisor
Department of Statistics
Coversheet for Request for Approval  
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>MA-Public History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>History/CHASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>5/07/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Contact: Dr. Juliette Levy  
Email: juliette.levy@ucr.edu  
Phone: 827-6492
Prepared by: Iselda Salgado  
Email: iseldas@ucr.edu  
Phone: 827-1435

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Other (please describe):

- Course requirements
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be strikethrough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- [x] Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
- [x] Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
- [x] Revised and Dated Program Summary
- [x] Revised Catalogue Copy
- [ ] Revised Website Copy
Proposed modifications and justification:
In line with changes to the History Department PhD and MA program in Fall 2013, we have modified the Public History Program to align with previous program changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department of History offers three programs of study leading to the M.A. degree: the Regular Program (Plan I and Plan II) and the Public History Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Public History Program (M.A.) |  |
| This program provides education in history as well as technical training for historical careers in archives, historic preservation, museums, and other positions in the public sector. | This program provides historical training in academic research and historiography as well as preparation for careers outside of the academy, in archives, historic preservation, museums, and other realms of public engagement with history and the humanities, including the digital, education in history as well as technical training for historical careers in archives, historic preservation, museums, and other positions in the public sector. |

Justification: This clarifies public history as the field is defined today and in terms of how our courses are currently taught in the department and across the university, to include multimedia (such as the digital) and interdisciplinarity.

| Admission |  |
| Applicants must have either the B.A. in History or the Baccalaureate in another field and be able to demonstrate a satisfactory knowledge of history. |  |

| Students prepare in three areas | Students prepare in three two areas |
| 1. A historical field, in which the student is trained in academic research and historiography | 1. A historical field outside of Public History, in which the student is trained in academic research and historiography |

Justification: Modified to align with program change

| 2. A professional specialty: archival management, historic preservation, or museum curatorship | 2. A specialization in Public History professional specialty: archival management, historic preservation, or museum curatorship |

Justification: Changed for clarification

| 3. A subspecialty, consisting of courses related to the professional specialty | A subspecialty, consisting of courses related to the professional specialty |

Justification: Eliminating convoluted language; streamlined to represent Public History as the specialization, which encompasses a range of coursework.

| Coursework |  |
| Candidates must complete a minimum of 40 units of courses as follows | At least one of the following: HIST 260, HIST 262, or HIST 263, chosen |

| 1. One two-quarter graduate history research seminar. |  |
| 2. Two history courses chosen from HIST 200-250 and 254. | 2. Two history courses chosen from HIST 200-250 and 254, graduate reading seminars. |

Justification: Theory and Methods & Materials courses were replaced by readings seminars allowing more flexibility; this change is consistent with larger changes in the History graduate program.

| 3. HIST 260, HIST 262, or HIST 263, chosen |  |
according to the student’s subspecialty. The accompanying practicum must also be taken if offered.  

| Justification: Modified to align with program change and to allow for flexibility in development of public history courses. |

4. Four upper-division undergraduate or graduate courses related to the subspecialty. Two should be outside the History department; additional courses outside the department require approval of the Public History advisor.  

| Justification: Streamlined to represent Public History as the specialization |

5. Four units of HIST 290 while writing the internship field report.  

| Justification: This is the only field that has a required course, changed to align with other field requirements. |

**Internship** The candidate must complete a ten-week internship, coincident with an academic quarter or summer session, at a cooperating institution, for training under professional supervision in a field of the candidate’s choice. The internship is registered with a History Department faculty advisor as HIST 398-I. The internship requires a written field report.  

| When the candidate’s advisor and the Committee on Public History Judge that an additional skill, particularly in the subspecialty, is needed, then the defined level of competency in that skill is required for the degree. |

| Justification: This has not been exercised by the department, and is already covered by the fact that the field report oral exam will test competency in the field. |

**Oral Examination** Candidates must pass two-part oral examination: one part on the field-report-in-progress and a second part on the candidate’s field of history and subspecialty.  

| **Oral Examination** Candidates must pass two-part oral examination: one part on the field-report-in-progress and a second part on the candidate’s field of history and Public History subspecialty. |

| **Normative Time to Degree** 6 quarters. M.A. students who wish to transfer to the Ph.D. Program must apply for a sixth-quarter review as described in the Ph.D. program. No student may enroll in these M.A. programs for more than 9 quarters. |

**Program Advisor:** Dr. Juliette Levy  

**Signature:**  

**Date:**
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>History/CHASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>05/07/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Contact</th>
<th>Dr. Juliette Levy</th>
<th>Email: <a href="mailto:juliette.levy@ucr.edu">juliette.levy@ucr.edu</a></th>
<th>Phone: 827-6492</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by</td>
<td>Iseldas Salgado</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:iseldas@ucr.edu">iseldas@ucr.edu</a></td>
<td>Phone: 827-1435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)**

- Admission requirements
- Unit requirements
- Professional Development Plan
- Other (please describe):
- Course requirements
- Examination requirements
- Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be strikethrough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Date signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):**

- Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
- Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
- Revised and Dated Program Summary
- Revised Catalogue Copy
- Revised Website Copy
Proposed modifications and justification:
In line with changes proposed to MA program in Public History, we have modified the PhD program to align with proposed program changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department of History offers the Ph.D. in History. The Ph.D. program in History prepares graduates for careers as university teachers, public historians, and professional researchers and analysts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Admission** Students may prepare for entry into the Ph.D. program by earning a B.A. or an M.A. degree in History or by earning a degree in a closely related field that involves significant study of history. Students holding a degree in another field are evaluated by the graduate studies committee on a case-by-case basis to determine the level of the graduate program at which they should commence their studies.

**Course Work** Candidates for the Ph.D. degree entering with a baccalaureate degree complete a minimum of 56 units of required course work, 44 of which must be at the graduate level. Students who enter with an M.A. degree complete a minimum of 28 units, 20 of which must be at the graduate level, and may be able to waive certain course requirements listed below. The student's curriculum during the entire graduate career must include the following:

1. At least two two-quarter graduate research seminars
2. At least six reading seminars or equivalent courses, chosen from the student's fields
3. At least three courses approved by the graduate advisor for the teaching field requirement, of which two must be at the graduate level
4. All Ph.D. students must also complete HIST 301. Students whose research or complementary field is Public History must complete HIST 402. These courses do not count towards unit requirements.

Justification: Students who enter the PhD with a MA can petition to waive one two quarter research seminar based on the MA thesis. Students in Public History complete a Field Report equivalent to a MA thesis.

1. At least two two-quarter graduate research seminars. One two-quarter research seminar may be waived by petition for students completing a MA in Public History at UCR.
<p>| Justification: This is the only field that has a required course. Changed to align with other program field requirements. |
| Courses should be chosen in consultation with the student's faculty advisor and the graduate advisor; suitable courses are described in the departmental protocols. HIST 290 may be used towards the specific requirements above only with the permission of the graduate advisor. |
| Ph.D. Fields Students prepare three fields: a research field, a complementary field, and a teaching field. The research fields that the department offers are listed below; complementary and teaching fields may be chosen from among the research fields or from the list of additional fields. In special cases, students may petition to replace the complementary field with a custom field designed by the student in consultation with two faculty members who agree to administer the written examination in the field. Students may not offer three fields that all deal with a single country or region. |
| Research Fields: |
| Early America |
| Nineteenth-Century United States |
| Twentieth-Century United States |
| American West |
| Native American History |
| Ancient Mediterranean |
| Early Modern Europe |
| Modern Europe |
| Early Modern England |
| Modern England |
| Modern Russia |
| Colonial Latin America |
| Modern Latin America |
| Southeast Asia |
| Public History |
| Additional Fields |
| Early Modern World History |
| Modern World History |
| Gender History |
| Sixth-Quarter Review All Ph.D. students undergo a comprehensive review no later than the sixth quarter of enrollment in the program, based on a portfolio selected by the student and advisor. The graduate studies committee reviews the student's record and makes one of the following recommendations: proceed, hold, or terminate. Students receiving a hold may reapply once, within three quarters. Students receiving a terminate may continue enrolling for no more than three quarters to complete |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MA requirements.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only under extraordinary circumstances may a student continue enrolling for more than 9 quarters (including enrollment while an M.A. student at UCR) without permission to proceed to examinations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.A. in History degree for Ph.D. Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program may apply for the M.A. degree in History once they have completed the requirements for the degree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirements for completing the Ph.D. degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examinations</strong> Students are examined in their research and complementary fields by a single written examination and at the Ph.D. oral examination. To take the Ph.D. oral qualifying examination, the student must submit a preliminary draft of the dissertation proposal. The teaching field is satisfied by course work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Requirement</strong> Students must demonstrate reading proficiency in at least one language other than English. In certain research fields, students may be required to demonstrate a higher level of proficiency or to demonstrate proficiency in additional languages. Consult the departmental protocols for specific requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Candidacy</strong> Students advance to candidacy after completing all examinations, the teaching field, and the language requirement. By the end of the following academic quarter, each student must submit to the graduate study committee a dissertation proposal approved by the student's faculty advisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation</strong> Candidates must submit a dissertation that demonstrates scholarly, original, and independent investigation of a subject in the student's research field chosen with the advice and approval of the dissertation committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Time to Degree</strong> 17 quarters (including M.A. work).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Advisor:** Dr. Juliette Levy

**Signature:**

**Date:** 5/11/2014
Coversheet for Request for Approval
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Academic Unit/School</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>5/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
<td>fall 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty Contact: | Deborah Willis | Email: | deborah.willis@ucr.edu | Phone: | 21458 |
| Prepared by: | Tina Feldmann | Email: | tina.feldmann@ucr.edu | Phone: | 21454 |

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- [x] Admission requirements
- [ ] Unit requirements
- [ ] Professional Development Plan
- [ ] Other (please describe):
- [x] Course requirements
- [ ] Examination requirements
- [ ] Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be striken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table and strike the deletions.</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

| Department Chair / Program Director: | Please type name(s) as appropriate |
| Signature: | Please include signature(s) as appropriate |
| Date: | Date signed |

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- [ ] Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter
- [ ] Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate
- [x] Revised and Dated Program Summary
- [ ] Revised Catalogue Copy
- [ ] Revised Website Copy
May 20, 2014

TO: Graduate Council
FROM: Deborah Willis, Chair
Department of English
RE: Proposal to Change English Department Protocols on Course Requirement Options

At a department meeting on May 6, 2013, English Department faculty unanimously approved the following change to our protocols in order to allow graduate students who enter with the B.A. to take up to two of their ten graduate seminars in another department at UCR or another UC campus during their first two years in our Ph.D. program. For several years, graduate students have been requesting this change. To ensure that the selection of such courses is done carefully, students will consult with the English Department’s Director of Graduate Studies before enrolling in order to determine whether the outside course will truly help them reach their overall academic goals. The new protocol language is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students may take up to two of their ten</td>
<td>Students may take up to two of their ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements as upper-division English courses</td>
<td>requirements as upper-division English courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a two-unit English 292.</td>
<td>with a two-unit English 292, or as graduate seminars in another department at UCR or at another UC campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUSTIFICATION: This change to our protocols seeks to make it easier for graduate students to pursue interdisciplinary work by taking up to two seminars outside the English Department, either in another department at UCR or at another UC campus. For some students, coursework outside English is crucial
to the development of their dissertation projects, and such work is strongly supported by many English faculty. Graduate students in other departments often enroll in English department graduate seminars, and it is only reasonable that our own students be allowed similar options, particularly now that some CHASS departments have launched new graduate programs and others have expanded offerings. (We include the option of taking courses at other UC campuses to further extend the range of possibilities, though we expect this option will be rarely used, and only when the other campus offers courses in an area not covered by UCR faculty.) Moreover, in our recent Graduate Review, the extramural review team recommended that we create “more flexibility in the graduate curriculum in the first two years to allow for multidisciplinary studies,” a recommendation also supported in Graduate Council’s own findings (see D.2 in “Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations,” 9/20/2012). Approval of this change to our protocol language will implement this recommendation.
May 28, 2014

To: Ken Barish, Planning & Budget Chair
    Lynda Bell, Graduate Council Chair

    Erica Edwards, CHASS Executive Committee
    Barry Mishra, SOBA Executive Committee
    Mike Vanderwood, GSOE Executive Committee
    Akula Venkatram, BCOE Executive Committee
    Ameae Walker, SOM Executive Committee
    Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
      Riverside Division 

RE: Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Policy

I forward for your expedited review a revised proposal for a new Presidential policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs. As Provost Dorr’s letter reminds you, a previous version of this policy was sent for review last Fall, and the Senate commented at that time. The Academic Planning Council has considered all the comments received and made changes to the proposed policy draft in response. Provost Dorr’s letter highlights the substantive changes since the last version was reviewed.

Provost Dorr requests that the Senate comment on the revised draft no later than at the July 23 meeting of the Academic Council. In order to ensure that Council is able to consider all incoming comments with care, please send your committee response by July 11, 2014.

I realize that the summer period makes it challenging to accomplish this review in the requested time period but hope it will be possible.
CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR WILLIAM JACOB

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find a revised version of the proposed Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Policy. As you may remember, we sent out a draft policy developed by the Academic Planning Council (APC) in November 2013 for a formal review and requested comments back by February 7, 2014. The Academic Planning Council has had two full meetings and a number of subcommittee meetings since comments were received.

The APC has now developed this revised policy draft in response to the comments received. The revised policy draft was endorsed at a combined meeting on May 1, 2014 of the 2012-13 and 2013-14 Academic Planning Councils (members of the 2012-13 APC were included because they had developed the original proposal). The APC is the joint Academic Senate/Administration committee tasked with working on policies of this nature.

This transmittal is a request to the Academic Council for formal but expedited review of the policy by the Academic Senate and to the Chancellors for a second round of review by the campus administrations. For campus review, this request is being sent directly to Chancellors, with copies to the Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs), per the request of COC that major communications and requests for information from UCOP are addressed to the Chancellors. In addition, the proposed policy will be shared with campus constituent groups convened by UCOP such as the Graduate Deans, the Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget, the Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs, and the Extension Deans.

The main issue addressed in response to the written comments of the campuses and the Academic Senate was the issue of the appropriate criteria for defining which graduate professional programs would be eligible for self-supporting status. A number of commentators expressed concern that the proposed policy was too restrictive as to which programs would be eligible whereas a number of other commentators were concerned that
Chancellors
Academic Council Chair Jacob
May 14, 2014
Page 2

the proposed policy did not have clearly defined criteria and thus was overly lax on the issue of program eligibility.

UC’s existing policy and the proposed policy both exclude all Ph.D. programs and “academic’s master’s degree programs leading solely or primarily” to a Ph.D. degree. Beyond those exclusions, the new draft seeks to address the concerns raised by including language from the UC Davis self-supporting policy: “SSGPDPs are graduate programs that primarily serve professionals seeking to advance their career.” In addition, to address the issue of not losing state support for UC’s core functions, the new revision includes language that “a proposal to create a self-supporting program must make a compelling case as to why the program cannot or should not be a state-supported program.”

There are a number of other changes in response to the comments and the enclosed redline draft describes those changes. In addition, we are enclosing the November 2013 draft and original transmittal. UC’s current self-supporting policy and background materials can be found at this website: http://tiny.cc/3wqefx.

With these changes, I believe the enclosed draft represents a fair compromise between the competing points of view that were expressed in the comments received in February. I hope to present this policy to President Napolitano for her consideration sometime later this year. The Academic Council has agreed to consider the policy at their July 23, 2014 meeting, so we are requesting comments in advance of that meeting.

Please submit your written responses on the proposed policy by July 14, 2014 via email to Aimee.Dorr@ucop.edu with a copy to Todd.Greenspan@ucop.edu.

I look forward to receiving your responses.

Cordially,

Aimée Dorr, Provost
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Enclosures

cc: Vice Chair Gilly
    Executive Vice Chancellors
    Vice President Brown
    The Academic Planning Council (2012-13 and 2013-14)
    Executive Director Winnacker
    Director Greenspan
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Officer:</th>
<th>President of the University of California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Office:</td>
<td>Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance Date:</td>
<td>[Issuance Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>[Effective Date]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope:</td>
<td>This Policy applies to all UC campuses and academic units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact: Email: Phone #:
### POLICY

#### I. POLICY SUMMARY

This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP.¹

#### II. DEFINITIONS

a. **Self-supporting** – Self-supporting means that all program costs, both direct and indirect, are covered by revenues generated by the program such as student charges or from alternative revenues that are not disallowed funds as defined in Section II(g) below.

b. **Program costs** – Program costs include both direct and indirect costs.

c. **Direct costs** – Direct costs for SSGPDPs include, but are not limited to, costs related to instruction, program support, student services, financial aid, faculty and staff salaries and benefits, supplies, and equipment.

¹ Nothing in this Policy constitutes a contract, an offer of a contract, or a promise that any student charges ultimately authorized by the University will be limited by any term or provision of this Policy. The University expressly reserves the right and option, in its absolute discretion, to establish student charges at any level it deems appropriate based on a full consideration of the circumstances, and nothing in this Policy shall be a basis for any party to rely on student charges of a specified level or based on a specified formula.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>d. Indirect costs</strong> – Indirect costs are costs that cannot be charged to a particular project or activity but are incurred by the University or an organizational unit of the University as a result of undertaking the project or activity. Indirect costs for SSGPDPs include, but are not limited to, the charges levied by a school, college, campus, and/or systemwide entity for a program’s share of academic and administrative support, libraries, building use, and operation and maintenance of physical facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. Charges (SSGPDPs)</strong> – Charges are funds paid by students to attend SSGPDPs. The charges may include approved Compulsory Campus-Based Student Fees and Course Materials and Services Fees. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, these fees are disallowed funds as defined in g. below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. Tuition and fees (state-supported programs)</strong> – Tuition and fees are funds paid by students to attend state-supported programs and include, but are not limited to, Tuition, Student Services Fee, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST), and Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g. Disallowed funds</strong> – Disallowed funds are funds the SSGPD may not rely on for program costs. Disallowed funds include State General Funds and tuition and fees as defined in f. above. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, revenue from these fees may not be used to support the SSGPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h. Compendium</strong> – The Compendium is the <em>Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, &amp; Research Units</em>. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendium draws on current University policies to articulate systemwide review processes for proposals to establish, transfer, consolidate, change the name of, and discontinue or disestablish undergraduate degree programs (in certain cases), graduate degree programs, schools, colleges, and research units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. POLICY TEXT

A. Introduction. Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) allow the University of California (UC or University) to (1) serve additional students above and beyond those supported by resources provided by the State while fulfilling-and (2) fulfill demonstrated higher education and workforce needs. Models of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs include, but are not limited to, those that serve non-traditional populations, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students with specialized goals, and/or students whose professional education is supported by their employers. Many SSGPDPs are (1) offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online or hybrid instruction; (2) alternatively-scheduled (e.g., during evenings, weekends, and/or summers); and/or (3) offered in alternative locations (e.g., off-campus).

This Policy facilitates-governs the establishment and operation of SSGPDPs at the University and its campuses, while ensuring that these programs do not use disallowed funds.

In times when the University received adequate State support to honor its commitment to the California Master Plan and to expand graduate academic and professional programs in response to State and societal needs, UC directed self-supporting programs primarily towards working adults and other non-traditional student populations. These programs provide alternative venues and opportunities for access to quality programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading to graduate professional degrees. With the decline in State support, this Policy now recognizes that offering self-supporting graduate professional degree programs is also a necessary educational strategy to allow the University to serve a greater number of students above and beyond those whom State resources will support. Although these programs receive no state-support, they have the potential to generate resources that would enhance the quality, accessibility, and affordability of core academic programs and departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, the Policy requires that a compelling case be made for why a SSGPDP cannot or should not be state-supported and assurances that the SSGPDP will not have a detrimental impact on a school’s or a department’s ability to carry out its state-supported teaching, research, and service responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP. SSGPDPs shall not use disallowed funds. However, nothing in this Policy is intended to prescribe campus policy or pre-empt a campus’s discretion with respect to how it distributes resources with the exception that disallowed fund sources may not be used to fund SSGPDPs. Campus may have their own policies with regard to SSGPDPs provided those policies do not conflict with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restored from prior versions—agreed to in APC 2/18 meeting—moved to new location in APC 4/25 meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added in APC 4/25 meeting to state principle now detailed in Section H(1) below. The “compelling case” language is an alternative to adding more restrictive criteria about what kinds of programs are eligible for SSGPDP status.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from 2nd paragraph of this section (APC 4/25 meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added to allow campuses to retain their own policies on self-supporting programs (APC 4/25 meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B. Description of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs.** SSGPDPs are graduate programs that primarily serve professionals seeking to advance their careers, education, and skills that correspond to anticipated professional careers. They provide expanded educational opportunities and can be directed towards those students with anticipated capacity to pay higher fees (for example, because the fees are paid by the employer). All direct and indirect costs shall be covered by charges paid by SSGPDP students or by other funds that the sponsoring academic unit allocates to the SSGPDP. SSGPDPs may not use disallowed funds.

SSGPDPs are an alternate mechanism to enable the establishment of new graduate professional degree programs and, in some cases, the maintenance of existing graduate professional degree programs. This Policy governs both circumstances. With the exception of the source of funds and the costs the funds must cover, all SSGPDPs must adhere to the same policies as state-supported programs. SSGPDPs are subject to Academic Senate oversight and review to ensure that all degree programs meet UC standards of academic rigor and quality. All faculty (both Senate and non-Senate) in SSGPDPs are governed by UC academic personnel policies and practices.

All direct and indirect costs shall be covered by charges paid by SSGPDP students or by other funds that the sponsoring academic unit allocates to the SSGPDP. SSGPDPs may not use disallowed funds.

**First sentence re-written to track UC Davis policy. Second sentence deleted because concepts already included in A. above. Language on costs and disallowed funds moved to end of section (APC 4/25 meeting)**

**Moved from above – no change in wording (APC 4/25 meeting)**
C. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status include the following: all undergraduate degree programs, all academic master’s degree programs leading solely or primarily to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree, and all Ph.D. programs.

D. Location of offerings. SSGPDP courses and other program requirements may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or online, using distance technologies as appropriate (consistent with Academic Senate Reg. 694).

E. Comparable quality to regular state-supported graduate programs. SSGPDPs are held to the same standards of quality as all other UC graduate professional degree programs. Student admission and performance standards for SSGPDPs are governed by the Academic Senate.

F. Comparable faculty. As is the case for all other UC degree programs, Senate faculty are responsible for SSGPDPs. Senate faculty who teach in SSGPDPs are appointed, evaluated, and advanced under the same processes and criteria as are other Senate faculty regardless of whether a portion of their regular compensation comes from SSGPDPs. The nature of certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion than usual of non-Senate faculty (e.g., clinical faculty, adjunct faculty, lecturers, and visitors).

G. Faculty workload and compensation. SSGPDPs shall comply with the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) with respect to how faculty, both Senate and non-Senate, are compensated. Faculty are expected to comply with all relevant reporting requirements. Teaching in a self-supporting program does not constitute workload for purposes of State reporting. Faculty teaching in SSGPDPs shall be handled either through compensation to a faculty member’s department for a reduction in the faculty member’s workload (a “buy-
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out”) or through additional compensation to the faculty member for additional workload above normal workload depending. This depends on whether the teaching replaces part of the faculty member’s expected full-time load (a “buy-out”) or is in addition to the full-time load (additional compensation). A “buy-out” must include the complete cost of faculty salary, health benefits, and retirement compensation. Campus policies on “buy-out” or additional compensation may be applied so long as they do not conflict with this policy or the APM.² SSGPDPs shall not in any way diminish a school or department’s responsibilities to the full complement of state-supported programs.

For non-Senate academic appointees covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.

### H. Initiation and approval of SSGPDPS.

1. **Initiation.** Departments, groups of departments, or schools may propose a new SSGPDP or conversion of an existing state-supported program to an SSGPDP. Proposals shall originate with an academic unit that is authorized to conduct graduate work. A proposal to create a self-supporting program must make a compelling case as to why the program cannot or should not be a state-supported program. It must articulate how it will ensure that the self-supporting program will not have a detrimental impact on state-supported teaching, research or service, both academically and financially, in the unit proposing the program.

---

² Section 662 of the APM addresses additional compensation for additional teaching.
2. **New Program.** The establishment of a new SSGPDP must be approved according to procedures and requirements specified in the Compendium.

3. **Conversion.** Conversion of a state-supported graduate professional degree program to self-supporting status is possible, but the expectation is that conversion will be infrequent and uncommon. Conversion of an existing state-supported program to self-supporting status is regarded as exceptional. Special justification 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, sustainable or has unduly restricted development of the program.

Graduate professional degree programs converting to self-supporting status must meet the same criteria as new SSGPDPs and are subject to the same review criteria as new SSGPDPs. This includes criteria related to financial sustainability, financial accessibility, faculty appointments, and course approvals.

Initial review of a conversion proposal shall be conducted by the Graduate Council of the proposing campus. The campus Graduate Council determines whether the converting program is in good academic standing and provides CCGA with a statement of support or non-support for the proposal.

*Alternative language for “uncommon and infrequent” taken from CCGA comment letter. (APC 2/18 meeting)*
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

i. **Conversion when changing academic requirements.** A proposal to convert a state-supported program that includes changes to the program’s academic requirements shall be reviewed through the same processes as a newly-created graduate professional degree program.

ii. **Conversion when not changing academic requirements.** A proposal to convert a state-supported program that includes no changes to the program’s academic requirements shall be reviewed through Academic Senate processes at the campus and at the system level to evaluate context and justification for the conversion and to assure that the program proposed for conversion is in good academic standing. In order for a conversion proposal to be reviewed at the system level, the program must have undergone and received a meritorious academic review within the previous five years. At the discretion of systemwide review bodies, system level review may be expedited.

iii. **Review of conversion SSGPDP.** The first academic review of a program that converted from state-supported to self-supporting status shall be in the fourth year of establishment (after three years of operation). Thereafter the program joins the campus’ regular academic review cycle.

### I. Phase-in period.

All SSGPDPS shall be fully self-supporting within three years of inception. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program shall submit to UCOP a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan for review and approval.

### J. Failure to become or remain self-supporting.

If a new or converting self-supporting program does not reach financial sustainability within the required three years, the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disallowed funds for those purposes. Similarly, if an existing SSGPDP is no longer financially self-supporting, the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use disallowed funds for those purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K. Reversion to state-supported status.** Any SSGPDP (existing, new, or converted) seeking to become a state-supported graduate professional degree program shall be subject to the same campus approvals required to establish new state-supported graduate academic or professional degree programs and enrollments.

**L. Discontinuation.** Consistent with the requirements for the discontinuation of any UC academic program, a discontinued SSGPDP must ensure that students have the opportunity to complete their degrees or transfer to other programs.

**M. Review of SSGPDPs.** Campus Graduate Councils shall review SSGPDPs as part of regularly-scheduled campus program reviews on the same basis as state-supported academic programs are reviewed. Once established, the SSGPDP shall be under the purview of the campus Graduate Council and the Graduate Division to ensure adequate progress of students according to campus criteria. Campuses may apply additional review measures so long as they do not conflict with this policy. SSGPDP courses are subject to normal campus procedures for approval, revision, and termination.

**N. Admission and enrollment.** Admission standards for SSGPDPs shall be comparable to those in effect for analogous state-supported programs, if such programs are available. Admissions criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field, as applicable to the specific graduate professional degree offered. Students must be admitted through the Graduate Division through the regular admissions process. Enrollments in SSGPDPs do not count for purposes of calculating the number of students
supported by the State. SSGPDP enrollments will be reported separately from enrollment of students in state-supported programs. During the approved phase-in period, the distribution of enrollments between state-supported and self-supporting programs will conform to the specifications of the approved plan.

**O. Approval by President of student charges and phase-in plans.** In addition to the program approval requirements above, proposed student charges and the phase-in plan for each SSGPDP shall be submitted to the President for approval.

**P. Student charges.** The President will review and approve proposed student charges for each SSGPDP upon establishment or conversion, as well as subsequent proposed annual increases or decreases in such charges. The President will report annually to The Regents on the level of student charges for each approved program.

Student charges for SSGPDPs will cover all program costs within the required three-year period unless the campus chooses to use other non-disallowed funds to assist in meeting program costs. The Chancellor must approve the use of non-disallowed funds to subsidize SSGPDPs. Chancellor approval authority may not be delegated.

The level of student charges shall be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs as defined in the Policy and further detailed in the Implementation Guidelines.

*University employees enrolled in SSGPDPs are not eligible for reduced course charges. This does not preclude a department from subsidizing a portion of the program charges from non-disallowed funds.* Program deficits, including deficits during the approved phase-in

---

*This fee reduction language from the prior policy was designed to distinguish SSPs from Extension enrollments since many of the early self-supporting*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>POLICY</strong></th>
<th><strong>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>period, are the responsibility of the campus; disallowed funds cannot be used to cover any deficit. State-supported degree programs and SSGPDPs must separately account for their use of resources. Campuses shall not charge a blended tuition/fee level for any course or program.</td>
<td>programs were run out of Extension. APC decided at the 2/18 meeting that the policy should be silent on the issue of any fee reductions or remissions—thus, the first two sentences deleted. The issue of remission for TAs is now covered by new language in faculty section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q. Financial accessibility.</strong> SSGPDPs must have a financial accessibility goal for their student population and a student financial support plan for achieving this goal. It is expected that the plan will address access for students from a wide range of income levels. Examples of possible student financial support include scholarships or grants from the program’s own resources (i.e., return-to-aid from student charges), privately raised funds, waivers of student charges, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, or other external support. For the purposes of state and federal student financial aid programs, “student charges” has the same meaning as “tuition.”</td>
<td>It is currently not possible to waive mandatory systemwide tuition and fees for students enrolled in degree-granting programs. (4/25 APC meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. Consultation.</strong> Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. IMPLEMENTATION OF SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (SSGPDP) POLICY

The President issues the following Policy implementation procedures for the SSGPDP Policy:

A. Program approvals. Prior to operation, all SSGPDPs must obtain necessary program approvals pursuant to this Policy and the processes detailed in the Compendium. A proposal for a new or conversion SSGPDP must be accompanied by a joint letter of support from the Graduate Council, the Executive Board, the Executive Vice Chancellor, and the Chancellor. Similarly, SSGPDPs that are being discontinued or converted to state-supported status must adhere to the requirements of this Policy and the Compendium. New SSGPDPs and state-supported programs seeking to convert to SSGPDP status may apply for review of proposed student charges [see V.B.] prior to completion of program approval processes. However, no student charges will be approved in advance of final program approval.

B. Process for certification of self-supporting status and Presidential approval of self-supporting program charges. SSGPDP student charges must be approved by the President every three years. In order to receive Presidential approval for student charges, each SSGPDP and each campus with one or more SSGPDPs shall follow the following procedures:

1. Triennial program templates.
   For each SSGPDP, a UCOP template shall be completed that covers the following elements:
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Program approval status. The completed template shall indicate the program approval status for the SSGPDP, the date and results of its most recent academic program review, and/or the dates the next academic program review will begin and be completed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Current and proposed student charges. The completed template shall include, at a minimum, the current level of student charges and the projected student charges for the next three-year period. Approved Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees may be charged to SSGPDP students when it can be shown that SSGPDP students benefit from the services funded by those fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Financial accessibility. The completed template shall include a description of the SSGPDP’s student financial support plan and the extent to which it is attaining its financial accessibility goal. For programs that have converted or are proposing to convert from state-supported status, the description shall compare the program’s student financial accessibility with that of other UC programs offering similar degrees, whether self-supporting or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Cost analysis. The completed template shall include a cost analysis that demonstrates that the proposed student charges cover full direct and indirect costs, or (to the extent that student charges are insufficient to cover these costs) that no disallowed funds will be used to subsidize the program. The required elements and format of the cost analysis shall be specified in the UCOP template. New SSGPDPs are subject to the same cost analysis. Programs are expected to become fully self-supporting within three years, though campuses may continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS ON REVISIONS**

*Added in 2/18 APC meeting.*
to subsidize programs with non-disallowed funds at their discretion. Program deficits, including any deficits during the phase-in period, must be covered by the campuses; disallowed funds may not be used to cover any deficit. The template shall require campuses to identify in advance fund sources that will be used to cover any projected deficits and to identify fund sources being used to cover any current deficits.

e. **Consultation.** The completed template shall include a section identifying the stakeholders who were consulted and when and how the consultation took place, and providing a short summary of the feedback received from each category of stakeholders. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program. Prior to establishing a new program, student input shall be sought from students likely to apply to such a program.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to subsidize programs with non-disallowed funds at their discretion. Program deficits, including any deficits during the phase-in period, must be covered by the campuses; disallowed funds may not be used to cover any deficit. The template shall require campuses to identify in advance fund sources that will be used to cover any projected deficits and to identify fund sources being used to cover any current deficits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. <strong>Consultation.</strong> The completed template shall include a section identifying the stakeholders who were consulted and when and how the consultation took place, and providing a short summary of the feedback received from each category of stakeholders. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program. Prior to establishing a new program, student input shall be sought from students likely to apply to such a program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Campus submittals.**
   
   Each campus with one or more SSGPDPs must provide a submittal consisting of (1) a cover letter from the Chancellor to the Vice President—Budget and Capital Resources requesting approval of student charges for the upcoming period and (2) the program templates for each existing or proposed SSGPDP on that campus. Specifically, the cover letter shall include:

   a. A statement that appropriate campus leadership has reviewed and approved the attached templates for each SSGPDP on that campus. The statement must certify that each program is operating on a self-supporting basis (or is using non-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>COMMENTS ON REVISIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disallowed funds to cover any deficit) and is in compliance with this Policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A request to approve the proposed level of student charges for each existing or proposed SSGPDP for the upcoming period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A table showing, for each SSGPDP, the current level of student charges, the proposed level of student charges, and the percentage increase or decrease, if any. UCOP will provide a template for this table to ensure that student charges can be compared across programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Timeline for submittals.
   a. November preceding the next academic year – Campuses receive templates from UCOP together with instructions on the process for the required annual submittals.
   b. February 1 – Budget and Capital Resources (BCR) at UCOP receives completed campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP. Staff designated by the Vice President-BCR and the Provost begin to review proposals.
   c. March 1 – Provost and Vice President-BCR receive the results of UCOP staff review, including campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP.
   d. April 1 – President makes decisions and campuses are notified of approved program student charges for the upcoming academic year.
   e. The President reports this information to The Regents annually.
### C. Miscellaneous implementation guidelines:

1. **Reporting of enrollments.**
   
   SSGPDPs should be identified in the Corporate Student System with a major code that is distinct from state-supported programs and with an attribute code flagging enrollments in each SSGPDP as self-supporting.

2. **Faculty workload.**
   
   All faculty participation in the SSGPDP must be funded directly from SSGPDP revenue or other allowable sources in proportion to the faculty member’s workload commitment to the program. If the faculty member’s participation is in lieu of some of his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then the SSGPDP must reimburse the faculty member’s department an amount equivalent to the cost of that particular faculty member’s time (**“buy-out”**). Consistent with the requirement that the SSGPDP must cover all program costs, **for a “buy-out”** the total cost of faculty salary, benefits, and retirement must be funded by SSGPDP-generated or other non-disallowed funds. If the faculty member’s participation is in addition to his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then he or she should receive additional compensation which must be calculated and recorded in accordance with relevant Academic Personnel Manual policies and reporting requirements.³

³ Section 662 of the APM addresses additional compensation for additional teaching.

---

For non-Senate academic appointees covered by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), this policy applies only to the extent provided for in the MOU.
November 12, 2013

CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR JACOB

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the proposed revised Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Policy that includes implementation information. This draft policy is a revision to the 2011 Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs and its associated implementation guidelines. The proposed policy was developed and endorsed by the 2012-13 Academic Planning Council (APC), the joint Academic Senate/Administration Committee tasked with working on policies of this nature. A roster of the 2012-13 APC members is enclosed.

This transmittal is a request to the Academic Council for formal review of the policy and its implementation by the Academic Senate and to the Chancellors for review by the campus administrations. For campus review, this request is being sent directly to Chancellors, with copies to the Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs), per the request of the Chancellors that major communications and requests for information from UCOP are addressed to them. In addition, the proposed policy and implementation is being shared with other campus constituent groups convened by UCOP -- the Graduate Deans, the Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget, and the Extension Deans.

The University now has approximately 60 self-supporting graduate professional degree programs, enrolling over 4,500 students and generating over $30 million annually in revenue from student charges. By policy, this revenue supports all costs of the programs and also the costs incurred by the departments/schools and campuses on behalf of the programs.

The enclosed new proposed policy builds on the 2011 revision to the policy and explicitly recognizes that self-supporting graduate professional degree programs are a necessary educational strategy to allow the University to serve a greater number of students above and beyond that which state resources will support. The proposed policy provides that only graduate professional degrees can be self-supporting – self-supporting Ph.D. programs, graduate master’s degree programs primarily leading to a Ph.D., and all undergraduate degree programs would not be eligible for self-supporting status.

Among other things, the new policy addresses the very limited circumstances under which a state-supported graduate professional degree program can convert to self-supporting status. The policy also revises the existing implementation guidelines (now included as Section V. of the enclosed draft policy) to help departments and campuses facilitate the establishment of self-
supporting programs and to clarify the process for receiving Presidental approval for setting and increasing student charges for each of the approved programs.

The members of the 2012-13 Academic Planning Council and I believe this policy strikes the appropriate balance between encouraging the development of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs to serve additional students and diversify University revenues and ensuring that these programs do not detract from the core state-supported mission of the University.

_Please submit your written responses on the proposed policy by February 7, 2014 via email to Aimee.Dorr@ucop.edu with a copy to Todd.Greenspan@ucop.edu._ All feedback received by February 7th will be considered by the Academic Planning Council as it works to complete the policy proposal that will be sent to President Napolitano for her approval. We hope to present it to her before the end of March 2014.

I look forward to receiving your responses.

Cordially,

Aimee Dorr
Provost and Executive Vice President

Enclosures

cc: Academic Council Vice Chair Gilly
Executive Vice Chancellors
Vice President Lenz
Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget
Council of Graduate Deans
Deans of University Extension
2012-13 Academic Planning Council Members
Executive Director Winnacker
Director Jennings
Director Greenspan
I. POLICY SUMMARY

This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP.¹

¹ Nothing in this Policy constitutes a contract, an offer of a contract, or a promise that any student charges ultimately authorized by the University will be limited by any term or provision of this Policy. The University expressly reserves the right and option, in its absolute discretion, to establish student charges at any level it deems appropriate based on a full consideration of the circumstances, and nothing in this Policy shall be a basis for any party to rely on student charges of a specified level or based on a specified formula.
II. DEFINITIONS

a. **Self-supporting** – Self-supporting means that all program costs, both direct and indirect, are covered by revenues generated by the program such as student charges or from alternative revenues that are not disallowed funds as defined in Section II(g) below.

b. **Program costs** – Program costs include both direct and indirect costs.

c. **Direct costs** – Direct costs for SSGPDPs include, but are not limited to, costs related to instruction, program support, student services, financial aid, faculty and staff salaries and benefits, supplies, and equipment.

d. **Indirect costs** – Indirect costs are costs that cannot be charged to a particular project or activity but are incurred by the University or an organizational unit of the University as a result of undertaking the project or activity. Indirect costs for SSGPDPs include but are not limited to the charges levied by school, college, campus, and systemwide entities for a program’s share of academic and administrative support, libraries, building use, and operation and maintenance of physical facilities.

e. **Charges (SSGPDPs)** – Charges are funds paid by students to attend SSGPDPs which may include approved Compulsory Campus-Based Student Fees and Course Materials and Services Fees. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, they are disallowed funds as defined in g. below.

f. **Tuition and fees (state-supported programs)** – Tuition and fees are funds paid by students to attend state-supported programs and include but are not limited to Tuition, Student Services Fee, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST), and Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees.

g. **Disallowed funds** – Disallowed funds are funds the SSGPDP may not rely on for program costs. Disallowed funds include State General Funds and tuition and fees as defined in f. above. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, revenue from these fees may not be used to support the SSGPDP.

h. **Compendium** – The Compendium is the [Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/compendium_jan2011.pdf). The Compendium draws on current University policies to articulate systemwide review processes for proposals to establish, transfer, consolidate, change the name of, and discontinue or disestablish undergraduate degree programs (in certain cases), graduate degree programs, schools, colleges, and research units.
III. POLICY TEXT

A. Introduction. Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) allow the University of California (UC or University) to serve additional students above and beyond the resources provided by the State while fulfilling demonstrated higher education and workforce needs. Models of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs include, but are not limited to, those that serve non-traditional populations, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students, and/or students whose education is supported by their employers. Many SSGPDPs are (1) offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online or hybrid instruction; (2) alternatively-scheduled (e.g., during evenings, weekends, and/or summers); and/or (3) offered in alternative locations (e.g., off-campus).

This Policy facilitates the establishment and operation of SSGPDPs at the University and its campuses while ensuring that these programs do not use disallowed funds.

When the University received adequate State support to honor its commitment to the California Master Plan and to expand graduate academic and professional programs in response to State and societal needs, UC directed self-supporting programs towards working adults and other non-traditional student populations. These programs currently provide alternative venues and opportunities for access to quality programs leading to graduate professional degrees (e.g., Master’s of Advanced Studies). Given the decline in State support, this Policy now recognizes that self-supporting graduate professional degree programs are also a necessary educational strategy to allow the University to serve a greater number of students above and beyond that which State resources will support.

This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP. However, nothing in this Policy is intended to prescribe campus policy or pre-empt a campus’s discretion with respect to how it distributes resources with the exception that disallowed fund sources may not be used to fund SSGPDPs.

B. Description of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs. SSGPDPs are graduate programs that provide education and skills that correspond to anticipated professional careers. They provide expanded educational opportunities and can be directed towards those students with anticipated capacity to pay higher fees (for example, because the fees are paid by the employer). All direct and indirect costs shall be covered by charges
paid by SSGPDP students or by other funds that the sponsoring academic unit allocates to the SSGPDP. SSGPDPs may not use disallowed funds.

SSGPDPs are an alternate mechanism to enable the establishment of new graduate professional degree programs and, in some circumstances, the maintenance of existing graduate professional degree programs. This Policy governs both circumstances. With the exception of the source of funds and the costs the funds must cover, all SSGPDPs must adhere to the same policies as state-supported programs. Both state-supported programs and SSGPDPs require Academic Senate oversight and review to ensure that all degree programs meet UC standards of academic rigor and quality. Also, all faculty (both ladder and non-ladder) in both state-supported programs and SSGPDPs operate under UC academic personnel policies and practices.

C. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status include: all undergraduate degree programs, all academic master’s degree programs primarily leading to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree, and all Ph.D. programs.

D. Location of offerings. SSGPDP courses and other program requirements may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or online, using distance technologies as appropriate (consistent with Academic Senate Reg. 694).

E. Comparable quality to regular state-supported graduate programs. SSGPDPs are held to the same standards of quality as any other UC graduate professional degree programs. Student admission and performance standards for SSGPDPs are governed by the Academic Senate.

F. Comparable faculty. As for all UC degree programs, ladder faculty are responsible for SSGPDPs. Ladder faculty who teach in SSGPDPs are appointed, evaluated, and advanced under the same processes and criteria as other ladder faculty regardless of whether a portion of their regular compensation comes from SSGPDPs. The nature of certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion than usual of non-ladder rank faculty (e.g., clinical faculty, adjunct faculty, lecturers, and visitors).

G. Faculty workload and compensation. SSGPDPs shall comply with the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) with respect to how faculty, both ladder rank and non-ladder rank, are compensated. Faculty are expected to comply with all relevant reporting requirements. Teaching in a self-supporting program does not constitute workload for purposes of State reporting. Faculty teaching in SSGPDPs shall be handled either through a buy-out or through
additional compensation depending on whether the teaching replaces part of the faculty member's expected full-time load (a buy-out) or is in addition to the full-time load (additional compensation). SSGPDPs shall not in any way diminish a school's or department's responsibilities to the full complement of state-supported programs.

H. Initiation and approval of SSGPDPs.

1. **Initiation.** Departments, groups of departments, or schools may propose a new SSGPDP or a conversion of an existing state-supported program to a SSGPDP. Proposals shall originate with an academic unit that is already authorized to conduct graduate work.

2. **New Program.** The establishment of a new SSGPDP must be approved according to procedures and requirements specified in the Compendium.

3. **Conversion.** Conversion of a state-supported graduate professional degree program to self-supporting status is possible, but the expectation is that conversion will be infrequent and uncommon. Graduate professional degree programs converting to self-supporting status must meet the same criteria and are subject to the same review criteria as are new SSGPDPs. This includes criteria related to financial sustainability, financial accessibility, faculty appointments, and course approvals.

   i. **Conversion when changing academic requirements.** Programs that are changing academic requirements shall be reviewed through the same processes as required of a newly-created graduate professional degree programs.

   ii. **Conversion when not changing academic requirements.** A proposal to convert a state-supported program that includes no change to the program’s academic requirements shall be reviewed through Academic Senate processes at the campus and at the systemwide level to evaluate context and justification for the conversion and to assure meritorious status of the program proposed for conversion. In order for a conversion proposal to be reviewed at the systemwide level, the program must have undergone and received a meritorious academic review within the previous five years. At the discretion of systemwide review bodies, systemwide review may be expedited.

I. **Phase-in period.** All SSGPDPs shall be fully self-supporting within three years of inception. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program shall submit to UCOP a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan for review and approval.
J. Failure to become or remain self-supporting. If a new or converting self-supporting program is not successful (i.e., does not reach financial sustainability within the required three years), the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use disallowed funds for those purposes. Similarly, if an existing SSGPDP is no longer financially self-supporting, the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use disallowed funds for those purposes.

Any SSGPDP (existing, new, or converted) seeking to become a state-supported graduate professional degree program shall be subject to the same campus approvals required to establish new state-supported graduate academic or professional degree programs and enrollments. Consistent with the requirements for the discontinuation of any UC academic program, a discontinued SSGPDP must ensure that students have the opportunity to complete their degrees or transfer to other programs.

K. Review of SSGPDPs. Graduate Councils or other campus review bodies appointed by the Academic Senate shall review SSGPDPs as part of regularly-scheduled campus program reviews on the same basis as state-supported academic programs are reviewed. Once established, the SSGPDP shall be under the purview of the campus Graduate Council and Graduate Division to ensure adequate progress of students according to campus criteria. Courses for SSGPDP are subject to normal campus procedures for approval, revision, and termination.

L. Admission and enrollment. Admission standards for SSGPDPs shall be comparable to those in effect for analogous state-supported programs, if such programs are available. Admissions criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field, as applicable to the specific graduate professional degree offered. Students must be admitted through the Graduate Division through the regular admissions process.

Enrollments in SSGPDPs do not count for purposes of calculating the number of students supported by the State. SSGPDP enrollments will be reported separately from enrollment of students in state-supported programs. During the approved phase-in period, the distribution of enrollments between state-supported and self-supporting will conform to the specifications of the approved plan.

M. Approval by President of student charges and phase-in plans. In addition to the program approval requirements above, proposed student charges and the phase-in plan for each SSGPDP shall be submitted to the President for approval.
N. Student charges. The President will review and approve proposed student charges for each SSGPDP upon establishment or conversion, as well as subsequent proposed annual increases or decreases in such charges. The President will report annually to The Regents on the level of student charges for each approved program.

Student charges for SSGPDPs will cover all program costs within the required three-year period unless the campus chooses to use other non-disallowed funds to assist in meeting program costs.

The level of student charges shall be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs as defined in the Policy and further detailed in the Implementation Guidelines.

University employees enrolled in SSGPDPs are not eligible for reduced course charges. This does not preclude a department from subsidizing a portion of the program charges from non-disallowed funds. Program deficits, including deficits during the approved phase-in period, are the responsibility of the campus; disallowed funds cannot be used to cover any deficit.

State-supported degree programs and SSGPDPs must separately account for their use of resources. Campuses shall not charge a blended tuition/fee level for any course or program.

O. Financial accessibility. SSGPDPs must have a financial accessibility goal for their student population and a student financial support plan for achieving this goal. It is expected that the plan will address access for students from a wide range of income levels. Examples of possible student financial support include scholarships or grants from the program’s own resources (i.e., return-to-aid from student charges), privately raised funds, waivers of student charges, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, or other external support. For the purposes of state and federal student financial aid programs, “student charges” has the same meaning as “tuition.”

P. Consultation. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program.

IV. COMPLIANCE / RESPONSIBILITIES

All UC campuses and academic units are required to comply with this Presidential Policy. The President has full authority over implementation and may delegate that authority to other
officials in the Office of the President. The Academic Planning Council (or its successor committee) is designated as the joint Administration/Academic Senate body authorized to recommend Policy revisions to the President.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (SSGPDP) POLICY

The President issues the following Policy implementation procedures for the SSGPDP Policy:

A. Program approvals. Prior to operation, all SSGPDPs must obtain necessary program approvals pursuant to this Policy and the processes detailed in the Compendium. Similarly, all SSGPDPs that are being discontinued or converted back to state-supported status must adhere to the requirements of this Policy and the Compendium. New SSGPDPs, and state-supported programs seeking to convert to SSGPDP status, may apply for review of proposed student charges [see B.] prior to completion of program approval processes. However, no student charges will be approved in advance of final program approval.

B. Annual process for certification of self-supporting status and Presidential approval of self-supporting program charges. The President will annually approve student charges for each SSGPDP. In order to receive Presidential approval for student charges, each SSGPDP and each campus with one or more SSGPDPs shall follow the following procedures:

1. Annual program templates.
   For each SSGPDP, a UCOP template shall be filled out that covers the following elements:

   a. Program approval status. The completed template shall indicate the program approval status for the SSGPDP, the date and results of its most recent academic program review, and/or the dates the next academic program review will begin and be completed.

   b. Current and proposed student charges. The completed template shall include, at a minimum, the current level of student charges and the projected student charges for the next year. Approved Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees may be charged to SSGPDP students when it can be shown that SSGPDP students benefit from the services funded by those fees.
c. **Financial accessibility.** The completed template shall include a description of the SSGPDP’s student financial support plan and the extent to which it is attaining its financial accessibility goal. For programs that have converted or are proposing to convert from state-supported status, the description shall compare the program’s student financial accessibility with that of other UC programs offering similar degrees, whether self-supporting or not.

d. **Cost analysis.** The completed template shall include an annual cost analysis that demonstrates that the proposed student charges cover full direct and indirect costs, or (to the extent that student charges are insufficient to cover these costs) that no disallowed funds will be used to subsidize the program. The required elements and format of the cost analysis shall be specified in the UCOP template.

New SSGPDPs are subject to the same cost analysis. Programs are expected to become fully self-supporting within three years, though campuses may continue to subsidize programs with non-disallowed funds at their discretion. Program deficits, including any deficits during the phase-in period, must be covered by the campuses; disallowed funds may not be used to cover any deficit. The template shall require campuses to identify in advance fund sources that will be used to cover any projected deficits and to identify fund sources being used to cover any current deficits.

e. **Consultation.** The completed template shall include a section identifying the stakeholders who were consulted and when and how the consultation took place, and providing a short summary of the feedback received from each category of stakeholders. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program. Prior to establishing a new program, student input shall be sought from students likely to apply to such a program.

2. **Annual campus submittals.**

Each campus with one or more SSGPDPs must provide an annual submittal consisting of (1) a cover letter from campus leadership to the Vice President—Budget and Capital Resources requesting approval of student charges for the upcoming year and (2) the annual program templates for each of the existing or proposed SSGPDPs on that campus. Specifically, the cover letter shall include:
a. A statement that appropriate campus leadership has reviewed and approved the attached templates for each SSGPDP on that campus. The statement must certify that each program is operating on a self-supporting basis (or is using non-disallowed funds to cover any deficit) and is in compliance with this Policy.

b. A request to approve the proposed level of student charges for each existing or proposed SSGPDP for the upcoming year.

c. A table showing, for each SSGPDP, the current level of student charges, the proposed level of student charges, and the percentage increase or decrease, if any. UCOP will provide a template for this table to ensure that student charges can be compared across programs.

d. A statement that the campus Chancellor approves the student charges request (if the letter is not from the Chancellor).

3. **Timeline for submittals.**

   a. November preceding the next academic year – Campuses receive templates from UCOP together with instructions on the process for the required annual submittals.

   b. February 1 – Budget and Capital Resources (BCR) at UCOP receives completed campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP. Staff designated by the Vice President-BCR and the Provost begin to review proposals.

   c. March 1 – Provost and Vice President-BCR receive the results of UCOP staff review, including campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP.

   d. April 1 – President makes decisions and campuses are notified of approved program student charges for the upcoming academic year.

   e. The President reports this information to The Regents annually.
C. Miscellaneous implementation guidelines:

1. **Reporting of enrollments.**
   SSGPDPs should be identified in the Corporate Student System with a separate major code from state-supported programs and with an attribute code flagging enrollments in each SSGPDP as self-supporting.

2. **Faculty workload.**
   All faculty participation in the SSGPDP must be funded directly from SSGPDP revenue in proportion to the faculty member’s workload commitment to the program. If the faculty member’s participation is in lieu of some of his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then the SSGPDP must reimburse the faculty member’s department an amount equivalent to the cost of that particular faculty member’s time. Consistent with the requirement that the SSGPDP must cover all program costs, the total cost of faculty salary, benefits, and retirement must be funded by SSGPDP-generated or other non-disallowed funds. If the faculty member’s participation is in addition to his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then he or she should receive additional compensation which must be calculated and recorded in accordance with relevant Academic Personnel Manual policies and reporting requirements.

VI. RELATED INFORMATION

**Regents’ Delegation of Authority to the President to Set Fees for Self-Supporting Degree Programs**
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/ssp_delegtopres.pdf

**UCOP Self-Supporting Degree Programs Information**
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/academic-planning/planning-policies-and-other-activities/self-supporting-programs.html

VII. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

To be developed
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