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M. Maduro, Chair
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J. Arey
K. Barish
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1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of October 14, 2010 were approved with minor grammatical corrections.

2. Announcements

a. Chair of the Graduate Council

The Chair is working on the modification of the bylaws to move course approvals out of the Graduate Council.

Chair Maduro, Gene Nothnagel (Chair of Committee on Courses), and Jose Wudka (Chair, Committee on Educational Policy) met to discuss the guidelines for online instruction. It would be helpful to establish similar guidelines for how
graduate courses can be done on line and Chair Maduro will bring the relevant discussion from future meetings to the Graduate Council’s attention.

Chair Maduro and Dean Childers are on an Enrollment Management Committee to determine how best to reach enrollment targets. The chair will be reporting the graduate numbers to the Council. The committee will be meeting 1-2 times per month.

The Chair received a letter via email from Professor Khoury regarding the FEMBA and EMBA programs. The EMBA program will be discussed when the program comes up for review in the future.

The Chair attended a meeting with Mary Gauvain, Chair of the Senate, and certain Executive Council members regarding budget issues. The way we do business will have to change in response to the budget crisis.

b. CCGA Representative

The committee met on Tuesday, November 2, 2010. There was much discussion related to bringing money in for professional and graduate programs, through professional degree fees and self supporting programs. There are issues regarding requests for professional degree fees in that the proposals are by-passing the divisional graduate councils and going straight to UCOP. CCGA as a whole felt that the divisional graduate councils should see any proposals for degree fees before they leave the campus. Whenever there is a professional fee increase, the Graduate Dean is asked for input. The institution of new fees needs to go through CCGA.

Other concerns related to this are self supporting programs and there are similar issues whether or not self supporting programs have the potential to sustain themselves after the campus investment has dwindled away.

The other item that came up at CCGA is the most recent downsizing resolution. Attrition is probably not enough to bring the faculty size down to where it needs to be within a few years. There are several graduate programs on all of the campuses, less so at Merced, where the expertise within the faculty of a particular program or department is in danger of becoming moribund within a couple of years if certain key people retire. Several campuses have taken a self evaluation of what graduate programs are in the most risk for going moribund within the next 3-5 years because there may not be money to replace key faculty who serve as anchors for those programs.

c. Graduate Student Council Representative

GSA is conducting a self survey to see what student concerns are. Their concerns are (1) funding levels, (2) Biomedical Science is having trouble understanding their course expectations, (3) Bourns College of Engineering had concerns that they are accepting more students than there are PIs willing to take them. They have students who are having trouble getting into a laboratory, (4)
AGSM is having a hard time with their TAships, making sure they can get funding and they want a better alumni structure and, (5) Dance doesn’t feel they have a good success base for graduate students.

GSA will send the survey outcome to the Graduate Council.

d. Dean of the Graduate Division

(1) The recruiting budget for next year has not been received. The Dean has asked for an increase in the per student average. If the Dean gets extra money for students, it will be passed directly onto the programs.

The Dean met with President Yudoff in Oakland last week. President Yudoff is very adamant about bringing up graduate numbers, not just in professional schools, across the system. He sees Riverside, Merced, Santa Cruz, and Santa Barbara as growth campuses.

Two weeks ago the Dean attended a two day Leadership Retreat for the campus. The Deans, Vice Chancellors, the Chancellor and the Chair of the Academic Senate attended. One of the topics that was foremost was research and graduate growth on this campus. In the Strategic Plan, one of the aspirational goals is to increase our graduate enrollment to 20% of our total student population. Last year we were down a couple of percent, but overall enrollment was up because we had less attrition. If we consider our projected professional school numbers, we should eventually have about 600 graduate professional students. In order to get 4,000 graduate students total, which would be 20% of our current population, we need to have about a 1,000 more. We have to think of other kinds of graduate students. Something that is available to us and we should be thinking about is a Professional Science Masters.

The Dean has been asked to do a carrying capacity study for programs. This is tied to the Strategic Plan and resources.

3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee - There were no courses to review.

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee

a. Status Report

The status report was received. Work continues on commitments from Religious Studies and Southeast Asian Studies for internal review dates.

b. Mathematics – Final Response

Review Subcommittee B discussed the department response from the Findings and Recommendations. The Council voted to formally accept the program’s response with an additional recommendation to offer a retake of the qualifying exam (i.e., for students who did not pass the first time) within six months.
5. **Old Business** – There was no old business.

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

   a. **Discussion of Designated Emphasis** - There are faculty who are interested in putting together a Designated Emphasis which is similar to a minor at the graduate level. This will provide added value to the degree and emphasize a focus of study. The Designated Emphasis is comprised of 12-16 additional units, where 4 of those units reflect a significant research product, whether a paper or poster. They will be run by faculty groups consisting of at least one member from each of the cooperating Ph.D. programs and must be submitted to the Graduate Council and Graduate Dean for approval. The Dean will draft a proposal and circulate it to the Graduate Council members. The Council unanimously approved the Designated Emphasis in principal.

   b. **Guidelines for University Oral Exams for Advancement to Candidacy** - The Chair will follow up and see if there is a problem to be solved and report back to the Council.

   c. **Conflict of Interest Policy for Composition of Oral Qualifying Committees and Supervisory Committees**. There are no specific rules about who may and may not be on an exam committee with respect to spouses. This would be more of a faculty conduct issue rather than a conflict of interest issue.

   d. **Discussion of Cross-Registration with Loma Linda University** – The Bioengineering graduate program would like to cross register one or more courses with Loma Linda University and similarly, Loma Linda would like their students to take one or more of our courses. The Loma Linda courses under consideration are Introduction to Medical Imaging and Medical Imaging Laboratory. The Council approved to formalize.

Meeting adjourned @ 11:30 a.m.

Janet Arey, Secretary
December 1, 2010

TO: Ken Barish, Chair
Courses & Programs Subcommittee
Graduate Council

FROM: George Marcoulides, Associate Dean, GSOE
Rollanda O’Connor, Special Education Program Convener, GSOE
Sharon Duffy, Extension Dean and Professor, GSOE

We have clarified the requirement that students take either 246K or 246L in the M.Ed. Autism Emphasis Curriculum Requirements, which is attached as a separate document. The only change this clarification generated in our October 20th comments, below, is the number of units for electives, which has dropped to 8 (see top of page 4, in red).

October 20, 2010

TO: Ken Barish, Chair
Courses & Programs Subcommittee
Graduate Council

FROM: George Marcoulides, Associate Dean, GSOE
Rollanda O’Connor, Special Education Program Convener, GSOE
Sharon Duffy, Extension Dean and Professor, GSOE

Below we provide responses to your January 5, 2010 letter regarding the changes we proposed last November to the GSOE M.Ed. Emphasis in Autism. For some reason your letter did not reach the appropriate person in GSOE until September, 2010. Thus, the delay in our response. For efficiency, we have copied the body of your letter and inserted our responses in red in the appropriate sections.

The Graduate Council’s Courses & Programs subcommittee met on Friday, December 4, 2009 and considered the proposed changes to the M.Ed. (Autism Emphasis) described in your memo dated November 8, 2009. The subcommittee would like clarification on issues related to Item #2 in your memo:

1) When this emphasis was originally submitted and approved, the GSOE justified why very specific courses in UNEX were necessary for this emphasis. From the current request, it appears that courses that are to replace EDUX 421.13 and EDUC 421.29 have not yet been developed and that students will be free to choose random UNEX courses to satisfy this requirement.

It was not our intent to replace courses with random Extension courses. We see now that we were not clear in our explanation of changes in course requirements or in our reasons for those changes. The Extension courses GSOE faculty approved as
requirements or optional courses to include in the program are described below and are shown on the table included with this response.

The subcommittee requests that specific course numbers that are to replace these two courses be provided. In addition, when this emphasis was first proposed, the proposal indicated that the Council “will have the opportunity to review them (the courses) before they are taught.” To date, the Council is unaware of review of any of the courses associated with this emphasis. We ask that you ensure that extension courses associated with this emphasis be submitted to the Council for review prior to their offering.

**REQUIRED COURSE—NEW NUMBER ONLY**

All M.Ed. students must take EDU X450.05 “Curriculum Adaptation for Students with Autism” from Extension, as described in the original proposal, but the number is different than in the proposal. Extension has now numbered all autism courses in a “EDU X450” series to be helpful to students. In the original proposal this course was listed as EDU X421.xx.

**“REPLACEMENT” COURSES (REPLACING COURSES IN THE ORIGINAL PROGRAM APPROVED JUNE, 2008)**

Subsequent to the M.Ed. Autism Emphasis approval by the Graduate Council in June, 2008, Extension received approval from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to offer a “Certificate and Added Authorization in Autism Spectrum Disorders.” This authorization certifies California K-12 teachers to teach students with autism. As part of this program Extension developed new courses that focus exclusively on autism and are a better fit to the M.Ed.

- **NEW 2-UNIT ELECTIVE COURSES**

  Three new 2-unit courses for the Autism certificate/authorization were approved by the Senate Committee on Extension (ASD) prior to submission of the certificate program to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. These courses are therefore better suited to the M.Ed. Autism emphasis than the courses in the original proposal—the original courses included a significant component of topics as they related to children with autism, but the courses also included other disabilities in their discussion of issues, interventions, and professional practices. The new 2-unit autism-specific courses include:

  EDU X450.02 Interventions that Address Learning/Behavioral Needs in ASD
  EDU X450.03 Communication Skills and ASD
  EDU X450.04 Evidence-based Practices for Increasing Social Competence in ASD
• 4-UNIT ELECTIVE COURSES

A 4-unit course (EDU X450.06 “Collaborating with Service Providers”) was developed for the Certificate/Authorization. This course is similar to a course in the original M.Ed. proposal (EDU X421.13) but was revised to meet the guidelines for 4-unit course. Students can count this course or EDUC120 in GSOE as an elective but not both.

EDU X450.07 is a new 4-unit course (pending Fall 2010 approval by Academic Senate Committee on Extension) on Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA). It focuses on ABA for children with autism (only). It is a better fit to the goals of the M.Ed. than the more general 3-unit Behavioral Observation course that was in the original proposal and addressed behavioral observation of students with a range of disabilities. Students are required to either take this course or EDUC255A in GSOE, but cannot count both courses toward the M.Ed.

MAXIMUM OF 8 EXTENSION UNITS (NO LONGER 8 OR 9)

In addition to the required EDU X450.05 four-unit course, students may (but do not have to) count 4 additional units from the approved list of Extension courses (described above) toward the required 36 units for the M.Ed. Students cannot include more than 8 units of credit, regardless of the number of approved courses.

Eliminating the 3-unit courses from the list of approved courses means that the total units for the M.Ed. will not vary from 36 to 37, depending whether students include 3-unit courses—all students will complete 36 units with a maximum of 8 from Extension—this should be less confusing to students.

Why so many options for Extension courses when students can only include 4 units in addition to the required Extension course? Practicing teachers who will be interested in this M.Ed. might also want to get the Certificate/Supplemental Authorization in Autism in order to teach students with autism. Others might only be interested in the M.Ed. but might prefer the option to take an autism-specific course that is not available in GSOE, or to take EDU X450.07 that is not required for the Certificate/Authorization but focuses on behavioral observations of students with autism. For some students, the preference might be related to scheduling choices, as Extension courses are sometimes offered later in the evenings or on weekends GSOE faculty agree that all courses on the approved list of Extension courses are of sufficient rigor and quality for the M.Ed., and will benefit students in this M.Ed. emphasis. Including a broader set of electives also allows students to take whichever approved elective course is offered during the quarter the student needs to take a course.

NEW REQUIRED COURSE: MULTICULTURAL SPECIAL EDUCATION
Since the proposed changes were submitted in November, 2009, the Special Education area in GSOE has had a new course approved that we would like to include as a required course for this Autism emphasis. EDUC246M, Multicultural Special Education, is a course that addresses multicultural topics in the education of students with disabilities. We propose to add this as a required course for the M.Ed. Autism emphasis. This reduces the number of elective units to 8 units.

2) The requested changes and proposed catalog copy need to be consistent. On the text submitted, it states that “A maximum of 8 units of Extension credit can be included on the M.Ed. program. The remaining 24 units will be GSOE courses.” However, on the proposed catalog copy, under Course Work, it states “…8 units of Extension credit can be applied to program. A total of 36 units are required.” We ask that you ensure that the wording for the proposed changes and the catalog copy be consistent. In addition, you state that all students will take one required 4 units course (EDU X450.05) from Extension. However, the proposed catalog copy no longer indicates that this course is required. Again, we request that the proposed change and the catalog copy text wording be consistent.

We can see that we were inconsistent in the proposal and catalog description. We hope the following wording will be consistent and clear for students:

Course Work Courses are offered in the Graduate School of Education, Summer Session, and University Extension. One required course is offered only at UCR Extension. For some requirements, students may choose from courses with comparable content in GSOE and Extension. A maximum of 8 units of approved Extension credit can be applied to the M.Ed. program. A total of 36 units are required.

GRADUATE COUNCIL REVIEW OF EXTENSION COURSES

With regard to Extension courses being reviewed by the Graduate Council before they are offered, we apologize for this oversight. We are including the course outlines that were submitted in approval packets for each Extension course (on the current list of approved courses) when the courses were approved by the Academic Senate Committee on Extension.

If the Council wishes to see the syllabus each time an “eligible” course is taught by Extension we will be glad to provide this. All syllabi for these courses are reviewed by the Director of Extension Education and Extension Dean to be sure they are consistent with outlines that were approved by the Senate Committee on Extension (a review similar to the Committee on Courses). The syllabi are also reviewed to be sure the requirements are consistent with Senate Committee on Committees guidelines for unit allocation and units approved by the Senate Extension committee. GSOE special education faculty also review these courses on a regular basis. If the Council would also like to see the biographies of instructors (also already approved by the Academic Senate Committee on Extension) we will provide them. These courses are taught primarily by K-12 special education administrators who have received their Ph D.’s in special education from GSOE in the past five years.
Please advise us as to what the Council wishes to see and the process for submission of this information.
M.Ed. Autism Emphasis Curriculum Requirements

(Proposed October, 2010; Revised December 1, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>GSOE</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Asperger’s and High Functioning Autism</td>
<td>EDUC246E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Curriculum Adaptation for Students with Autism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>EDUC212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Behavior Observation</td>
<td>EDUC255A or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Multicultural Special Education</td>
<td>EDUC246M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder or Behavioral Phenotypes</td>
<td>EDUC246K or EDUC246L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (8 units)</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder Behavioral Phenotypes</td>
<td>EDUC246K EDUC246L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (8 units)</td>
<td>Human Differences</td>
<td>EDUC200 EDUC246J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (8 units)</td>
<td>Issues in Special Education</td>
<td>EDUC270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (8 units)</td>
<td>Reading Development</td>
<td>EDUC120 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (8 units)</td>
<td>Services Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required (4 units)</td>
<td>Case analysis (capstone)</td>
<td>EDUC297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Electives may include EDUC246K or EDUC246L, whichever was not included as a required course
- All courses are 4 units unless noted
- A maximum of 8 units of Extension course credit can be included on M.Ed. Program Plan
- EDUC120 can be included on Program Plan if course has not counted toward another degree
- Total units: 36
MEMO: Morris Maduro  
Chair, Graduate Council  

FROM: Anthea Kraut  
Graduate Advisor  

RE: Request for Revisions to Course Work Requirements for the MFA in Experimental Choreography Program  

DATE: October 18, 2010  

The Dance Department requests revisions to the course requirements for the MFA in Experimental Choreography. These revisions might more accurately be seen as clarifications to the current requirements, reflecting the practices and intentions of the MFA program. These revisions/clarifications require no new resources for the department.  

Revisions:  

1. As currently written, our MFA curriculum requires that students take “8 units of elective courses relevant to their specific research project” but does not offer any specifics on what these units should be. The main proposed change would specify that these courses should be graduate-level units, to be taken for a letter grade, and should be determined in consultation with the student’s Chair, as was always the intention of the Department.  

2. An additional change to the MFA requirement would omit the reference to “the option of field study, an off-campus period of study.” This will remain an option for students on a case-by-case basis, but the existing language was proving confusing to students in its lack of specificity.  

Justification:  

1. As the MFA requirement is currently written, it would theoretically be possible for an MFA student to fulfill his/her elective requirements by taking only lower-division undergraduate courses, and only courses taken for S/NC, rather than for a letter grade. We have found that enrollment in graduate-level courses for these electives best prepares our MFA students to successfully carry out their choreographic research. We wish to make explicit in our requirements what has been a de facto practice within the department.  

The faculty voted unanimously in favor of these revisions.
To be adopted:  

## Proposed Change in the MFA for Dance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **M.F.A in Experimental Choreography**  
Students must take 8 units of electives relevant to their specific research project. These courses may be offered within or outside of the department, or they may be fulfilled through the option of field study, an off-campus period of study integral to the student’s successful completion of the master’s project. | **M.F.A in Experimental Choreography**  
Students must take 8 graduate-level units of electives, to be determined in consultation with their chair, that are relevant to their specific research project. These courses should be taken for a letter grade and can include graduate-level seminars within or outside of the department, Dance 280 (the Colloquium), or the bundling of an upper division 4 unit undergraduate-level course with 2 units of 292, Concurrent Analysis, (which would be worth 4 graduate units). |

### Justifications:

The Dance Department requests revisions to the course requirements for the MFA in Experimental Choreography. These revisions might more accurately be seen as clarifications to the current requirements, reflecting the practices and intentions of the MFA program. These revisions/clarifications require no new resources for the department.

### Revisions:

1. As currently written, our MFA curriculum requires that students take “8 units of elective courses relevant to their specific research project” but does not offer any specifics on what these units should be. The main proposed change would specify that these courses should be graduate-level units, to be taken for a letter grade, and should be determined in consultation with the student’s Chair, as was always the intention of the Department.

2. An additional change to the MFA requirement would omit the reference to “the option of field study, an off-campus period of study.” This will remain an option for students on a case-by-case basis, but the existing language was proving confusing to students in its lack of specificity.
Justification:

1. As the MFA requirement is currently written, it would theoretically be possible for an MFA student to fulfill his/her elective requirements by taking only lower-division undergraduate courses, and only courses taken for S/NC, rather than for a letter grade. We have found that enrollment in graduate-level courses for these electives best prepares our MFA students to successfully carry out their choreographic research. We wish to make explicit in our requirements what has been a de facto practice within the department.

The faculty voted unanimously in favor of these revisions.

Approvals:

Approved by the Faculty of the Department of Dance: 10/6/2010

Approved by the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences:

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy:
### UCR Graduate Council - Order of Reviews for Graduate Programs

#### STATUS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. RECEIVED</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP. DUE</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO DUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO RECEIVED</th>
<th>FINAL RESP.</th>
<th>SEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
<td>May 21, 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>1/25/2010</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
<td>6/24/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred to 2011/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jan 24-25, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>Feb 7-8, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>April 11, 12, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Internal)</td>
<td>February 14, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Stud (Internal)</td>
<td>March 7, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Closure Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-96</td>
<td>Dec-96</td>
<td>Feb-05</td>
<td>Dec-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1965/1966</td>
<td>Apr-83</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Feb-93</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 1-99</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar-07</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
<td>Feb-87</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Oct-95</td>
<td>Apr-96</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>Mar-07</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
<td>Dec-80</td>
<td>Apr-82</td>
<td>Apr-88</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>May-96</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>Feb-03</td>
<td>Nov-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/2007</td>
<td>Apr-86</td>
<td>Dec-87</td>
<td>Feb-91</td>
<td>Jun-92</td>
<td>May-00</td>
<td>Nov-01</td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
<td>Apr-84</td>
<td>May-85</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jun-91</td>
<td>Nov-98</td>
<td>Nov-99</td>
<td>Jan-06</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Fall -82</td>
<td>May-89</td>
<td>Dec-90</td>
<td>*IR 11-97</td>
<td>Mar-99</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>Nov-85</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Dec-91</td>
<td>Nov-92</td>
<td>May-02</td>
<td>Jun-02</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1966/1967</td>
<td>May-85</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Jan-91</td>
<td>Mar-92</td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/1966</td>
<td>Feb-94</td>
<td>Jun-95</td>
<td>Feb-92</td>
<td>Dec-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>Nov-86</td>
<td>Jun-88</td>
<td>Feb-92</td>
<td>Mar-94</td>
<td>Apr-00</td>
<td>Oct-01</td>
<td>May-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-81</td>
<td>Nov-82</td>
<td>Feb-89</td>
<td>Jun-90</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jun-96</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>May-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>Mar-81</td>
<td>Mar-82</td>
<td>Apr-89</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Feb-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>Oct-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Oct-80</td>
<td>Jun-82</td>
<td>May-87</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>May-95</td>
<td>Jan-96</td>
<td>May-03</td>
<td>May-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; Bioinformatics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>May-94</td>
<td>Apr-95</td>
<td>Jan-03</td>
<td>Nov-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 3-99</td>
<td>Feb-00</td>
<td>Moratorium 11/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>May-81</td>
<td>Feb-83</td>
<td>Mar-88</td>
<td>Apr-90</td>
<td>Jan-97</td>
<td>Feb-98</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
<td>Feb-82</td>
<td>Dec-82</td>
<td>Jan-88</td>
<td>Nov-89</td>
<td>Mar-95</td>
<td>Dec-95</td>
<td>Mar-02</td>
<td>Apr-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 6-02</td>
<td>Jun-03</td>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1981/1994</td>
<td>May-86</td>
<td>Apr-87</td>
<td>Apr-92</td>
<td>May-93</td>
<td>*IR 3-98</td>
<td>May-99</td>
<td>Nov-07</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*IR 5-01</td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Internal Review
FELLOWSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

The Graduate Council's Fellowship subcommittee met on Thursday, November 18, 2010 to review the Fall 2010 competition of Dissertation and Masters Thesis Research Grants. Five Dissertation Research grants and no Masters Thesis Research grants were submitted. Five proposals were partially funded.

The total requests amounted to $4,970.71. The total awards given amounted to $4,000.00.
12/6/2010

To: Morris Maduro, Chair, Graduate Council

Fr: Thomas Payne, Bourns College of Engineering

Re: Response to Council memo of 10/25/2010 regarding BCoE’s proposal to establish an Online Self-Supporting MS in Engineering.

To summarize, the Council identified three areas on which it would like BCoE to provide additional information:

1. “Prior to sending to CCGA, the proposal needs to be rewritten, incorporating changes addressing the comments from other Academic Senate subcommittees and the Graduate Division, and following the compendium guidelines for Proposed Graduate Degree Programs.”

   Per Grad Council’s request, a revised proposal is attached. It incorporates our response of 6/9/2010 to the Council’s memo of 2/8/2010 as well as comments from other Academic Senate subcommittees and the Graduate Division. This draft does not yet follow the format of the compendium guidelines, but the next version will.

2. “A minor issue in response to #3 — Precedents other than UCLA. The MAS in Architecture-Based Enterprise Systems Engineering program at UCSD, which has recently been approved by CCGA, does not have an online component, and UCB’s program (as stated in the response) is not online. Are there any other precedents for Online MS degrees in Engineering within the UC system, besides UCLA?”

   Currently, UCLA offers the UC System’s only online M.S. degree program in Engineering. UCI offers an online M.A.S. program in Criminology, Law, and Society. Beyond the UC system, many other prominent research intensive engineering schools such as those at Purdue, Georgia Tech, and the University of Wisconsin offer such programs.

3. “Regarding #2 — Academic Standards and #4 — Consultation with Committee on Courses. Independently of Committee on Courses, the Graduate Council would like to see a demonstration of the online lecture/teaching experience. This is perhaps the main concern for the council as we have not had prior experience with online courses. The Council needs to understand, first-hand, the experience of a student taking their graduate degree online. The UCLA Master of Science in Engineering Online [Class Demo](http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/prospective-students/demo) page is ‘under construction’ (as of the writing of this letter), and the Viterbi School of Engineering site (USC) does not list [Courses on Demand](http://mapp.usc.edu/professionalprograms/CoursesonDemand/index.html) as being available.

   Even if these sites were online, they would give us only an indication of how other established programs work, and we need to see how this will work in your program.”
An online course has the following four aspects:

- A course management system, in our case iLearn (BlackBoard), which UCR has been using for many years and with which most UCR faculty members are already familiar.

- A web-based meeting system that includes audio (e.g., Skype or normal phone service) plus shared desktops (e.g., VNC or one of the many other free options) for remote interaction with TAs and faculty.

- Remotely available online video recordings of classroom lectures (e.g., Flash 7.0) with accompanying presentation graphics (e.g., PowerPoint slides).

- Remotely proctored exams, for which we will initially follow UCLA’s policies and protocols.

The links available on UCLA’s current-students web page give a reasonably good idea of how their program works, except for their class-demo site, which unfortunately is still being updated.

As noted in our proposal, the estimated average cost of developing an online course is expected to be about $5000. Thus, we would like to avoid the cost of developing a prototype course at this time. Alternatively, there are a number of online courses available at Academic Earth. Note that several of these courses are delivered by faculty members at Stanford, UCLA, UC Berkeley, and MIT.

Mark Matsumoto, BCOE’s Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, and I would very much appreciate an opportunity to discuss this proposal with the Graduate Council.

---

3http://www.openalternatives.org/site/2008/08/free-screen-sharing-alternatives-a-list/
4http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/current-students/exams
5http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/current-students
6http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/prospective-students/demo
7http://academicearth.org/
OCTOBER 25, 2010

TO: THOMAS H. PAYNE, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, EMERITUS
COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING
BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

FM: MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR
GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSAL FOR SELF-SUPPORTING, COLLEGE-WIDE, ONLINE
MASTER-OF-ENGINEERING DEGREE PROGRAM

The Graduate Council met on October 1, 2010. The Subcommittee on Courses & Programs presented their assessment of the proposal to establish a Self-Supporting, College-Wide, Online Master-of-Engineering degree program within BCOE, particularly with respect to the responses to the previous letter from Graduate Council (dated February 8, 2010). Most of the comments have been addressed well. The proposal overall has many positives, and ultimately the Council would like to see it fully approved. There remain some issues that need to be resolved first.

1. Prior to sending to CCGA, the proposal needs to be rewritten, incorporating changes addressing the comments from other Academic Senate subcommittees and the Graduate Division, and following the compendium guidelines for Proposed Graduate Degree Programs. (I suspect you already planned to do this.)

2. A minor issue in response to #3 – Precedents other than UCLA. The MAS in Architecture-Based Enterprise Systems Engineering program at UCSD, which has recently been approved by CCGA, does not have an online component, and UCB’s program (as stated in the response) is not online. Are there any other precedents for Online MS degrees in Engineering within the UC system, besides UCLA?

3. Regarding #2 – Academic Standards and #4 – Consultation with Committee on Courses. Independently of Committee on Courses, the Graduate Council would like to see a demonstration of the online lecture/teaching experience. This is perhaps the main concern for the council as we have not had prior experience with online courses. The Council needs to understand, first-hand, the experience of a student taking their graduate degree online. The UCLA Master of Science in Engineering Online Class Demo page (http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/prospective-students/demo) is ‘under construction’ (as of the writing of this letter), and the Viterbi School of Engineering site (USC) does not list Courses on Demand as being available.
(http://mapp.usc.edu/professionalprograms/CoursesonDemand/index.html). Even if these sites were online, they would give us only an indication of how other established programs work, and we need to see how this will work in your program.

At this point, the Council feels that the best way to address these and other minor concerns would be to have you attend one of our meetings and answer questions directly. In particular, if you would be willing to prepare some kind of demonstration of the components of the online experience, that would be of great benefit. It may be useful to invite the chair of Committee on Courses (Dr. Eugene Nothnagel) to attend this meeting as well.

I continue to serve as UCR representative to the CCGA, and am aware of certain things that are now being sought during the system-wide approval process. For example, CCGA will be looking for explicit funding commitments from local campus administration, as well as strong justification for creation of programs that may have extensive overlap with programs at other UCs. Once you are ready to submit, I would be willing to work with you to generate the strongest proposal possible.

Sincerely,

Morris F. Maduro
Chair, Graduate Council
Proposal to Establish a Self-Supporting, College-Wide, Online Master-of-Engineering Degree Program within the Bourns College of Engineering

December 6, 2010
Contents
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aims and Objectives

The primary purpose of BCOE’s proposed Online Master-of-Science in Engineering Program is to enable fully employed engineers, including computer scientists, to advance their professional education, enhancing their value to their employers. The training and education that the proposed program offers are of benefit to engineers, their employers, this state, and the nation. It is at the Master’s level that engineers have the opportunity to learn a specialization in depth and to renew and update their knowledge of technological advances.

This program is being developed for highly-qualified employed engineers who, for various reasons, do not or cannot attend traditional full-time M.S. programs and who are keenly interested in maintaining up-to-date knowledge of engineering and technology.

There are several reasons for the proposed online MS-degree program in Engineering:

- It furthers the mission of the University.
- It provides UCR in general and BCOE in particular with an entre to online education, which is certain to become a major mode of delivery for higher education in the 21st Century. A recent survey found that almost a third of UC and UC-eligible students had already taken at least one online course. The number for UCR is not available, but it is very likely to be below that number.
- It serves the needs of working professionals and serves the needs of the industrial community.
- It provides industrial contacts for faculty members to establish research collaborations.
- It provides support funds for PhD students.

According to the Size and Shape of UC working group of President Yudof’s Commission on the Future:

The Size & Shape Working Group is in favor of expanding self-supporting Master’s programs.

Rationale: The terminal Masters is slightly anomalous at UC, where graduate students who are not pursuing professional degrees are usually pursuing doctorates. **Self-supporting Master’s programs are beneficial both to the UC mission and to state economic needs.** [Emphasis added.]

Also, per President Yudof’s May 14, 2010 letter to the Regents:

http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/sizeofuc.html
The University’s self-supporting programs extend the University’s degree programs to academically qualified working adults who cannot be full-time students, as well as to foreign-trained students, students located off campus, and students seeking instruction in niche fields.

The distinctive features of the proposed program are that:

1. The Program will be self supporting.

2. The Program will be college-wide. This structure enables efficient management at the college level and will facilitate the development of interdisciplinary specializations.

3. The Program will be delivered over the Internet. Students of the Program will receive all course materials, including lectures, in an “online” manner. The current mode of delivering many courses within the Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) relies heavily upon information technology, using learning-management systems. That is, currently, BCOE students receive course lecture notes, assignments, announcements, and other items via WEB interfaces, and they participate in online forums for questions and answers with instructors and TAs. In addition, prepared lectures will be available online for the students of the online M.S. in Engineering Program. The full description of what is meant by “online lecture” is contained in Subsection 2.6.

4. The Program’s requirements include a significant design experience, incorporating additional readings and the knowledge of the courses undertaken. The Program includes an online 296A course, Preparation for the Comprehensive Examination, which will address this engineering design experience — see Section 2.4.

5. Program profits will mainly be used to support Ph.D. students.

6. The design experience, the mode of delivery of the courses of instruction, the availability of this online M.S. in Engineering Program for employed engineers, and the ability to easily implement multidisciplinary programs of study are what distinguish this new program from the M.S. programs that BCOE departments currently offer.

1.2 College and Departmental Strength

This college-wide program will be based on existing areas of study and combinations thereof in order to implement appropriate (possibly multidisciplinary) “specializations.” The material for each 100/200-level course of the online M.S. in Engineering Program is to be equivalent to the material delivered under the

---

2Engineering 296A is a yet-to-be-proposed course similar to UCLA’s 597A, which is offered by each engineering department.
traditional MS/PhD program; the difference is the mode of delivery. Courses will be taught and administered by ladder-rank faculty and, at times, by selected adjunct faculty, emeriti, and lecturers. Program details are provided in Section 2.

Not all areas of study within the College will be candidates for this program and, as discussed in Section 2, the initial stage (the first year) will begin with Bioengineering as our initial specialization. At the beginning of the second year, the first year for the second cohort, we intend to have in place at least one additional specialization. Generally, any set of approved courses that can effectively be delivered by online instruction is a candidate to be included in the online M.S. in Engineering Program. However, during the “initialization stage,” and the subsequent year 2 and/or year 3, it is most likely that only a few specializations will be offered. Further specializations will be chosen according to faculty availability and advice from our industry advisers, their employees, and our alumni.

1.3 Timetable for Development of the Program

We hope to implement an initial offering by the Fall 2011. Before implementation, a number of tasks will need to be done including:

- Development of initial specialization curriculum.
- Approval of new graduate courses for the professional component of this degree program.
- Development of appropriate versions of these newly developed courses as well as the technical courses that will make up the initial specialization areas for online delivery.
- Sufficient potential enrollments in the initial specializations (~5 students).

As stated above, we plan to initialize the online M.S. in Engineering Program by offering a specialization in Bioengineering. Upon imminent approval of the online M.S. in Engineering Program by the Graduate Council and CCGA, we will solicit further advice from our industry partners and alumni with respect to specializations in the other BCOE departments and programs.

We will solicit the opinions of our alumni with respect to appropriate specializations, including suggested multidisciplinary areas. This will be an on-going effort of BCOE. We will be in frequent contact with our industry partners for their opinions on appropriate specializations, with emphasis upon emerging and future areas.

1.4 Relationship with Existing Programs on Campus

The online M.S. in Engineering Program will emphasize specializations. As an example, our initial specialization will be drawn from Bioengineering courses of

\(^{\text{Instructor compensation is discussed on page ??.}}\)
the Bioengineering Department. As described in Section 2, the online M.S. in Engineering Program will consist of nine courses, including Engineering 296A to provide the appropriate instruction mechanism and course credit for the major design project. It is important to note that each 100/200 level course’s material in the online M.S. in Engineering Program is equivalent to the material delivered in the traditional MS/PhD program; the difference is the mode of delivery.

There will be no operational relationship between the online M.S. in Engineering Program and the traditional M.S. programs. In particular, the offerings of a given course will be distinct. Each course of the online M.S. in Engineering Program will be constituted as a separate section of the traditional course (e.g., CS235, Section 2). Only students of the online M.S. in Engineering Program will be allowed to enroll in this latter section, and similarly students of the online M.S. in Engineering Program will not be allowed to enroll in the traditional offering (e.g., CS235, Section 1). Additionally, while many traditional graduate courses are offered once per year, their online counterparts may be offered more often.

1.5 Relationship with Other Programs

UCLA has an established self-supporting online “Master of Science in Engineering” program that is intended for employed engineers as well. Other UC campuses such as UCSD are also considering the establishment of similar programs.

Another local competitor for the proposed program is the Distance Education Network of USC, which offers the M.S. degree in the various engineering disciplines.

The Stanford Center for Professional Development (SCPD) offers online M.S. degrees, for employees of member companies, in several engineering disciplines (including Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Computer Science).

On the East Coast, the Georgia Institute of Technology offers online M.S. degrees in several engineering disciplines (including Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Civil Engineering).

We believe the strength of the faculty and the specializations that we will include in the online M.S. in Engineering program will lead to considerable demand for the education and training that BCOE has to offer.

As this program is to be a self-supporting, no resources, teaching or otherwise, will be withdrawn from the BCOE’s undergraduate or graduate programs.

Precedents. Within the UC System:

- UCLA proposed their Online MS in Engineering in 2004. It was established in 2007 and now has 450 students. Currently, UCLA’s is the UC System’s only online MS in Engineering.

---

This course, described in subsection 2.4, is yet to be submitted for approval to the Committee on Courses and the Graduate Council.
• UCSD has proposed a Master of Advanced Studies in Systems Engineering, and that proposal has gone forward to the CCGA.

• UCB is proposing a one year, Master of Engineering program that is not online.

US News has published a list of 60 well respected universities that offer online degrees in engineering, both graduate and/or undergraduate.

Here are further examples of online M.S. degree programs in engineering offered by top-fifty engineering schools — specifically, US News ranks the University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign as fifth, USC as seventh, UCLA as 14th, the University of Florida as 25th, Arizona State as 45th:

• USC’s Viterbi School of Engineering offers 66 M.S. degree programs in engineering of which 46 are available online.

• The EDGE (Electronic Delivery of Graduate Engineering) Program of the University of Florida offers 20 different MS degree programs within seven majors:
  – Civil and Coastal Engineering
  – Computer and Information Science and Engineering
  – Electrical and Computer Engineering
  – Environmental Engineering Sciences
  – Industrial & Systems Engineering
  – Materials Science and Engineering
  – Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Their most popular degree is in Environmental Engineering.

UF has been offering distance education since 1964. For 2009-2010, EDGE had approximately 1200 graduate course enrollments. Half of these students came from Florida, with the remainder distributed all over the U.S. and internationally.

• The University of Illinois–Urbana-Champaign offers an online M.S. degree in Mechanical Engineering.

• Arizona State University offers an online M.S. degree in Software Engineering.

---

5 [http://www.usnews.com/directories/online-education/specialty/index_html/cat+eng/]
7 [http://mapp.usc.edu/mastersprograms/degreeprograms/index.html]
8 [http://www.ufedge.ufl.edu/]
9 [http://online.engineering.illinois.edu/degrees/mechanical.htm]
10 [http://www.earnmydegree.com/online-education/online-college/arizona-state-university.html]
1.6 Administration of the Program

The administration of the program will be the responsibility of the Bourns College of Engineering.

Admissions: Applications to the online M.S. in Engineering Program are to be made to the Bourns College of Engineering and to the Graduate Division. The standards for admission are the same as those for BCOE’s traditional M.S. degrees, including GRE requirements and compliance with all Graduate Council regulations for admission. Each year, and for each specialization currently active in the online M.S. in Engineering Program, the Program’s Director will appoint at least two faculty members, associated with the corresponding specialization, to act as an admissions committee. Each committee will make its recommendations to the Director, who will forward them to the Graduate Division. This recommendation process is virtually equivalent to what is now in place for the current M.S. and Ph.D. programs.

The applicant shall have completed the substantial equivalent of the basic requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science in Engineering, Computer Science, Physical Science, or Mathematics. The adequacy of the applicant’s preparation will be determined by the faculty admission committee.

Petitions, disqualification, and the legion of miscellaneous issues that arise are to be handled in the same manner as they are for the M.S. and Ph.D. programs.

Each student’s course work and comprehensive examination (major design experience and project) will be supervised as follows. For each specialization that is active in the online M.S. in Engineering Program, the Director will appoint two faculty members, associated with that specialization, to oversee the students’ programs. The Director will recommend to the Graduate Division a committee of three faculty members, associated with the specialization, to constitute the comprehensive examination committee for the students of that specialization.

Oversight committee. The proposed program will have an oversight committee appointed by BCOE’s dean and consisting of representatives from the various BCOE departments and programs:

- Reza Abbaschian, Dean BCOE and former chair of Material Science and Engineering at the University of Florida (ex officio)
- Mark Matsumoto, Associate Dean BCOE and former chair of Chemical and Environmental Engineering at UCR (ex officio and representing Chemical and Environmental Engineering)
- Jie Chen, former chair of Electrical Engineering at UCR (representing Electrical Engineering)
- Rajiv Gupta, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering and Fellow of the Association for Computing Machinery (representing Computer Science and Engineering)
• Cengiz Ozkan, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering specializing in materials research (representing MS&E)
• Tom Payne, former chair of Computer Science and Engineering at UCR (Chair of programs oversight committee)
• Jerry Schultz, founding chair of Bioengineering at UCR and member of the National Academy of Engineering (representing Bioengineering)
• Kambiz Vafai, Professor of Mechanical Engineering specializing in transport phenomena (representing Mechanical Engineering)

Appointment histories are attached.

Instructors for the online courses will be selected and assigned via the same methods and criteria as for BCOE’s existing programs. Mostly, they will be ladder-rank UCR faculty. And, the fact that the program is online does not affect their credentials.

1.7 Evaluation of the Program

1. At the end of each quarter, students will be asked, via online questionnaires, for their opinions of the effectiveness of the teaching medium, approach, and content. Since these graduate students are employed engineers, a good deal of valuable feedback is expected, and improvements will be made accordingly.

2. During the initialization stage and the second year, the Dean and the Associate Dean will meet periodically with the faculty of the specializations. The head administrator of the computing facilities involved will also attend so that any problems associated with the physical resources needed for the delivery of online lectures may be discussed and resolved. Specifically sought will be the faculty opinion of the success of the online students relative to the traditional students.

3. At the end of each two-year period, the Dean will request that the Faculty Executive Committee review the program and provide its recommendations to the Dean, who will forward those recommendation, as well as the Dean’s recommendations, to the Graduate Council to implement recommended changes.

4. As with all graduate programs, the Graduate Council executes its reviews according to its schedule.

1.8 Academic Standards

The assurance of academic standards for the proposed program is the track record of the proposing unit. In the 20 years of its existence, BCOE has established six graduate programs including the two largest PhD programs on the UCR campus. In addition:
• The students entering the program will meet the same admission standards as those entering the standard programs.

• The courses for this program will be approved via UCR’s standard process.

• The program will be reviewed via UCR’s standard graduate-review process on the standard review cycle.

• The courses will be taught by UCR faculty who are reviewed via the standard processes.

• Some of the courses will be taught to live audiences of resident students and simultaneously recorded for online students. This technique has been successfully employed by other top universities, such as the University of Florida.

• The program committee will monitor the annual BCOE alumni surveys to determine whether the program’s objectives are being met.

• There will be UCR’s standard course evaluations.

• All students’ exams will be proctored.

• Each student must either take a comprehensive examination prepared by a committee of BCOE faculty or do an MS project under the supervision of a BCOE faculty member. In either case, there will be faculty feedback regarding the educational outcomes.

• Each course is taught under the auspices of an existing UCR department, which will have oversight responsibility for that course.

In addition, the proposed program has been modeled after a successful program at UCLA. Also, there are precedent for such programs at many other top universities throughout the country.

According to a 3/1/2010 report from UCOP, “Current state of online education in the US: Opportunities and challenges”:

A systematic analysis conducted by the U.S. Department of Education of the research literature from 1996 through July 2008 identified more than a thousand empirical studies of online learning in K-12, post-secondary, and professional education. An analysis of the studies that:

• contrasted an online to a face-to-face condition,

• measured student learning outcomes,

• employed rigorous research design, and

---

11http://www.ufedge.ufl.edu/programs/degree.php
12http://groups.ischool.berkeley.edu/onlineeducation/docs/currentstate
• provided adequate information to calculate an effect size,
produced 51 independent effects (44 of which were based on re-
search with students beyond K-12) that could be subjected to meta-
analysis.

_The meta-analysis found that, on average, students in on-
line learning conditions performed better than those receiv-
ing face-to-face instruction._ ...

Online education will not ... dilute the integrity and quality of the
host institution’s academic offerings whether delivered in person or
online. And online courses need not require more faculty time than
face-to-face instruction.

2 PROGRAM

The online M.S. in Engineering Program will be structured in a manner that
will allow employed engineers to complete the requirements in two academic
years plus one additional summer quarter. All students will complete their
requirements through Plan II (project or comprehensive exam). The project will
involve a literature review of a specialization topic, a substantial engineering-
design project, and a report based on those readings as well as upon course
work.

The program will consist of nine courses (36 units), six of which must be
at the 200 level. Each student’s program will contain at least four core courses
from the professional engineering series, four more from the student’s chosen
specialization, plus ENGR 296A (Preparation for M.S. Comprehensive Examina-
tion). The latter provides the opportunity for adequate study and instruction
for the major design project, a key component of the online M.S. in Engineering
Program.

2.1 Undergraduate Preparation for Admission

In addition to the requirements of the University, each applicant must possess
the equivalent of a Bachelor’s degree in engineering, computer science, physical
science, or mathematics, and have sufficient background, courses or experience,
to satisfy the prerequisites for the courses of the corresponding specialization.

2.2 Specializations

Each area of study within each BCOE’s traditional graduate programs is a
candidate for a corresponding specialization of the online M.S. in Engineering
Program, provided that the courses can be effectively delivered in an online
fashion. Combinations of such areas will be actively sought in order to enhance

13See Subsection 4 for more details.
multidisciplinary education. A distinct advantage of the College-wide M.S. in Engineering Program will be the ability to provide multidisciplinary education.

We will initiate the Program by offering the Bioengineering specialization. At the beginning of the second year, we intend to introduce at least one more new area-of study, to be selected early in the first year upon the advice of faculty, industry, and alumni. Two likely possibilities include Water-Quality Control Systems and Computer Networks.

As a result of our on-going advice from our industry partners, as well as from our alumni, new specializations will be added to the Program.

2.3 Normative Time for Completion

The normative time for completion will be two calendar years.

2.4 The Online Courses for the Program

As previously noted, the proposed program is based on existing courses that are yet-to-be approved for online delivery. We, therefore, request that this proposal be approved contingent upon Committee on Courses approval of the online delivery of those courses.

An online course involves the following four components:

• A course management system, e.g., UCR’s iLearn (BlackBoard) system, which UCR has been using for many years and with which most UCR faculty are already familiar.

• For online consultation with TAs and faculty, a web-based meeting system that includes shared desktop, audio, and possibly video communication.

• Remotely available online video recordings of classroom lectures (e.g., Flash 7.0+) with accompanying presentation graphics (e.g., PowerPoint slides).

• Remotely proctored exams, for which we will initially follow UCLA’s policies and protocols.

The links available on UCLA’s current-students web page give a reasonably good idea of how their program works.

2.4.1 The Course Management System

UCR has deployed an online, full-service website, iLearn (based on BlackBoard), that provides student and faculty access to courses and associated materials. Assignments, answer sheets, announcements, lecture slides, lecture notes, etc., may

14http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/current-students/exams
15http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/current-students
16Unfortunately, their class-demo website is currently being updated.
be uploaded by the faculty and easily accessed and downloaded by the student. It also provides threaded forums by which student questions are addressed by the instructor or TA, as well as, possibly, by other students. An e-mail tool is built in that allows the instructor to easily send information to the students of the class.

2.4.2 The Online Lectures for the Program

There are, of course, several technologies for producing online lectures. We have decided that it is best to have the instructor visible and speaking directly to the remote audience. We have decided upon producing video-audio synchronized PowerPoint lectures. Many faculty members of BCOE have a good deal of experience with the production of such lectures. Considerable effort is required of the instructor to create such video-synchronized PowerPoint lectures for an entire course.

When the lecture has been constructed, various files are published (uploaded) to two servers, for the purpose of streaming the lecture material. Each of these servers acts as a backup for the other.

This technology enables the student to have complete control of the streamed lecture material. The student may stop (pause) the flow of the presentation to carefully view a particular slide, the student may easily move from the present slide to any other slide and its concomitant video explanation, and, of course, the student may repeat a lecture or portions of a lecture as often as desired. When the student “clicks” on the appropriate hyperlink, the lecture is streamed to that student’s machine and displayed in the machine’s browser.

2.4.3 Online Consultation

We are currently exploring various collaborative-software technologies (e.g., Skype plus VNC) that will enhance office hours, beyond the usage of online forums, allowing audio and visual contact between the instructor and several students of the class, even if such students are geographically dispersed.

2.4.4 Examinations

Examinations need not be online examinations. During the initialization stage, we expect to mainly enroll those applicants who are employed in organizations with which we are familiar and for which we are able to “localize” the examination. As an example, if we have employees of Company X in Boston enrolled in the program, an examination (e.g., midterm, final) can be posted at a given time and downloaded to a Company X facility at which we have arranged for a trusted proctor (e.g., a member of the office of the “VP of University Relations”). We would also have an “open link” with the proctor to be able to answer the typical clarification questions that arise during an examination. The students’ examinations would then be scanned and sent back to the instructor via e-mail or by FTP to a protected site.
A design project (in lieu of comprehensive-examination) would be handled as a course (296A) in which the instructor will be in contact with the students, and with portions of the projects being sent to the instructor throughout the duration of the course. In addition to online lecture material (e.g., to clarify the design project), and in addition to the communication ability built into BCOE’s online learning-management system, we may also initiate a “net meeting” implementation to enhance our visual and audio communication with the students of this program.

If there are students of the program who are within a reasonable distance from the UCR Campus, those students may be asked to come to the campus for their examinations, to be synchronously taken along with their remote student colleagues.

As the program develops beyond the initialization stage, we will develop arrangements with organizations, including other schools, at which examinations may take place in a trusted, proctored environment.

2.4.5 Intellectual Property

UC policy is that “[T]he University owns the copyright to recordings of classroom lectures, but faculty own the copyright to their own lecture notes and teaching aids.” It is the College’s position that studio-based pre-recorded lectures are teaching aids and, therefore, the property of the faculty member who created those lectures. No other faculty member may use them without the explicit approval of the creator. Neither the College nor its representatives will distribute those lectures to others without the explicit approval of the creator of those materials.

2.4.6 Summary

In summary, the physical resources of BCOE, the availability of an online learning-management system, and our hardware and software facilities for recording and editing online lectures enable BCOE to provide this program. An outside vendor is unnecessary.

UCLA has a sample, demonstration course posted on its web site. Also, USC has an extensive web site detailing how they run their online programs. Regarding academic standards they note that:

“[S]ince the classes you are completing are the exact same courses our on-campus graduate students take, your degree earned is the exact same degree as our on-campus students, with absolutely no mention of ‘distance learning’ on your diploma or transcript.”

---

17See http://www.ucop.edu/irc/wp/wp_Docs/wp002.html
18http://msengrol.seas.ucla.edu/prospective-students/demo
19http://mapp.usc.edu/distanceeducation/index.html
20http://www.ufedge.ufl.edu/programs/degree.php
They also describe their process for appointing a proctor and processing exams. And, they have posted a cover sheet for exam proctors certification.

3 ARTICULATION AMONG BCOE GRAD PROGRAMS

An on-going student of a traditional M.S. program may not switch to the online M.S. in Engineering program. Students who have completed the online M.S. in Engineering program may apply to the Ph.D. program. Students who have completed a traditional M.S. or Ph.D. programs may be admitted to the online M.S. in Engineering program; however, courses taken in completion of those programs’ requirements may not be used for the online M.S. in Engineering program.

4 SAMPLE PROGRAM

A specialization associated with the online M.S. in Engineering Program will be constructed from areas of study associated with the traditional M.S. programs. As an example, we consider the Bioengineering specialization.

Specializations

Bioengineering

Principles and applications of Bioengineering based on a solid fundamental foundation in biological science and engineering to equip the students with diverse communication skills and training in the most advanced quantitative bioengineering research so that they can become leaders in their respective fields. The result is a rigorous, but exceptionally interactive and welcoming educational training for Bioengineering graduate students.

Prerequisite. B.S. degree in engineering or equivalent.

Minimum Course Requirements. Nine four-unit courses, of which at least six must be graduate courses, i.e., at the 200 level.

Plan II. Engineering 296A; four courses from the professional engineering core; plus four courses from the following list, subject to the approval of the student’s adviser:

- BIEN 223 – Engineering Analysis of Physiological Systems
- BIEN 224 – Cellular and Molecular Engineering
- BIEN 249 – Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology

21http://www.ufedge.ufl.edu/partners/proctors.php
22http://www.ufedge.ufl.edu/pdf/ExamCoverSheet_2010.pdf
• BIEN 264 – Dynamics of Biological Systems

Selection of courses for the professional engineering core will include courses such as the following:

• MGT 201 Quantative Analysis
• MGT 221 Decision Making Under Uncertainty
• MGT 236 Decision Making Under Certainty
• MGT 230 Databases for Management
• MGT 243 Product Development
• MGT 266 Project Management
• MGT 281 Systems Analysis and Design
• XRC 463 Systems Engineering Management Egr.
• XRC 463.1 Systems Requirements Definition and Analysis Egr.
• XRC 463.2 Systems Concepts Development and Selection Egr.
• XRC 463.3 Systems Design and Integration Egr.
• XRC 463.4 Systems Verification Egr.
• XRC 470.37 New Product Development
• XRC 470.41 Project Management Essentials (an online course)

A sample specialization, drawn from Bioengineering follows:

• BIEN 223
• BIEN 224
• BIEN 249
• BIEN 264

The comprehensive-examination requirement will be met by a literature review, a major design project, plus a report; one enrollment in Engineering 296A will provide the appropriate course credit and instruction vehicle for this requirement.

---

23 Online versions of these courses have been neither developed nor proposed for Academic Senate approval. Nor have the X 463 series and X 470 series been proposed for XRC status. Online version will be developed as needed, except that X 470.41 is already an online course that has been delivered multiple times by UNEX.

24 Online versions of these courses have been neither been developed nor proposed for Academic Senate approval at this time.

25 Engineering 296A is a yet-to-be-proposed course similar to UCLA’s 597A, which is offered by each engineering department.
ENGR 296A. Preparation for M.S. Comprehensive Examination. (4 units) Tutorial, to be arranged. **Limited to graduate engineering students in the online M.S. program.** Reading and preparation for M.S. comprehensive examination. S/U grading.

We believe that ENGR 296A requirement will benefit employed engineers far more than only lectures, the mode of operation of other online engineering programs. We believe that the design project and the concomitant satisfaction upon its completion will attract online M.S. in Engineering students to our Ph.D. programs.

5 PROJECTED NEED

Working engineers, even those with years of experience, need to frequently renew and update their knowledge to deal with technology advances that occur, and have been occurring, at a rapid rate. There are likely few professions for which the need to renew and update is so critical. The faculty and administration of the BCOE wish to provide a critical educational service for California’s and the nation’s engineers and for the organizations that employ them. This program will make it convenient for working engineers to renew their education, while continuing their professional careers, and to have the benefit of instruction by and access to research-active UCR faculty members.

BCOE has numerous alumni employed throughout the U.S. and other countries. Not only are many of them candidates for our program, but many are also in positions to influence others to take advantage of what BCOE at UCR has to offer. We have no doubt that there is a considerable potential base of knowledgeable engineers who will appreciate BCOE’s efforts and enroll in the online M.S. in Engineering Program.

6 STAFF

As discussed in Subsection 2.2, we will initiate the online M.S. in Engineering Program with the Bioengineering specialization. We expect that as the Program develops, more specializations and associated faculty will become active participants.

All online courses are to be taught by the ladder faculty generally associated with the corresponding specialization. Occasionally, adjuncts, emeriti, and lecturers may also be instructors of online courses.

7 COURSES

The graduate courses of the BCOE are candidates, along with appropriate undergraduate prerequisite courses, for inclusion in the online M.S. in Engineering Program. Courses are added to the program as a result of the addition of specializations.
8 RESOURCES AND ENROLLMENT PLANNING

Our intention is to initiate this online M.S. in Engineering Program modestly. As stated above, we intend initially to offer a single specialization, Bioengineering. In each of the subsequent years, we intend to add an additional specialization (and possibly more), while continuing with the previous areas as well. At this point, a likely specialization to be included at the beginning of the second year is Water-Quality Control Systems and/or Computer Networks. The following table illustrates this conservative course offering plan by specialization: five incoming students per area per year with four of the five continuing through the second year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spec. 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spec 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spec 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spec 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Online M.S. in Engineering Program Course Offerings.

We propose that the basic fee for the online M.S. in Engineering Program be $15,000 per year for the two-year program, i.e., $30,000 per student for the two-year program. Revenue will be used for faculty compensation, Special Reader support for Ph.D. students, fee remissions, administrative and computer support. A faculty member’s compensation covers the instructor’s workload, comprising construction of new assignments, changes in the original lectures, online office hours, instructing and monitoring the special readers, and general grading responsibilities — payments to the faculty may be used for additional student support, travel, and summer salary. Programmer and Student Affairs (Administrative Analyst) assistance will also be needed, in addition to computer server equipment additions that will be needed as enrollment grows and the physical demands of lecture “streaming” increase. We will also allocate one Special Reader for each class. The nature of online lectures necessitates, certainly at the beginning of the Program, adequate consultation resources for the students of the Program. These positions also contribute to needed Ph.D. student support.

The following table describes the revenue and costs for a single specialization of the online M.S. in Engineering Program — the expectation is to introduce one new specialization per year. Profits will be used for unpredicted costs and for graduate fellowships for BCOE’s Ph.D. students.
It is expected that the technical courses will be delivered by tenure-track faculty, who will be both the developer of the course and its instructor. For offerings of that course, the faculty member will receive $400 per student per offering, and will have the assistance of a .25-FTE Special Reader, who will receive $4500 in salary plus $400 in benefits. Other courses, commonly the core engineering methodology courses, will be delivered by adjunct faculty or lecturers, who will work without a TA or Reader and will receive a $400/student/offering instructor fee in addition to $4500 in salary and $400 in benefits for each offering.

26These on-line courses will not be in lieu of or replacement for a faculty member’s normal teaching, research, or service duties.

27It is expected that .25-FTE Special Readers will be responsible for an average of five students and a maximum of eight — at that level the load would be split over two .25-FTE Special Readers or given to a .50-FTE Special Reader.
M.S. in Engineering (online)

Nine-course, two-year program with a new cohort each fall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of courses/year/student</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition ($15,000/student/year)</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application fee (one time per student)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online-Course Develop/Mgmt Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to develop 1st offering of online course</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to update for each subsequent offering</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services Fee (per student/offering)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor compensation (per student/offering)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25-FTE TA/Reader costs/offering (salary + fees)</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
<td>$3,255</td>
<td>$3,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 new students annually</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average enrollment per offering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Development (one-time costs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course conversion ($5000 for 1st offering)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total One-Time Costs</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Instructional Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor compensation ($400/student/offering)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA/Reader salary and benefits</td>
<td>$30,135</td>
<td>$54,243</td>
<td>$54,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services Fee ($500/student/offering)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$20,250</td>
<td>$20,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course update/revision fee ($1,000/offering)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Instructional Costs</td>
<td>$67,635</td>
<td>$110,693</td>
<td>$114,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual costs</td>
<td>$92,635</td>
<td>$130,693</td>
<td>$114,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Three-Year Net Revenue** $6979

Table 2. Budget for the online M.S. in Engineering Program.

---

11 This fee covers such things as student-affairs and technical services.

12 Any net-positive Revenue will be used to support BCOE Graduate Students.
9 GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT

Since the online M.S. in Engineering Program is for employed engineers, the issue of support of graduate students of the program is not relevant. However, an important reason for the introduction of the online M.S. in Engineering Program is to generate funds to support Ph.D. students, and the profit generated by the program by this program will be used primarily to do so.

10 DEGREE DESIGNATION

This section discusses several related issues: (1) the reason for the requested degree designation, (2) the issue of differential fees, and (3) SR 694.

10.1 Master of Science in Engineering (M.S.)

It is well-understood in the engineering/computer-science community that the M.S. degree is the degree that leads to the specialized advanced education that is of importance to the student, to industry, and to the students entering the Ph.D. program. Engineers seek the M.S. degree to expand their engineering education to attain a level of technical competence that is generally not achieved at the baccalaureate level, and to enhance their opportunities and be of greater use to their employers. Indeed, the attainment of the M.S. generally leads to increases in pay.

The M.S. program provides the education by which engineers improve their educational and professional status; that is, the M.S. degree in engineering/computer-science areas is the de facto “professional” degree. To use any other designation would inappropriately diminish the dedication of the faculty and the value to be accrued by the students of the program. Our proposed degree program is educationally equivalent to the traditional M.S. program and so should be its degree designation. It is the position of the College’s administration and faculty that to call the degree anything other than M.S. would be inappropriate, misleading, and would contradict the Program’s content and would defeat the Program’s purpose. UCLA, Stanford, USC, Georgia Tech, and a host of other engineering schools use M.S. and in no way distinguish the online program’s degree from the traditional degree.

10.2 Differential Fees

The proposed online Master-of-Engineering program is educationally comparable to the traditional M.S. programs offered by the College. However, considerable extra effort and time are required of the participating faculty who will not receive “teaching credit” for the courses of this program. Additionally, there will be considerable infrastructure, special reader, programmer analyst, and student affairs officer costs.
10.3 SR 694

In 1956, in a “Report of the Graduate Council, Northern Section,” (1956/05/24, Academic Senate, Northern Section: Notice of Special Meeting of the Representative Assembly (Vol. II, No. 11)), the following opening sentence occurs:

“At its meeting on April 23, 1956, the Graduate Council gave consideration to a report of its sub-committee appointed to study a proposal presented by Dr. B. M. Woods, Vice-Chairman–University Extension, that off-campus instruction be offered for the master’s degree, and to study also the entire conception of off-campus instruction directed toward higher degrees.”

The resulting legislation, SR 883, was renumbered in 1964 to SR 694. The main request by the Vice-Chairman of University Extension, in 1956, was to allow University Extension to have a wider role in Master’s programs. It is our opinion, upon reading the referenced report, that “off-campus instruction” refers to off-campus centers generally operated by Extension. Parts C and D also reveal the Council’s concern with faculty, courses, and programs at such centers. It is our opinion that SR 694(B) is essentially a restriction on Extension with respect to the M.A. and M.S. degrees and certainly should not be considered to be a restriction on ladder faculty presenting courses and programs approved by the Graduate Council, the Committee on Courses, and the Committee on Educational Policy. In any event, SR 694 is so thoroughly intertwined with Extension and its centers (indeed, the opening sentence of SR 694 requires the cooperation of Extension) that we strongly believe that SR 694 is irrelevant with respect to BCOE’s proposal.

Moreover, today’s technology could not have been envisioned by the legislators of 1956.
Daniel L. Simmons  
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November 3, 2010

SENATE DIVISION AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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

Dear Colleagues:

Provost Pitts has requested Senate advice on a proposed revision of the 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs and its Implementation Guidelines. Since 1996 there has been an increase in self-supporting graduate degree programs and, as you know, the Commission on the Future recommended further expansion of these programs as a potential source of revenue for the University.

The administration is proposing to update the policy to reflect the range of self-supporting graduate programs currently offered by the University. The revisions would expand the parameters for self-supporting graduate degree programs beyond the current limitation to part-time, professional programs. Doctoral programs are explicitly excluded from being designated as self-supporting programs.

In conducting your review, we refer you to CCGA’s April 2010 letter highlighting issues to be clarified in the revised policy. Such issues include faculty oversight of programs and courses offered through University Extension, the provision of financial support for needy student (the policy does not require that a portion of the revenues be dedicated to return-to-aid), and ensuring that self-supporting programs are truly independent from state support and do not draw resources from state-supported instruction.

Although Provost Pitt’s letter requests comment by December 17, I have requested sufficient time to allow for a 60 day review. Please send your comments to senatereview@ucop.edu by January 14, so that the Academic Council can address it at its January 26 meeting. Please do not send comments directly to the address noted in the provost’s letter.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Simmons, Chair  
Academic Council
To: CHAIR SIMMONS
    VICE CHAIR ANDERSON
    ACADEMIC SENATE

Re: Draft Revision of the 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Dear Dan and Bob:

Enclosed please find draft proposed revisions of the 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs and the Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs. Given expanding workforce needs and the current shortfall in state funding, there is increasing interest by campuses and academic departments in offering more self-supporting programs. The Commission on the Future is also recommending that UC expand its self-supporting offerings. Thus, this is an opportune time to update the policy to both facilitate the establishment of new programs and to update the policy to conform to the actual practices of current self-supporting programs.

The existing policy was adopted in 1996. Since that time, there has been steady growth in the number of self-supporting programs. UC now has over 40 such programs, enrolling over 4,000 students and generating over $100 million annually in fee revenue. These programs address specific workforce needs as well as generate resources to support core academic departments.

The campuses are facing unprecedented fiscal challenges given the recent trend of declining state support. We believe that such policies should be revised to allow campuses greater flexibility in pursuing alternative revenue sources such as self-supporting programs. At the same time, given the on-going need to make our case for adequate state support, we propose coupling this flexibility with increased accountability and transparency.

There is some concern that the flexibility proposed in this revision would create incentives for existing graduate programs to give up their state support and convert to self-supporting programs. We do not believe that these policy revisions do that — in almost all cases, the additional revenue generated by such a conversion would not be enough to offset the loss of current state support received by the campus. In addition, there are adequate checks and balances at the campus level. The goal of this revision is to facilitate the creation of new self-supporting programs to serve new groups of students that do not have the opportunity to attend one of our traditional graduate programs. We do not believe these policy changes should nor would encourage state-supported programs to convert to self-supporting.
The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) was charged by the Academic Council to provide specific recommendations to the 1996 policy. Throughout the 2008-09 academic year, CCGA reviewed the policy and a background paper was prepared by UCOP staff. In 2009-10, a UCOP staff group was formed and it reviewed prior work and developed these proposed revisions to the 1996 policy.

A number of issues have been addressed in the draft revised policy. Nine of the 40 existing programs are not “part-time,” a requirement of existing policy that is outdated. Also, there are programs that serve a greater variety of student populations than were contemplated in 1996; not all programs are “professional.” Given these factors, the most significant proposed change in the policy is to list criteria that would be used to distinguish self-supporting from state-supported programs, but each program would not be required to meet all criteria. While this introduces more flexibility in the types of graduate degrees that would be eligible for self-supporting status, the draft revised policy also accepts the CCGA recommendation that Ph.D. degree programs not be eligible for self-supporting status.

The suggested revisions are based on the prior discussions of the CCGA and the UCOP staff group. Background materials are available at www.ucop.edu/planning/selfsupporting.html. Included on the website are the existing policy and implementation guidelines, the 2008 background paper on self-supporting programs written by UCOP staff for CCGA, the April 2010 CCGA letter, and a listing of existing self-supporting programs at UC.

We are seeking comments on the draft revision of the 1996 Policy. Please provide your campus’ response by December 17, 2010, to Todd Greenspan [todd.greenspan@ucop.edu, 510-987-9430]. Please note that we are also requesting comments from the Executive Vice Chancellors, the Graduate Deans, and the Extension Deans.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Enclosure

cc: Vice Provost Greenstein
    Vice President Beckwith
    Vice President Sakaki
    Vice President Lenz
    Executive Director Winnacker
    Director Greenspan
POLICY ON SELF-SUPPORTING PART-TIME GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL-DEGREE PROGRAMS

Preamble

The University has entered an era in which state funding for higher education has been reduced and is not expected to represent in the future the proportion of the University’s budget that it has in the past. This poses two potentially interrelated challenges: How can the University extend its degree programs to serve new groups of students? And how can the University find new and creative ways to fund its degree programs?

In 1994, the UC Task Force on Part-time Professional Master’s Degree Programs advocated that UC expand such opportunities for groups of clearly defined students not now served by UC’s regular programs. In 1995, the Advisory Committee on Policy for High Fee Part-Time Professional Programs urged the University to create a climate of encouragement and support for creative new approaches to delivering part-time professional education. This policy is a revision of UC’s 7-30-79 Policy on Part-Time Off-Campus Professional Graduate Degree Programs, based on advice from both these groups.

The purpose for offering part-time graduate professional degree programs is to serve a public need. Once the need has been identified, the next decision should be whether the program should be self-supporting. As a matter of course, it is likely that the more specifically a program addresses training needs for a profession, the likelier it is that the program should be self-supporting. Market factors play a key role in making this decision and guiding appropriate fee levels.

Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs should adhere to the same UC academic standards as do other graduate degree programs.

The University should consider expanding flexible part-time pathways to graduate professional degrees to accommodate academically qualified working adults who cannot be full-time students.
DRAFT – Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs: Policy

Extending the opportunity to enroll part-time in professional master’s graduate degree programs to those who need to continue their employment while studying is consistent with the University’s mission in graduate professional education. As provided by Academic Senate Regulation 694, courses to satisfy the requirements of such programs may be given, either in whole or in part, at off-campus sites. The following outlines University policy relative to self-supporting part-time graduate professional programs, offered in both on-campus and off-campus locations and through electronic means.

I. REFERENCE
   A. President’s Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs, Month Year.

II. POLICY

Self-supporting programs allow the University to serve additional students above and beyond the resources provided by the state. Currently, there are populations of working adults not served by UC state-supported programs who would be willing to enroll in self-supporting programs. This policy is designed to facilitate the establishment of self-supporting programs by the University and its campuses while ensuring that these programs do not use state resources. These programs will receive no state support, but they may generate revenues that would enhance the quality of academic programs and departments.

A. General
   A. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be undertaken only when a demonstrated need for a part-time program in a specific field of study exists. Justification for expansion of part-time programming depends on a careful definition of the pools of employed people who need such degrees and the ability of the University to provide appropriate graduate degrees of quality to them.

1. Self-supporting graduate degree programs should meet one or more of the following criteria:
   a. fulfill a demonstrated higher education and/or workforce need;
   b. serve a non-traditional population, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students, and/or students supported by their employers;

Rationale for creating self-supporting programs.

This section has been revised to list a set of criteria for self-supporting programs, but programs would only have to meet one or more of the criteria.
c. be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction;

d. be alternatively scheduled, such as during evenings and weekends.

2. Such programs shall not be undertaken if they strain the resources of the department that sponsors them or have an adverse effect on regular programs on campus. If the campus determines that the part-time graduate professional degree program should be offered on a self-supporting basis, in this policy, “self-supporting” is used for part-time programs that are supported with non-state funds only; the State General Funds subsidy has been removed from the part-time program. Such programs should be fully self-supporting upon inception or within a short phase-in period set the goal of becoming fully self-supporting as quickly as possible; “self-supporting” means that full program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead, should be covered by student fees or other non-state funds. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program should submit a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan with their request for approval of proposed student fees to the Office of the President [see Implementation Guidelines].

3. By expanding self-supporting programming that serves practitioners, the department may have access to additional field-based resources (working students, their employers, and field-based lecturers) that it might not otherwise be able to afford. Therefore, where appropriate, these programs should be undertaken in partnership with the profession served.

4. Courses may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or in a combination of on-campus and off-campus facilities. The possibility of using programs may also use distance technologies (computer- and video-based, e-mail, etc.) should also be engaged as appropriate. As provided by Academic Senate Regulation 694, courses to satisfy the requirements of such programs may be given, either in whole or in part, at off-campus sites.

---

1 SR 694: A school, department, or group of departments which offers a program leading to a Master’s degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division, may, in cooperation with University Extension, provide at a center or centers other than a campus of the University, a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree. [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/694.html]
B. Programs Ineligible for Self-Supporting Status

1. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs are not eligible to become self-supporting programs.

C. Relationship to Regular On-Campus Programs

1. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs should be held to the same standards of quality as regular programs, as determined by the appropriate Graduate Council. Because students should meet the same standards of quality in the part-time self-supporting and regular state-supported programs, campuses, provisions should be made that allow students to transfer between programs. Campuses may also determine which offer courses which are available to students in both programs, keeping in mind that. However, regular and self-supporting part-time programs must separately account for their use of resources, should have comparable availability of faculty and courses. Campuses shall not charge a “blended” fee for any course or program (i.e., a fee that combines state-supported and self-supported students).

2. Any part-time self-supporting programs should be established by academic departments and staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as regular state-supported programs. Teaching faculty should be appointed through regular campus processes irrespective of academic series. Certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion of non-regular faculty (e.g., clinical/adjunct faculty, lecturers, visitors), but that proportion must be in keeping with the standards of each campus’ Graduate Council. Courses offered in these programs should be taught by a mix of faculty members that parallels the mix of faculty in regular state-supported programs. When regular state-supported programs employ some combination of Senate faculty and guest lecturers or consultants, courses for part-time self-supporting programs may use a similar combination. Under no circumstances shall anyone teach in part-time self-supporting programs whose appointment has not been subject to the appropriate academic review.

Ph.D. programs not eligible – CCGA’s comment, “There was general agreement among CCGA members that SSPs should not be geared toward Ph.D. programs” (p.3, CCGA letter).

Transfer and Cross-enrollment – If transfer were made possible between a state-supported and self-supporting program, there might be unintended financial incentives for students to be enrolled in one program and transfer in another. Because the criteria above are supposed to distinguish the programs, it was recommended that transfer not be encouraged. There was some sentiment to prohibit transfer. Instead, language is added about separately accounting for resources if programs share courses.

No “blended” fee – UCOP staff workgroup discussed this issue since it would be difficult to demonstrate that state resources are not being used to support self-supporting students.

Teaching faculty – “We felt that SSP teaching faculty should be appointed through regular campus processes irrespective of academic series.” (CCGA letter, p. 2)

Replaced “part-time” with “self-supporting” and “regular” with “state-supported.”
3. Self-supporting programs will not be funded from State General Funds and reports of state-funded enrollments will exclude students in self-supporting programs. However, these enrollments will be reported to the Office of the President as a separate category which is not counted against the campus budgeted (state-funded) enrollment target. During the approved phase-in period, distribution of enrollment between state and non-state targets will conform to specifications of the phase-in plan.

4. The Dean of the school or college offering the self-supporting program and the Academic Vice Chancellor are responsible for assuring that program publicity and marketing meet the highest standards of quality and accuracy.

5. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be administered in cooperation with University Extension where and when appropriate. Programs administered through UC Extension shall not be required to obtain fee approval from the President. UC Extension’s role may include assisting in the administration of the program (e.g., course enrollment, collecting fees, etc.). Courses for self-supporting programs are subject to normal campus procedures for approval (i.e., approval by Committee on Courses) [see Implementation Guidelines].

Currently UCOP certifies the self-supporting nature of new programs by requiring campus budgets. An alternative would be having net determinants to the campus with regular audits of self-supporting. Suggested wording: “Self-supported programs are subject to periodic audits conducted by the Office of the President.”

UC Extension — “The majority of courses offered by UC Extension are not reviewed and approved by campus Senate committees, which consider academic quality. UC Extension courses that are used in campus-based SSP need to be approved by the divisional COCI and that CCGA approves systemwide courses, which may be adapted by systemwide entities.” (CCGA letter, p.2)

Because University Extension is by definition a self-supporting entity of the University, programs administered by UC Extension are currently exempted from receiving presidential fee approval. See footnote 4 below. (UCOP staff workgroup)

D. Initiation and Review Procedures

1. Departments, groups of departments, or schools offering graduate professional degree programs under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division may propose that such self-supporting programs be offered in whole or in part at off-campus sites or

2SR 694. See footnote 1.
by distance learning technologies.

2. Such proposals must be approved by campus Graduate Councils, as well as by appropriate campus administrators. The establishment of any new self-supporting graduate program shall be approved by the campus Graduate Council, Divisional Senate, Systemwide Academic Senate, campus administrators, the Chancellor, and the UC President according to established procedures and requirements as specified in the Compendium.3

3. Graduate Councils or other duly appointed campus review bodies shall review such programs as part of regularly scheduled campus program reviews, on the same basis on which regular academic programs are reviewed. Once established, the self-supporting program will be overseen by the divisional Graduate Division to ensure adequate progress of students according to campus criteria.

E. Programs that Do Not Correspond to Currently Authorized Graduate Professional Programs

1. Proposals may be considered for self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs that do not correspond to regular state-supported programs that a campus is authorized to offer.

2. Such proposals shall be subject to the same procedures for approval as apply to all proposals for new graduate degrees.

3. These programs should originate with a unit that is already authorized to conduct

3 Proposals for all new graduate degree programs, including self-supporting and professional degree programs, degrees offered under the Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) title, multi-campus degree programs, and degree programs jointly sponsored by UC campus(es) and other higher education institutions (e.g., CSU), are reviewed systemwide by UCOP and CCCA. Self-supporting graduate degree programs must adhere to the same UC academic standards as do other graduate degree programs. (Language from the July 2010 “Compendium” draft – to be revised when new Compendium language is adopted)
graduate work on the campus at the level that is at least equal to the level of the proposed graduate professional program.

4. If approved, such programs shall be conducted in accordance with the policies set forth in this statement.

F. Admission and Enrollment

1. Admission standards for the part-time self-supporting programs should be comparable in effect to those for the regular state-supported program.

2. Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.

3. Access to courses offered as part of these programs must be equally available to all qualified students. No preference in enrollment may be given to members of any non-University sponsoring organization.

4. Admission criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field.

G. Student Fees and Program Funding

1. The President is responsible for reviewing and recommending to The Regents approving any proposed self-supporting program fees for self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs and subsequent increases or decreases. Programs administered by UC Extension do not require Presidential fee approval.\(^4\) The President will report annually to The Regents on self-supporting graduate programs and their fee levels.

---

\(^4\) “Extension can administer and operate the program, with the academic department providing academic oversight. In this case, the campus will write to UCOP, indicating that the program is administered through Extension and that the fee being charged is sufficient to cover both direct and indirect costs. Presidential fee approval is not required.” (February 22, 2001 letter from VP for Budget Hershman) http://www.ucop.edu/planning/documents/hershman_ltr022201.pdf

Approval by the President. Currently, the President approves the self-supporting fees and reports them to the Regents pursuant to a November 1998 delegation of authority.

Because University Extension is by definition a self-supporting entity of the University, programs administered by UC Extension are currently
2. Self-supporting program fees should be levied such that as quickly as possible they will cover all program costs.

3. Self-supporting program fees should be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead. The proposed self-supporting fee, its phase-in plan, and its justification shall be submitted with the proposal for the program to the President. When the self-supporting fee has been fully implemented, no State General Funds will be provided to the program. If the program fails to reach full self-support in line with its phase-in plan, state funds will be withdrawn from its support.

4. When the self-supporting program fee has been fully implemented (i.e., when all State funds have been withdrawn from the program), the campuses may not collect the Educational Fee or the University Registration Fee.

5. University employees enrolled in self-supporting part-time professional degree programs are not eligible for reduced course fees. However, this provision does not preclude the option of the UC employer subsidizing a portion of the fee.

6. Program deficits will be covered by the campuses; however, state funds cannot be used to cover any deficit, except during the start-up years under the approved phase-in plan.

7. Self-supporting programs must have an articulated financial accessibility goal for their students and a student financial support plan for achieving their goal. Examples of possible student financial support plan components include providing scholarships or grants from the program’s own resources (e.g., return-to-aid from fees charged but not from state funds or tuition or fees charged to students in state-supported programs), providing fee waivers, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, and participation in other external support programs such as veterans benefits. Note that the self-supporting programs are responsible for meeting the administrative requirements and costs of financial aid program participation.

CCGA’s Financial Aid comment: “...many qualified students fail to join these programs due to the lack or reduced amount of financial aid. CCGA recommends that there should be clear and adequate provisions for financial support built into any new policy.” (p. 2, CCGA letter)
Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Faculty FTE

All faculty must be funded directly from the revenue of self-supporting programs in proportion to the faculty member's workload commitment to the program. This includes the involvement of faculty from other departments. Alternatively, faculty can be paid for overload teaching within the 120% salary limitation that governs teaching in University Extension. Appropriate campus review committees should be vigilant to ensure that the overload option and 120% salary limitation are used appropriately.

Program Approval

For new self-supporting graduate degree programs, campuses should obtain required program approvals. The establishment of any new self-supporting graduate program shall be approved by the campus Graduate Council, Divisional Senate, Systemwide Academic Senate, campus administrators, the Chancellor, and the UC President according to established procedures and requirements as specified in the Compendium.¹

Cost Analysis

All programs must submit an annual cost analysis to Budget and Capital Resources. This analysis includes an estimate of average costs for the campus and school in addition to direct program costs. Program costs include the direct costs of staff and faculty salaries and benefits, supplies and equipment, and financial aid, among others. Campus and school costs are the indirect costs for items such as instruction, research, public services, academic support, and operation and maintenance of the plant.

¹ Proposals for all new graduate degree programs, including self-supporting and professional degree programs, degrees offered under the Master of Advanced Studies (M.A.S.) title, multi-campus degree programs, and degree programs jointly sponsored by UC campus(es) and other higher education institutions (e.g., CSU), are reviewed systemwide by UCOP and CCCA. Self-supporting graduate degree programs must adhere to the same UC academic standards as do other graduate degree programs. (Language from the July 2010 “Compendium” draft.)
Programs must demonstrate that their fees cover full direct and indirect costs, and, to the extent that fee revenue is insufficient to cover these costs, that only private fund sources are used to subsidize the program.

In addition to the cost analysis, campuses must submit a fee approval request letter to the Vice President – Budget and Capital Resources for all of their proposed self-supporting programs. Campuses must provide requested fee levels and the percentage fee increases for each program, as well as provide information about upcoming new programs and programs operated by University Extension. For a self-supporting program administered through UC Extension, the campus shall provide UC with a written statement that the program is administered through Extension and that the fee being charged is sufficient to cover both direct and indirect costs -- Presidential fee approval is not required. \(^2\)

Newly proposed self-supporting programs submit the same cost analysis to Budget and Capital Resources. Programs are expected to become fully self-supporting within three years, though campuses may continue to subsidize programs with non-State funds at their discretion.

Faculty FTE

All faculty must be funded directly from the revenue of self-supporting programs in proportion to the faculty member’s workload commitment to the program, or the program must reimburse an amount equivalent to the cost of faculty time. This includes the involvement of faculty from other departments. Alternatively, faculty can be paid for overload teaching within the 120% salary limitation that governs teaching in University Extension. Appropriate campus review committees should be vigilant to ensure that the overload option and 120% salary limitation are used appropriately.

Enrollments

Because enrollments in these programs are self-supported, they should not be included in counts of State-supported enrollment. Programs should be identified in the Corporate Student System by a separate major code and attribute flagging the enrollment as self-supporting.

Timeline
Campuses receive cost analysis templates for the next academic year in December, as well as the previous year's actual self-supporting enrollment numbers from the Corporate Student System. Campus financial statements, used in the preparation of the cost analysis, are posted online late in the month. Detailed instructions for the fee approval request letter are also given at this time.

Templates and letters are due back to Budget and Capital Resources (BCR) by March 1. After review by BCR, templates and a summary of fee requests are given to the President for approval, which usually happens by April. Campuses are then notified of approved fee levels for the upcoming academic year. This information is also reported to The Regents annually.

Office of the President Budget Office Review and Oversight
Upon final approval of this policy, the Office of the President Budget Office will have responsibility to ensure compliance.

Review and Approval of Phase-in Plan: Both existing and new self-supporting part time graduate professional degree programs are covered by this policy. Proposals for new self-supporting part-time professional degree programs, including a plan and timetable for phasing in fees that will assure self-support, should be submitted to the Office of the President Budget Office, which will coordinate the internal Office of the President interoffice review. Proposals should include information on the status of all current self-supporting programs on the proposers' campus and a worksheet showing cost components on which the self-supporting fee is based.

Fees: Office of the President Budget Office, working with the campuses, has already developed a methodology for establishing the minimum special fee a program should charge to assure that it is self-supporting; the Office of the President Budget Office will work with the campuses to apply that methodology to any proposed program.

Campuses with programs that do not charge at least the minimum special fee as determined by the agreed-upon methodology, and therefore are not fully self-supporting, will submit a proposal that specifies when the program will be self-supporting. The Office of the President Budget Office interprets the proposed policy language "as quickly as possible" to mean that normally a program
will achieve self-support within three years.

Upon Regental approval of the special fee, the Office of the President-Budget Office will monitor implementation of the phase-in plan. If the program does not reach self-sufficiency within the time specified in its plan, state funds will be withdrawn from its support.

Proposals for phasing a special fee and phasing out state support should also include a plan for reporting enrollments during the phase-in period. During the phase-in period, program enrollments will be counted as state-funded based on the proportion of the minimum fee that is being charged. If the fee charged is 75% of the minimum, for example, then 25% of the enrollment will be counted as state-funded.
Proposed Guidelines for a DE

All graduate students admitted to Ph.D. programs at the University of California Riverside may participate in a Designated Emphasis, a specialization that might include a new method of inquiry or an important field of application related to two or more existing Ph.D. programs. The Designated Emphasis is awarded in conjunction with the Ph.D. degree and is signified by a transcript designation; for example, “Ph.D. in English with a Designated Emphasis in Medieval Studies” or “Ph.D. in Biology with a Designated Emphasis in Vector-borne Diseases.”

Graduate students who have completed a Designated Emphases may be more competitive candidates for positions in their primary disciplines

Designated Emphases comprise 12-16 additional units, where 4 of those units reflect a significant research product, whether a paper or poster. Designated Emphases are run by faculty groups consisting of at least one member from each of the cooperating Ph.D. programs. Proposals for Designated Emphases must be submitted to the Graduate Council and Graduate Dean for approval.

For a D.E. proposal:

1. Must have a specified number of units (no less than 12) to be taken in at least two departments/programs. All courses must be at the graduate level or require graduate level work (both quantity and quality) from the student.
2. Must specify the research requirement for the D.E.
3. Courses used for the D.E. MAY NOT also be counted toward the MA/MS or Ph.D. requirements. They must be IN ADDITION.
4. ALL D.E.s must have a committee that oversees the curriculum.
5. NO DE should request extra resources in order to meet its obligation; this includes extra funding for Graduate Students because of increased time to degree or FTE in order to meet the teaching requirements.
6. The deadline for completion for the D.E. must be established in the proposal and may not be modified without Graduate Council approval. Although proposals may delineate a shorter deadline, the maximum time to D.E. that may be proposed is one calendar year from the quarter in which the candidate advances to candidacy.