

Final report of the Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs November 6, 2010

1. Introduction

The joint administration-Senate Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs (hereafter, SSDPs) met during the Spring 2010 semester to evaluate Berkeley campus and system-wide policy as well as implementation of that policy and current practice with respect to SSDPs. Our full charge is detailed in Appendix A. We investigated the role of SSDPs on the campus, the elements of program review, faculty teaching, and guidelines for proposals and financial arrangements of SSDPs. To inform our deliberations, we sought input from a wide range of Senate committees and deans, through surveys and discussions. We interviewed knowledgeable colleagues about SSDP proposals, financial arrangements, teaching policy and relationship to our educational mission.

SSDPs have developed historically from a combination of factors including emerging educational needs of the state and limitations of the state-supported financial model. In 1979, the University acknowledged the need to extend opportunities to students who could not enroll in programs full-time by issuing the *President's Policy on Part-Time, Off-Campus Professional Degree Programs*. When, in the 1990s, the University experienced a reduction in state funding, part-time graduate programs were identified as a creative way to fund existing degree programs. In 1996, the University issued the *Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs* in order to expand part-time offerings and generate sources of income to fund existing academic programs (see Appendix B). Berkeley has four such programs (three at Haas and one at Boalt); a number of new ones are under consideration.

At the time when this report was being finalized, it emerged that UCOP is considering modification of its 1996 policy. Campus policy should be revisited if this becomes necessary.

Our review and deliberations affirmed the following:

- Existing SSDPs serve the educational mission of the Berkeley campus and future ones will be able to do so. They bring a unique cohort of students to the campus who are largely working professionals. Just as some faculty members prefer teaching undergraduates and others graduate students, there are faculty members who prefer teaching SSDP students. The education of SSDP students is a unique and interesting challenge. Faculty report that combining SSPD and other graduate students in the same class can provide pedagogical advantages associated with the interaction of students with different perspectives — some straight out of college and others with substantial work experience.
- SSDPs currently raise substantial funds for the campus and for the offering units; increasing their scope may well raise more funds. These include both funds that we recognize as a contribution to central campus to support common goods and funds that are retained within the program with the effect of reducing that program's demand for central campus funds.
- SSDPs expand the faculty, increasing our ability to offer specialized electives to undergraduate, graduate and SSDP students.
- Existing procedures for review of SSDPs are adequate to insure new programs are of high quality — protecting the Berkeley “brand” and insuring that new SSDP programs proposed by one unit do not unfairly encroach on the academic territory of another.

Our review leads us to strongly (but not exclusively) endorse the view that faculty workload should be uniformly distributed across all activities (undergraduate, graduate—State or SSDP) of a unit. Successful SSDPs will have broad faculty support and willingness to engage by more than a subset of faculty.

Teaching assignments for SSDPs should be made using the same metrics as for undergraduate and graduate teaching assignments. We firmly believe that such practice will preserve the Berkeley “brand” and preserve time for faculty research.

Our review identified management of enrollment as the most challenging obstacle to the growth of SSDPs on this campus. Among the faculty surveyed informally and deans surveyed formally, there is a strong sentiment that PhD graduate enrollments should not be decreased to make room for SSDPs. In considering current enrollment targets, our deliberations focused on the overall balance of undergraduate, graduate and SSDP students and attended to both the numbers and to how these different resource streams might affect the pool of funds available for financial aid. We also recognized that, in addition to enrollment growth in SSDPs, there is pressure from programs with newly instituted Professional Degree Fees to increase enrollment. In the near term, we do not envision such rapid growth in SSDPs that the growth will strain the normal planning process. Over time, we project that careful integrated management in all categories of enrollment will be needed to align competing priorities within the range of the target daytime headcount. Given this constraint, we encourage new SSDPs to prioritize nighttime, weekend, or use of off-campus facilities.

Section 2 provides answers to the specific questions in our charge. Section 3 provides detailed recommendations.

2. Answers to Questions in the Task Force’s Charge

2.1 Programmatic Issues

2.1.1 Purpose

What is the purpose of self-supporting programs?

In the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, the University of California is clearly charged with responsibility for “instruction in professional fields.” Self-supporting degree programs are viewed as a useful way for professional schools to mount programs that are too costly for conventional offering, or that offer targeted education for a special area of knowledge that enables the practice of a profession. More recently, in this era of declining state resources available for professional education, SSDPs can be a vehicle for revenue generation for the school or college — or the campus.

How do they advance the priorities of the campus?

The campus has the responsibility to offer professional degrees that serve the interests of the state. Through SSDPs, the offering of such degrees can provide funds that contribute to the education of students in state-supported (hereinafter “regular”) programs. Hence SSDPs can advance the priorities of the campus to the extent that they serve state workforce needs and also generate income that helps underwrite the broader mission of the campus.

How do other universities handle similar structures?

Some inquiries were made and information gathered, but this was not found to be sufficiently illuminating for presentation, given the time available for analysis and the highly variable structures across institutions.

How do they fit into the developing vision of the Gould Commission on the Future of the University?

The Gould Commission on the Future of the University has circulated first round recommendations from the working groups. Among those of the Education and Curriculum working group, are two that are relevant to the present subject: “Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs,” and “Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities.” (We note that there is even reference made to the idea of part-time, self-supporting undergraduate education.)

How shall their development be prioritized with respect to other programs?

Respondents to the questionnaire clearly felt that SSDP development should not come at the expense of other graduate programs on the campus.

What is appropriate in terms of the impact of the portfolio of self-supporting programs in one school or college (actually and prospectively) on analogous programs — both state-supported and self-supporting — in other schools or colleges?

When degree programs are reviewed for campus approval, a key ingredient in the proposal is comprised of letters of support from related programs on campus addressing issues of overlap or cooperation. There is no difference whether the programs are SSDPs or state-supported. An important goal is to minimize overlap and redundancy. By including faculty from similar programs in the proposal for an SSDP, the proposers can minimize overlap with other programs. By targeting a different kind of student (such as returning professional), an SSDP can minimize overlap with other programs.

How can the campus avoid waste and duplication in self-supported programs by leveraging extant courses without crowding out state-supported program students?

Respondents to the questionnaire felt strongly that state-supported students should not be crowded out from extant courses. If many SSDP students wish to take a course in a regular program on an ongoing basis, an additional section can be provided through the mechanism of cross-listing the course by prior agreement between programs in the manner of an MOU. If GSI or Reader (or faculty) resources are a part of the course, then the additional section for SSDP students can have a GSI or Reader (or faculty) paid for through SSDP revenues. Alternatively, if a small number of SSDP students wish to enroll in a course in a regular program, this can be done through the already existing mechanism of concurrent enrollment, administered by University Extension. The SSDP may wish to cover the concurrent enrollment costs for such a student from SSDP revenues, for a limited number of courses. In this way, extra resources flow to the offering department in a way that can be tracked, and the educational experience of the SSDP students is enriched. An additional advantage of the MOU or concurrent enrollment idea is that this allows for tracking of expenditures, so that the SSDP can be shown to be self-supporting.

What are the costs to other students, in terms of more crowded access to faculty and student services?

A review of current SSDPs indicates there is little negative impact. At Haas, SSDP students have a quota in regular courses in order to keep the enrollment pressure manageable. At Boalt, LLM students enroll in cross-listed courses that mirror the regular offerings.

How might the campus support development of self-supporting programs mounted by interdisciplinary graduate groups?

To support development of SSDPs by graduate groups, two problems need to be addressed. One is that teaching in the program will likely have to be done by graduate group faculty as an overload — for which they can be compensated by SSDP revenue. (It may be possible for a graduate group to appoint a lecturer, for example, to help with additional teaching responsibilities.) The second is that administrative functions of the SSDP will need to be handled by some outside entity, such as University Extension.

2.1.2 Growth and Quality Review

How should the campus balance the growth of self-supporting programs within the overall enrollment targets of the campus?

The campus operates within current enrollment targets, which count (most importantly) students on campus during normal business hours, Monday to Friday, during the fall and spring semesters. Current SSDPs are constructed so as to have reduced impact on the current enrollment; they do this by holding classes in the evenings and weekends, or over the summer months, or during only part of a semester. All four are, in this expansive definition, part-time programs. Hence their enrollments count only fractionally (i.e. about half) toward the current enrollment, according to OPA. If a full-time, daytime SSDP were established, those students would count fully toward the current enrollment. For any SSDP proposal by a school or college, the necessary enrollment slots could come from three places: (i) the proposing school

or college may agree to sacrifice enrollments in another of their own undergraduate or graduate degree programs, or (ii) the campus may elect to scale back the enrollments in other graduate programs outside the proposing school or college on the basis of, say, changing perceptions of quality, need or effectiveness, or (iii) undergraduate enrollments may be reduced to make room for more SSDP students. A combination of these is, of course, possible. Finally, *in extremis*, an SSDP may offer to trade program revenues designated for graduate student support for enrollments belonging to another program on campus; Graduate Division could broker such agreements. This could improve student support in some programs while enabling growth in SSDP enrollments.

What body will adjudicate disputes that may arise?

The Graduate Division has the role of balancing enrollments in all graduate programs on the campus; this is done within the overall constraints imposed by current enrollment targets. In this respect, Graduate Division works with the VP-TLAPF to advise the EVCP and Chancellor on the overall ecosystem.

How shall such programs be reviewed for quality, and disestablished when necessary?

In the normal course of program review, an SSDP attached to a department, school or college will come up for review at the same time as the department, school or college — assuming that the whole school or college or department is reviewed all at once (such as Haas). If however, the school or college undergoes program review department-by-department (such as Engineering), then an SSDP mounted by the school or college should be separately reviewed using the normal procedures of interdisciplinary graduate group review. The Graduate Council, which conducts this review, has a track record in recent years of disestablishing programs when it is advisable to do so.

2.1.3 Impact on Students

Could a budgetary incentive to accommodate students in the self-supporting program crowd other students from those courses, thereby adding to time to degree and hence costs?

If many SSDP students will be taking a course in a regular program on an ongoing basis, there should be an MOU in place with that regular program to cover extra costs and to safeguard regular students. A copy of the MOU should be filed with the VP-TLAPF. With an MOU in place, the regular program can anticipate the additional demand that SSDP will place on the course and can prepare in advance to organize the necessary instructional resources. For less predictable or more sporadic demand, concurrent enrollment through University Extension of the SSDP students in a regular course will provide funds to the offering program that should be used to underwrite the faculty instructional and/or GSI costs implied by the presence of the SSDP students. Concurrent enrollment is only possible if there are still openings in the class — i.e. only after state-supported students are accommodated. Hence with this model, SSDP students potentially could crowd out other concurrent enrollment students.

Should self-supporting or traditional students have priority in registering for over-subscribed courses, and how will conflicts be minimized?

As described in the foregoing, traditional students should have priority for enrolling for courses in regular programs. If there is additional space available, then SSDP students should be allowed entrance, either arranged in advance through an MOU or through concurrent enrollment.

Will self-supporting students receive GSI resources from self-supporting program revenues, or will their fees contribute to the good of regular students, or both?

SSDP revenues will contribute to a regular program's GSI costs either on the basis of an MOU or through the payment of concurrent enrollment fees. The proceeds should first be used to pay GSI and faculty instruction costs in proportion to the SSDP enrollment.

How could one ensure that a self-supporting program did not create a two-tier system for student services and support?

SSDP students are likely to demand more in student services commensurate with their higher out-of-pocket expenses. It seems unavoidable that traditional student services would be negatively impacted. However, the School of Business offers a good example of how to address this: placement services for all

MBA students — traditional, evening and weekend, and Haas-Columbia — were combined, and all students appreciate excellent service.

2.1.4 Impact on Faculty

What are the consequences for ladder-rank faculty who teach in self-supporting programs, in terms of the balance of their work at the University?

If teaching in the SSDP is done as an overload, this can have a negative impact on the time available to a faculty member for research. However, a clever way to address this is as follows: faculty compensation for overload teaching in the SSDP would be paid into an account to enable research. Any negative impact on research must be carefully watched in faculty review. The alternative model of counting teaching in an SSDP in the same way as teaching in a regular program has the advantage that there is no extra impact on faculty research from SSDP activity. (This will not work if an interdisciplinary graduate group offers the SSDP; however, the campus has not solved the problem of teaching credit in state-supported interdisciplinary graduate groups yet, either.)

How does teaching in a self-supporting program relate to the instructional workload policies that departments have on file in the office of the VP-TLAPF?

For new SSDPs, departmental policies should be amended to reflect department plans for SSDP teaching.

Will there be compensating TAS resources made available from self-supporting program revenue to replace teaching in regular programs when faculty shift their teaching?

The profile of faculty teaching in an SSDP must be similar to that in other programs in the school or college, in terms of the proportion of ladder-rank faculty as stipulated in UCOP's 1996 guidelines. That means a new SSDP must involve ladder-rank faculty. They may either teach in the SSDP by overload — with consequential impact on time available for research — or the school or college may redistribute teaching among an expanded teaching staff enabled by SSDP revenues. In the latter case (redistribution), SSDP revenues are specifically enhancing the TAS or faculty salary budget to enlarge the teaching staff. In the former case (overload) SSDP revenues are provided to faculty who teach in the program in exchange for their overload teaching, and SSDP revenues pay directly for GSI/Reader costs if it is an SSDP course, or SSDP revenues pay through MOU or concurrent enrollment for GSI/Reader costs if it is a regular program course.

2.2 Financial and Operational Issues

2.2.1 Fees

Can fees be set to maximize revenue collection?

This is happening already. A related question is, if the school or college mounting the SSDP is allowed to charge what the market will bear, should the broader campus not also reap benefits 'as the market will bear'? We address alternative funding models below.

How much can a program charge beyond those fees necessary to mount a program of Berkeley quality, and at what cost to other endeavors?

Programs are now charging SSDP fees (and also PDFs) on the basis of what the market will bear. The only real constraints are: (1) how the fees compare with similar programs at other institutions, and (2) what is the campus contribution from SSDP revenues.

How do self-supporting programs contribute to the common good, and do they currently contribute an appropriate amount (existing programs in Business and Law currently contribute \$6.5 million in overhead to the central campus)?

SSDPs currently contribute an amount equal to the Educational Fee and Registration Fee for each enrolled student FTE, each year. They also have a side agreement with the Office of the Registrar and the Graduate Division to help cover costs associated with record keeping, etc. Finally, SSDPs replace central campus contributions to higher faculty salaries in their unit. Alternative ideas might include: (1) SSDPs

could be required to contribute a percentage of their proceeds (revenues minus costs) to the central campus. However, the costs that are entered on the worksheets that accompany SSDP fee proposals shed very little light on what exactly is being charged; (2) A fraction of SSDP fee *revenues* could be contributed to the campus in lieu of an amount equal to the Ed. & Reg. fees; this would help to stabilize the resources of SSDPs and might enable smaller programs to be viable than under the current model.

In some respects, the answer to the question depends on the outcome of current discussions. If the rules change, and the campus were allowed to keep fees and/or non-resident tuition generated on the campus, then the forgone revenue (from the point of view of the campus) in allowing a single enrollment slot to go to an SSDP would depend on the type of student ‘displaced.’ This manner of thinking assumes that current enrollment targets provide a firm limit on the student population count. By this argument, however, if the SSDP student is part-time then the contribution to the campus might be prorated in the same way the student is in the current enrollment calculation.

A related question is: what is the campus contribution from these programs being spent on? The answer is that it goes into a general fund, which provides for everything from covering the electricity bill to providing more TAS money. SSDPs would clearly fare better in the eyes of the broader campus if the EVCP and Chancellor identified specific initiatives funded by the campus contributions that benefitted others. Possibilities that come to mind include a \$2M research innovation fund, or faculty startups in Letters & Sciences, or child care resources, etc. This may not be possible in the current budgetary climate, but it represents a hopeful path for evolution. [Note added at the time of finalization of this report: the EVCP decided on model (2) in the foregoing section, i.e. to collect a fraction of SSDP revenues.]

What should be the relationship, if any, between their fee structures and the fees in units that charge “professional degree fees” (PDFs)?

There is no *a priori* reason why the two should be related. State-supported programs that charge PDFs operate under different rules, with fixed rates of return-to-aid on the Ed. & Reg. fees, and on the PDFs. SSDPs have no return-to-aid requirement. Note that there are potential consequences for converting a regular program to SSDP status. These are based on to the effect on the student FTE, which drives faculty size. These issues are already considered in the review process.

2.2.2 Financial Aid

What is the impact of fees for self-supporting programs on student indebtedness, competitiveness, diversity, and retention?

The School of Business MBA and EWMBA provide a good comparison. It appears that there is no negative impact of the SSDP fees on diversity. This may be explained by the fact that SSDPs thus far have targeted a different category of student (more local, for example, with the EWMBA) with diminished competitive pressures for diverse applicants vis-à-vis similar regular programs. Program satisfaction appeared comparable between the MBA and EWMBA as well. Student credentials upon entering are similar, too, except that EWMBA students have somewhat more experience but somewhat lower test scores. Completion rates are also uniformly high across both kinds of programs (for 2002-2005 cohorts, the rates were 99% in the MBA program and 94% in the EWMBA program).

What should be the commitment to provide financial support through return-to-aid to students in self-supporting programs?

Few respondents to the questionnaire saw any need for financial aid in SSDP. However, the currently existing SSDPs do think it reasonable to set aside aid for a few students to enable study that would otherwise be impossible.

2.2.3 Budget Allocation

What is the appropriate remuneration for departments providing courses taken by students in the self-supporting programs?

Concurrent enrollment by SSDP students in a course provides the most convenient remuneration of departments outside the school or college offering the SSDP. Proceeds should be spent on covering GSI/Reader costs and on faculty instructional costs. For ongoing planned enrollment of a larger cohort of

SSDP students in a regular program, there should be an MOU in place to address the issue of covering instructional costs.

How does one “firewall” the costs and the impact on our “regular” students when there is an intermixing of the two student populations in the classroom, in student services offices, etc.?

This is addressed elsewhere in this report.

How does one split the cost of an instructor teaching undergraduates, doctoral students and students in the self-supporting program in the same classroom?

This is accomplished by MOU or concurrent enrollment, as described elsewhere in this report.

Which “pot” of funds covers the GSI?

If SSDP student concurrent enrollments (or an MOU) are sufficient to engender a new section in a course, then the GSI/Reader costs are borne by the SSDP revenues through the concurrent enrollment fee. If SSDP student concurrent enrollments are fewer, then the associated revenues pay fractional costs, proportionally.

If a Student Affairs Officer (SAO) helps doctoral students, regular master’s students, and students in the self-supporting program, how does one apportion the SAO’s salary and benefits and future liability for pension?

The salary and benefits of the SAO should be covered by the SSDP proportionally to the *time* spent by the SAO on the SSDP students; this may be different than the *proportion* of students served.

How should new efforts plan for program start-up costs?

In the proposal establishing an SSDP, careful attention should be paid to program start-up costs. UCOP rules allow for a phase-in period before the program must be self-supporting. The proposal should be supported by a marketing study (developed without State funds) aimed at ascertaining demand (and price elasticity of demand) for the program. University Extension can help with the marketing study. The SSDP proposers should work in close conjunction with the Budget Office and Graduate Division on the details.

2.2.4 Infrastructure

What is an efficient way to administer these programs?

Thus far, the School of Business and the School of Law have developed working structures to accomplish this; however, it is unlikely to be efficient for each school or college to undertake administration of its own SSDP. It is suggested that University Extension develop the capacity to provide this function for SSDPs (with advice from Business and Law) and that future SSDPs be directed to University Extension for program administration apart from academic concerns.

What is the impact on administrative structures?

The impact can be minimized if administration is done collectively — as discussed above.

What is the impact on space and facilities?

Business and Law accommodate the SSDP students on evenings and weekends, in the summer, and partly by impacting facilities on a fall-spring/Monday-to-Friday/daytime basis. Their ~1000 SSDP students, although part-time in an expansive definition, contribute ~500 to the current enrollment count.

2.2.5 Proposal Review Processes

The Task Force should review the proposal process and approval criteria for a program that is self-supporting, or converting to self-supporting. How shall the answers to the above questions alter the process for vetting proposals for new self-supporting degree programs, or for changes in the fees or financial arrangements?

We recommend an additional requirement in the proposal for an SSDP or for a non-19900 faculty appointment on SSDP revenue: a discussion of teaching impact on related regular programs. This is described in the recommendations below.

How should the need for additional campus-wide revenues affect the existing review and approval processes?

To the extent that new enrollments may be accommodated, the campus may well welcome new SSDP students. If the campus moves to taxation by percentage of SSDP revenues, this may create incentives to favor development of one SSDP over another — particularly in a constrained fiscal environment.

How can approval processes be altered and speeded up?

Strictly speaking, only Graduate Council approval and favorable review by the Chancellor (or designee) are required to forward a proposal for a new degree to UCOP. However, the Berkeley campus requires, in addition, reviews by other Senate committees (BIR, CEP, Divisional Council) as well as the VP-AAFW. After its initial approval by the Graduate Council, Senate staff sends the Graduate Council-approved proposal to OPA. OPA then forwards it to Divisional Council. DivCo staff next sends the proposal to CEP and BIR. After BIR and CEP review it, DivCo considers their comments and reviews the proposal. Subsequently, DivCo sends the proposal and comments from the committees back to OPA to do a review for the VP-AAFW, who makes the final campus recommendation on behalf of the Chancellor. In the case of a favorable review, OPA then sends the proposal to UCOP. UCOP sends it to CCGA and CPEC. If approved, CCGA sends to Academic Council for its review. AC sends the approved proposal back to UCOP for final decision.

To streamline the process on campus would require a decision of the Senate to have fewer committees involved in the review.

3. Recommendations

Reaffirmation of current policies

1. We reaffirm the 1996 policy, and draw special attention to the following statements:
 - a. “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.”
 - b. “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.”
 - c. “Courses offered in [SSDPs] should be taught by a mix of faculty members that parallels the mix of faculty in regular programs.” (This formulation may need to be revisited if online offerings grow or evolve over time.)
 - d. “Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.”
2. We reaffirm the statement from the Academic Personnel Manual (section 190, app. F):
 - a. “All ladder-rank faculty positions, regardless of fund source, should have the same tenure, academic freedom, and funding guarantees as those now extended to ladder-rank faculty supported on State resources.”

And we call attention to two statements from the same source:

- b. “Not more than seven percent of total budgeted faculty positions on a campus and fifteen percent in a School or College may be supported by non-19900 funds. An exception to these limits requires approval by the Provost and Senior Vice President-

Academic Affairs.”

- c. “The Chancellor shall submit business plans for review and approval to the [UCOP] Provost and Senior Vice President–Academic Affairs before implementation or revision of a non-19900 ladder-rank faculty support proposal.”

Actions suggested to determine impact of SSDP proposals on enrollment

1. The VP-TLAPF annually collects academic plans for new programs from all deans for reporting to OP. The data collection should include questions about SSDPs. The report should be made available to all deans. The graduate dean and VP-TLAPF should assess the impact on the current enrollment, and develop a strategy for accommodating all programs, if possible, with a priority on regular academic graduate programs.
2. New SSDP proposals should specifically address impact on the current enrollment targets, either by (1) part-time status or off-campus delivery for the students in the program so as to minimize an increase to the current enrollment, or (2) commensurate reductions by the same school or college in regular program enrollments, or (3) agreements with programs outside the school or college for commensurate reductions in enrollments. ***If a program is delivered full-time in parallel with other state-supported programs, then the program should be configured as a state-supported program with a PDF to capture the necessary revenue, rather than as an SSDP. A proposed SSDP should be delivered part-time (interpreted with respect to current campus enrollment targets) or remotely.***
3. The campus Strategic Academic Plan expresses serious concern about the downward trend in the fraction of students on campus pursuing graduate degrees. Discussions at Divisional Council have emphasized that a decrease in the undergraduate student-to-faculty ratio would permit us to serve our students better. This Task Force concludes that a reduction in the numbers of undergraduates is advisable, and that such a reduction would make room that can accommodate SSDPs, desired growth in PDF-charging programs, and more modest requests for growth in graduate academic programs.

Recommendations for SSDP proposal review

1. Proposals for SSDPs should articulate clearly why establishment of the program serves the interests of the campus.
2. All SSDP proposals must aim to avoid duplication and redundancy with other programs on the Berkeley campus, either by sharing faculty or targeting a different kind of student. The process of developing any degree proposal should involve broad consultation and the seeking of academic partners.
3. All SSDP proposals should include a marketing study, developed in conjunction with University Extension, or equivalent.
4. University Extension should be asked to develop the capacity to administer any new SSDPs not in the Schools of Business or Law, with a suitable provision for revenue sharing. [But not mandated, per EVCP.]
5. Supporting details should be given along with the budget worksheet when SSDPs are establishing or requesting increases in the program fees. (Items 8-20 on the UCOP *Cost Analysis for Self-Supporting Program Fee Proposals* form need explanation; this will improve understanding of how the programs function and will guide review of new proposals.)
6. If SSDPs (planned *and* current) have enrollments on an ongoing basis for large cohorts in regular program courses, these should be accommodated by an MOU to be placed on file with the VP-

TLAPF. The MOU should address how SSDP program revenues underwrite an appropriate proportion of the instructional costs and protect regular students' access to the course.

7. SSDPs should allow concurrent enrollment of their students in regular courses. SSDPs should agree to cover the concurrent enrollment fee for a limited number of courses for each student in the program. This is in keeping with campus practice by which students are charged for the degree program, not the course.
8. Review guidelines should favor SSDPs hiring extra teaching capacity and redistributing the load among SSDPs *and* regular programs in a way that counts all teaching together, as this maintains ladder-rank faculty time for research.
9. Proposals for new SSDPs, or for hiring new teaching capacity on program revenue from an already existing SSDP, should include an analysis that shows the following: Additional teaching capacity developed from SSDP revenue must at least equal, or preferably exceed, the teaching responsibilities required to mount the SSDP. The analysis should address the host unit's faculty needs across all subfields relevant to its teaching mission across all programs. In other words, the SSDP teaching responsibilities should have no negative impact on regular program teaching.

Recommendations for the program review of SSDPs

1. Review of associated SSDPs should be an integral part of the program review of departments, schools, and colleges. The PROC should be advised to ask specific questions about SSDPs.
2. The Graduate Council should undertake review of any SSDPs not reviewed as part of department, school or college reviews (e.g. SSDPs mounted by interdisciplinary groups of faculty). These reviews should follow the format of the review of interdisciplinary graduate groups.

Recommendations on SSDP revenue sharing

1. SSDP program revenues should be shared with other units by way of an MOU when there is regular enrollment of a cohort of SSDP students in a course offered by the other unit.
2. The campus contribution from an SSDP should be set at a percentage of revenue generated by the program, but no less than the "campus indirect costs" per FTE student (line 45 of the UCOP *Cost Analysis for Self-Supporting Program Fee Proposals* form — currently about \$4500). This represents a change from current practice, in which the campus contribution is set at the in-state fees for a graduate student. Changing to a percentage of revenue offers two distinct advantages: (1) the campus contribution is more predictable to the program — and to the Chancellor, and (2) the change may permit more areas to engage in offering SSDPs beyond those that can generate sufficient revenue to make the current one-size-fits-all campus contribution. In any case, we recommend that moving to a single, common percentage among existing programs should be accomplished over a few years.

February 22, 2010

Dean Andrew Szeri, Graduate Division (Co-chair)
Professor Ronald Cohen (Chemistry/Chair, Graduate Council), (Co-chair)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Teresa Costantinidis, (Budget Office)
Vice Provost Catherine Koshland, Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities
Professor Mary Ann Mason (Law and Social Welfare/Senate Divisional Council Member)
Professor Ignacio Navarrete (Spanish & Portuguese/Chair, Committee on Educational Policy)
Chief Administrative Officer Moira Perez, Staff (Graduate Division)
Associate Vice Chancellor Robert Price, VC-Research
Professor Suzanne Scotchmer (Law, Economics, Public Policy/Senate Representative-at-Large)

Re: Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs

Dear Colleagues,

You are invited to serve on a small Task Force to examine emerging issues related to self-supporting degree programs. The Task Force will function in an advisory role to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and membership will include four senior members of the administration, and four faculty members chosen by the Academic Senate. Dean Andrew Szeri and Professor Ron Cohen will co-chair the group, which will be staffed by Dr. Moira Perez of the Graduate Division. The Task Force is expected to seek extensive input from deans and chairs, among others, and to produce a report with recommendations to the EVCP by April 30, 2010.

Rationale for Establishing the Task Force at This Time

In recent years, with continuing pressure on the State budget, colleges and professional schools at UC Berkeley have increasingly sought to develop funding strategies to cover the costs of program delivery, or to fund other programmatic ambitions. In several cases, the strategy has included developing *self-supporting programs* that charge their own set of established fees to their part-time or full-time students. For example, the Haas Business School has developed the Evening/Weekend MBA Program and the Masters in Financial Engineering Program, while the Law School has expanded its LL.M. degree program.

University of California policyⁱ states, “Self-supporting programs will not be funded from State General Funds. Rather, 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.” In 1998, the Regents delegated to the President the authority to set fees for self-supporting professional degree programs. The campus has the authority to divert funds from self-supporting program fees to fund aspects of the common good—e.g. Library, IS&T, Student Affairs, University Relations, Equity & Inclusion, maintenance, utilities, etc.

There are several types of self-supporting programs, not all of which share the same approval processes, financial models, faculty compensation, or impacts on State-funded programs, campus space availability, and campus enrollment targets. With continued erosion of State support we can expect that more units on campus will be interested in fielding self-supporting programs. This may well be desirable or necessary, in light of the pressure on our resources. But to ensure that the proliferation of such programs does not create its own contradictions, and to ensure that approval processes are expeditious, we will need to address and resolve a number of questions and implementation challenges.

ⁱ *Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs And Policy At The University Of California*. Background Paper Prepared For The Coordinating Committee On Graduate Affairs. By Academic Affairs, UCOP 11/2008.

Appendix A

Task Force Scope and Areas of Focus

This Task Force is asked to consider issues surrounding degree programs for both part-time (evenings, weekends, summer) and full-time (daytime, weekdays) students. Below are the specific areas of examination for the Task Force. Included are questions that explore the “devilish details” of implementation, especially as in #6, below. The Task Force may wish to empower a subgroup or selected individuals not already on the Task Force to study these details, perhaps deferring some for after the Task Force’s recommendations have been completed.

Programmatic Issues

1. **Purpose:** What is the purpose of self-supporting programs? How do they advance the priorities of the campus? How do other universities handle similar structures? How do they fit into the developing vision of the Gould Commission on the Future of the University? How shall their development be prioritized with respect to other programs? What is appropriate, in terms of the impact of the portfolio of self-supporting programs in one school or college (actually and prospectively) on analogous programs—both State-supported and self-supporting—in other schools or colleges? How can the campus avoid waste and duplication in self-supported programs by leveraging extant courses without crowding out State-supported program students? What are the costs to other students, in terms of more crowded access to faculty and student services? How might the campus support development of self-supporting programs mounted by interdisciplinary graduate groups?

2. **Growth and Quality Review:** How should the campus balance the growth of self-supporting programs within the overall enrollment target of the campus? What body will adjudicate disputes that may arise? How shall such programs be reviewed for quality, and disestablished when necessary?

3. **Impact on Students:** Could a budgetary incentive to accommodate students in the self-supporting program crowd other students from those courses, thereby adding to time to degree and hence costs? Should self-supporting or traditional students have priority in registering for over-subscribed courses, and how will conflicts be minimized? Will self-supporting students receive GSI resources from self-supporting program revenues, or will their fees contribute to the good of regular students, or both? How could one ensure that a self-supporting program did not create a two-tier system for student services and support?

4. **Impact on Faculty**
What are the consequences for ladder-rank faculty who teach in self-supporting programs, in terms of the balance of their work at the University? How does teaching in a self-supporting program relate to the instructional workload policies that departments have on file in the office of the VP-TLAPF? Will there be compensating TAS resources made available from self-supporting program revenue to replace teaching in regular programs when faculty shift their teaching?

Financial and Operational Issues

5. **Fees:** Can fees be set to maximize revenue collection? How much can a program charge beyond those fees necessary to mount a program of Berkeley quality, and at what cost to other endeavors? How do self-supporting programs contribute to the common good, and do they currently contribute an appropriate amount (existing programs in Business and Law currently contribute \$6.5 million in overhead to the central campus)? What should be the relationship, if any, between their fee structures and the fees in units that charge “professional degree fees” (PDFs)?

Appendix A

6. Financial Aid: What is the impact of fees for self-supporting programs on student indebtedness, competitiveness, diversity, and retention? What should be the commitment to provide financial support through return-to-aid to students in self-supporting programs?
7. Budget Allocation: What is the appropriate remuneration for departments providing courses taken by students in the self-supporting programs? How does one “firewall” the costs and the impact on our “regular” students when there is an intermixing of the two student populations in the classroom, in student services offices, etc.? How does one split the cost of an instructor teaching undergraduates, doctoral students and students in the self-supporting program in the same classroom? Which “pot” of funds covers the GSI? If a Student Affairs Officer (SAO) helps doctoral students, regular masters students, and students in the self-supporting program, how does one apportion the SAO’s salary and benefits and future liability for pension? How should new efforts plan for program start-up costs?
8. Infrastructure: What is an efficient way to administer these programs? What is the impact on administrative structures? What is the impact on space and facilities?
9. Proposal Review Processes: The Task Force should review the proposal process and approval criteria for a program that is self-supporting, or converting to self-supporting. How shall the answers to the above questions alter the process for vetting proposals for new self-supporting degree programs, or for changes in the fees or financial arrangements? How should the campuswide need for additional revenues affect the existing review and approval processes? How can approval processes be altered and speeded up?

If you have questions, please contact Dr. Perez at moirap@berkeley.edu or 642-5068. Meeting arrangements will be handled through her office.

Thank you for your willingness to contribute to this very important effort. No reply is necessary unless you are unable to serve.

Sincerely,

George W. Breslauer
Executive Vice Chancellor and
Provost

Christopher Kutz,
Chair, Academic Senate

University of California
June 24, 1996

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. 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. 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.
- B. 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,* such programs should set the goal of becoming fully self-supporting as quickly as possible; “self-supporting” means that MI 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 fiscal phase-in plan with their request for approval of proposed student fees to the Office of the President.
- C. 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, these programs should be undertaken in partnership with the profession served.
- D. 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 distance technologies (computer- and video-based, e-mail, etc.) should also be engaged as appropriate.

II. Relationship to Regular On-Campus Programs

- A. 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 and regular programs, provisions should be made that allow students to transfer between programs. Campuses may also determine

*In this policy, “self-supporting” is used for part-time programs that are supported with non-state funds only; the State General Fund subsidy has been removed from the part-time program.

which courses are available to students in both programs, keeping in mind that regular and part-time programs should have comparable availability of faculty and courses.

- B. Any part-time programs should be established by academic departments and staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as regular programs. 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 programs. When regular programs employ some combination of Senate faculty and guest lecturers or consultants, courses for part-time programs may use a similar combination. Under no circumstances shall anyone teach in part-time programs whose appointment has not been subject to the appropriate academic review.
- C. 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.
- D. The Dean of the school or college offering the program and the Academic Vice Chancellor are responsible for assuring that program publicity and marketing meet the highest standards of quality and accuracy.
- E. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be administered in cooperation with University Extension where and when appropriate.

III. Initiation and Review Procedures

- A. Departments, groups of departments, or schools offering graduate professional degree programs under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division may propose that such programs be offered in whole or in part at off-campus sites or by distance learning technologies.
- B. Such proposals must be approved by campus Graduate Councils, as well as by appropriate campus administrators.
- C. 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.

IV. Admission and Enrollment

- A. Admission standards for the part-time program should be comparable in effect to those for the regular program.
- B. Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.
- C. 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.
- D. Admission criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field.

V. Student Fees and Program Funding

- A. The President is responsible for reviewing and recommending to The Regents any proposed self-supporting program fees for part-time graduate professional degree programs and subsequent increases or decreases.
- B. Self-supporting program fees should be levied such that as quickly as possible they will cover all program costs.
- C. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. 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.

- F. 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.

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

- A. Proposals may be considered for self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs that do not correspond to regular programs that a campus is authorized to offer.
- B. Such proposals shall be subject to the same procedures for approval as apply to all proposals for new graduate degrees.
- C. These programs should originate with a unit that is already authorized to conduct graduate work on the campus at the level that is at least equal to the level of the proposed graduate professional program.
- D. If approved, such programs shall be conducted in accord with the policies set forth in this statement.

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.

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.

Enrollments: Proposals for phasing in 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.