

**Guidelines for the Development and Review of New Self-Supporting and
Senate-Regulated Graduate Degree Proposals at
the University of California, Irvine**

Policy Statement: All Self-Supporting Program (SSP) proposals must comply with all aspects of the September 2011 University of California Office of the President (UCOP) *Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs, Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs* and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) *Guidelines for Senate Review of New Self-Supporting Programs* (2011) .

1. SELF-SUPPORTING PROGRAM CRITERIA: Per the documents referenced above, a self-supporting program should meet one or more of the following criteria ("although meeting a single criterion is not necessarily sufficient justification for self-supporting status"): 1) primarily serve a non-traditional population, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students and/or students supported by their employers; 2) be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction or a hybrid model; 3) be alternatively scheduled, such as during evening, weekends, and summers; and/or 4) be offered in an alternative location (e.g., off-campus centers).
2. LADDER FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: Self-supporting graduate degree programs should be held to the same standards of quality as regular programs, and accordingly, proposals for new, self-supporting, Senate-regulated graduate degree programs must provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the self-supporting program to ensure that faculty members will continue to provide at least the current level of support to existing academic graduate and undergraduate programs. Ladder rank faculty must be involved in the conception, review, approval, teaching, and ongoing evaluation of all proposed self-supporting programs; a description of ladder faculty's role with the proposed self-supporting program is expected in the proposal.
3. PROGRAM INTENT AND CONGRUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION: New proposals should explain the intent for creating the self-supporting program and how congruent it is with the mission of the university and the department's educational programs; proposals should elaborate on how the program will contribute to meeting campus strategic goals and priorities. Additionally, the proposal should state how the proposed program will enhance the reputation of the department, school and/or university.
4. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: New proposals must provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed, as well as an explicit discussion of teaching assignments in relation to the usual workload of faculty members; the proposal must indicate whether the involved faculty members are teaching on an on-load or off-load basis. A description of the department, division and/or campus policies that deal with teaching load must be included in the proposal. Proposers are reminded that no more 20% (one-fifth rule) of the curriculum for the new graduate program can be transferred into the new program, including XI courses taught through UNEX.
5. RECRUITMENT AND RELATION TO EXISTING PROGRAMS: New proposals must describe the intended audience and academic goals of the program, including how the proposed curriculum offers students an opportunity to achieve these goals. The proposal should include a comparison to existing departmental degree programs and a description of how the proposed program does or does not overlap in the goals, missions and target audience of these programs. A detailed marketing plan is required, that includes a description of the student recruitment process, any marketing channels and media that will be deployed

to promote the program should be included in the proposal, as well. In such cases where a contractual agreement is being contemplated between the program proposers and University Extension to support selected components (*e.g.*, on-line instructional development and infrastructure) of the self-supporting program, the proposed arrangement and draft contract should be submitted with the proposal.

6. RESOURCE ANALYSIS AND DISPOSITION OF PROGRAM REVENUE: There are several aspects of resource analysis required for these proposals:

- A. The proposing faculty / department must provide preliminary market research that supports the feasibility/viability of a self-supporting program before investing resources in the extensive development of a full proposal. As per the memo issued by the EVC on June 20, 2012, faculty should contact the Graduate Division for coordination assistance with this market research process and campus decision-making prior to proposal development [see Appendix A - EVC Memo]. This market research phase must yield a positive outcome for the viability of the proposed program in order to justify final development of the comprehensive proposal and further review by the campus administration and academic senate committees.
- B. New proposals must use the SSP cost analysis template from the UCOP in preparation of their proposal budgets [provide link to template here]. This analysis should demonstrate that student tuition and fees will cover all direct and indirect costs of the program, supplemented only by non-state fund sources, and that the program will become fully self-supporting within three years. The recovery cost of the market analysis (paid initially by the campus administration) must be included in this cost analysis.
- C. The proposal must have a detailed resource analysis from the Office of Planning and Budget (OPB), which ensures that the disposition of the proposed program's projected revenues will be transparent and implemented to assure that secondary support services receive a return of the support (campus tax applied) needed to maintain excellence in the campus infrastructure. This review from OPB must be completed before submission to the Academic Senate.
- D. Upon receipt of the proposal in the Academic Senate office, the proposal will be forwarded both to the Graduate Council (GC) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) for further review, analysis and comment. A CPB statement of endorsement will be required before the GC acts to recommend approval of the proposal to the Senate Cabinet. CPB requirements include:
 - i. The CPB is specifically asked to assess whether the proposal has provided a thorough analysis of and justification for the proposed fees and enrollments that underlie revenue projections. This should be done in relation to the strengths and limitations of local, regional and national competing programs.
 - ii. Proposals must identify the nature, source and extent of any set-up, seed or temporary funding, and gifts and contributions-in-kind that affect program revenues, costs or operations, whether from campus or external entities. The nature of any formal or informal obligations incurred in relation to any of these contributions must be identified. A plan must be provided for the repayment and/or fulfillment of all financial and other obligations to campus or external entities, including the possibility that the program is a financial failure.
 - iii. A specific non-state funding source must be identified for the potential repayments in (ii), as well as to cover any program deficits.
 - iv. A plan should be presented for how any net revenues will be shared amongst the entities involved (department, school, campus) and how they will be used to support academic programs on campus

- v. The trade-offs and impacts of ladder rank faculty being involved in the administration and/or teaching in the program should be identified. In particular, the proposal should state how the unit would mitigate any adverse impact on the core teaching mission of the unit.
 - vi. The proposal should identify all academic units that might be affected in the event that a program fails and goes into deficit. the potential financial and programmatic impacts on each such unit should be discussed.
 - vii. Proposers must comply with University policy regarding Conflict of Interest for all program participants, administrators and staff, and should identify any known conflicts and their proposed resolution.
- E. Interdisciplinary programs (IDP) ideally report to the Dean of the Graduate Division, as proposed by the Graduate Council. For those that are proposed to be self-supporting, the Office of Planning and Budget will assist with the determination of appropriate indirect costs to be shared proportionally across the various disciplines involved. For IDPs, commitment of faculty FTEs dedicated to the IDP must be included in the proposal, with documented support from the school Dean. This is necessary to assure viability/stability of the program that could be jeopardized by resignations or other economic changes in any of the participating departments/schools. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is required between the participating disciplines to provide assurance about this ongoing support.

7. **PROGRAM GOVERNANCE:** New proposals require a set of bylaws that detail the governance of the proposed program, including the levels of engagement by ladder and adjunct faculty in the administration and execution of the program (i.e., committee structures) and assurances of financial transparency (i.e., annual reporting requirements).

8. **DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION:** Proposals for new self-supporting programs that rely heavily on digital technologies in the delivery of instruction should explain in the proposal how those technologies will enhance learning and provide access to a larger and more diverse student population. An assessment of whether the proposed program will create a “substantive change” as outlined by the Western Association of Schools and College (<http://www.wascsenior.org/subchange>) must be conducted to ensure compliance with WASC regulations.

9. **EXPEDITED REVIEWS:** CCGA generally requires up to two years to review new degree program proposals. On an exceptional basis, the CCGA may grant an expedited review. It is our goal to achieve an expedited review process through CCGA on these SSP proposals. In such cases, the proposal must meet the following criteria:

- a) The proposal must have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny at UCI;
- b) The GC must solicit both internal (to UC) and external (outside UC) reviews from appropriate UC faculty from other university campuses (whose reviews must address criteria as detailed in the CCGA Handbook, found at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ccga/reports.html>). Accordingly, proposers are requested to submit a recommended list of internal and external reviewers, as part of their proposal package.
- c) Proposers must address issues raised by the solicited reviews and make appropriate adjustments to the final proposal, before final approval is considered by the GC. These reviews and responses from the proposers will be included in the CCGA submission package.
- d) It is important to remember that all SSP proposals are additionally reviewed by the UC Council on Planning Budget (UCPB).

10. PROGRAM EVALUATION: Following approval of the proposal the self-supporting program will be required to submit an annual progress report to the GC and **three years after the admission of the program's first cohort**, the GC will conduct an independent review of the self-supporting program. Such a review will involve the collection of a written progress report from the program's department chair. In the precedent years, the self-supporting program will be reviewed annually by the Office of Planning and Budget; the resultant annual reports should be made available to the program's department chair and appended to the year-three progress report to enable the Council to consider the financial feasibility of the program, in addition to the academic merits of the program. If necessary, the GC may request assistance from the CPB to conduct a more thorough assessment of the program's financial feasibility. Following a successful year-three review by the GC, the self-supporting program should then be incorporated into the Academic Senate's regular, eight-year program review process. Should immediate concerns arise as a product of the year-three review the GC will address them directly with the department chair and monitor the program's progress with addressing the concerns. Should the concerns not be satisfactorily addressed within a reasonable specified period of time, the GC will move to suspend admissions to and/or discontinue the self-supporting degree program as afforded under the Academic Senate's Appendix V procedures and as recommended by the CCGA guidelines. Any voluntary suspension or termination of a self-supporting program by the faculty/department/school involved requires prompt reporting to Graduate Council via submission of the "Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Degree Program" form.

11. LOAN PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY: All SSPs that are successfully reviewed by the Academic Senate are eligible to apply for the loan program, established through the Office of Planning and Budget.

12. PROCESS STEPS FOR REVIEW OF SSPs UNDER THIS GUIDELINE:

- A. Faculty who are proposing a self-supporting program must meet with the Graduate Division to initiate discussions and internal decisions about preliminary market research needed prior to program development. At the discretion of the Graduate Dean, this initial meeting will include the faculty proposers, the school Dean, the Dean of the Graduate Division, and the Dean of University Extension (if the market analysis is conducted by UNEX). If determined to be justified, this process will be completed prior to final proposal preparation and submission to campus administration and the Academic Senate.
- B. Proposal preparation and submission (in compliance with these guidelines) to the OPB. Simultaneous with the OPB review, the proposal should be submitted to the Graduate Division and Senate analyst for GC who complete pre-reviews to assure completeness of the proposal and compliance with graduate program policies as pre-requisite to Senate review.
- C. Once approved by the OPB, the proposal is submitted to the Academic Senate, where initial reviews will be conducted by the GC and by the CPB. Proposers will respond to these review comments from the Councils and make applicable proposal changes.
- D. The GC, in conjunction with the Graduate Division, will seek and oversee critical peer reviews of the proposal (2 from faculty internal to UC, and 2 from faculty external to UC).
- E. The proposers will respond to all reviews received and revise the proposal accordingly to achieve a final proposal document. This may involve an iterative process of response and revision, depending upon the consistency of the review comments received.
- F. The GC will re-review the new degree program proposal in consideration of the peer review comments, the responses from the proposers, and the final proposal document. All of these documents will be shared as information items with the CPB, but additional review by this Council will be requested at the discretion of the GC.

- G. Once approved by the GC, the proposal will be reviewed for approval by the Senate Cabinet (and the Divisional Assembly as deemed necessary by the Cabinet).
- H. The proposal is then submitted to CCGA, with a specific request for an expedited review procedure. All review documentation from the GC, CPB, and the internal and external reviewers will be attached to demonstrate the adequacy and completeness of the review process. CCGA will additionally request a review for all SSPs by the UCPB.

Appendix A: EVC Memo for Mandatory Market Analysis for all SSPs

June 20, 2012

**DEANS
VICE PROVOSTS
DIRECTOR OLSHANSKY
CHAIR VANDELL**

RE: Preliminary Market Research for Proposed Self-Supporting Programs


Graduate Dean Leslie has been working with various faculty groups on the development of proposals for self-supporting masters programs. I am pleased to hear that there is considerable interest from the faculty for such programs.

Dean Leslie has recommended that preliminary market research be conducted before the schools invest resources in the development of proposals. This is a prudent approach, and I authorize the creation of a fund from central campus resources to support such preliminary market research.

It is estimated that costs for preliminary market research will not exceed \$10,000 per proposal. As new self-supporting programs become established, it will be expected that self-supporting program revenues will reimburse the central campus for the costs of the preliminary market research.

The decision to go forward with preliminary market research will be made jointly by the Graduate Dean, the Dean of the pertinent School, and my office. Dean Matkin's office provides an avenue to secure services for such market research.

I am asking that Dean Leslie's office be the coordinating office for the effort. Faculty proposing the self-supporting programs should contact the Graduate Division. The Graduate Dean will coordinate efforts for internal decisions about preliminary market research and, if appropriate, will coordinate with Dean Matkin's office for securing such market research services.


Michael R. Gottfredson
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

C: Chair Chamberlin
Chair Ogunseitan
Vice Chancellor Michaels
Associate Vice Chancellor Lynch
Director Price
Assistant Deans