

November 8, 2011

MEMBERS OF THE SELF-SUPPORTING DEGREE PROGRAMS TASK FORCE

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)

Dear Colleagues:

I write to thank you deeply for the outstanding work you put into studying the issue of Self-Supporting Degree Programs and formulating recommendations for the campus.

I especially appreciated the thoroughness of the report, the fact that you considered and addressed a lengthy list of specific questions, and that you obtained a wide range of inputs from across the campus and from a wide range of constituents. I was also impressed by how carefully you vetted the draft report with the Academic Senate, the deans, and the campus administration to ensure that concerns were addressed.

Finalization of this process was delayed by both the complexity of the issues and the fact that the UC Office of the President was revising its own systemwide guidelines for SSDPs. We decided to finalize the report only after the likely changes at UCOP had become clear.

I accept the report with some minor changes of language. I will amplify on those details in a moment.

As it is only with Graduate Council approval that degree program proposals can be forwarded from the campus, and as Graduate Division has the formal link from the Administration in to Graduate Council, Graduate Division should be responsible for implementing the policies outlined in the TF report. We need coordination on the overall enrollment profile with the Vice Provost for Teaching, Learning, Academic Planning and Facilities. However, once the balance of undergraduate and graduate enrollments is decided, Graduate Division should fulfill its (traditional) responsibility and decide the balances among graduate programs, whether they are state-supported or self-supporting. I note that the academic degree proposal process^[1] for self-supporting degrees already exists and is working well, with a key role for the Budget office, so this does not need to be modified on the Administration side. I am glad to hear (from Andrew) that the graduate dean and the VP-TLAPF and their staffs have already begun work on closer coordination of overall enrollment planning.

From time to time, exceptions to the policies outlined in the TF report will be requested. I assume that Graduate Division would grant (or deny) those exceptions, in consultation with the EVCP and other offices as appropriate. I will ask Graduate Division to post the final Task Force Report on its website, noted in the footnote below.

[1] http://grad.berkeley.edu/program_proposal/self_supported.shtml

As for details, let me address the recommendations one by one with notes and modifications.

A. Reaffirmation of current policies

- It was helpful that you called attention to the key components of the 1996 policy.
- UCOP is aware that the system needs to revisit the 7% campus and 15% school and college limits on non-19900 funded faculty. I plan to work with UCOP as we approach those limits.

B. Actions suggested to determine impact of SSDP proposals on enrollment

1. I am charging the graduate dean and the VP-TLAPF to work together to develop a timeline and a procedure for considering the evolution of the overall enrollment of the campus.
2. I agree in principle that it is preferable, but acknowledge there may be extenuating circumstances that require exception to the part-time, professional requirement. I agree that new programs must show how they will not undermine regular graduate programs if they are on-campus on weekdays. This should be carefully assessed.
3. I agree that reductions in the number of undergraduates may occasionally be advisable to consider. I continue to work with campus groups and UCOP on the enrollment plan for the campus.

C. Recommendations for SSDP proposal review

1. Agreed.
2. Agreed.
3. A marketing study may be a good idea, but I want to understand more fully what one would contain and whom it would serve. I will consult with VP-TLAPF on this.
4. I agree that UNEX should develop the capacity to administer SSDPs, particularly for those units that do not have the internal capability. However, there may be other programs, similar to Business and Law, which may better serve their students by having their programs run in-house. I am unwilling to mandate this at this time.
5. I will ask the Budget Office to clarify the content and therefore the meaning of the form.
6. I will ask VP-TLAPF to propose a model MOU.
7. Agreed.
8. Although extra teaching capacity is beneficial for our students, I want to be careful not to penalize SSDPs by putting undue financial pressures on them. However, I do agree with the philosophy that maintaining faculty time for research is an important principle. As the recommendation uses the word "favor," I am in accord.
9. I agree that teaching capacity must at least equal the teaching responsibilities to mount the program. That is required by policy. I expect that because SSDP revenue also helps units hire non-19900 funded faculty to support regular programs, the programs likely indirectly supplement both our teaching and research mission.

D. Recommendations for the program review of SSDPs

1. Agreed.
2. Agreed.

E. Recommendations on SSDP revenue sharing

1. Agreed.
2. Agreed. Indeed, I have set this at 15% for 2010-11 through 2012-13, compared to historic level of 14%, and will revisit it in 2012-13 for the three-year period starting 2013-14.

At the time of writing of this letter, UCOP has been busy revising (on 9/1/10 and 10/28/10) the 1996 Policy. I note that the current, proposed revisions permit campuses to have more

restrictive policies concerning SSDPs than are allowed by systemwide policy. The graduate dean is monitoring developments in this area.

Thank you again for your efforts on this important matter.

Warm regards,

George W. Breslauer
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost