



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9074
Fax: (510) 987-9086
<http://www.ucop.edu>

November 22, 2000

CHANCELLORS

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce the renewed availability of planning grants for departments, schools, or colleges that would like to plan new Master of Advanced Study (MAS) programs. This fall, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and Academic Council approved the first MAS program, a UCSD MAS in Management of Healthcare Organizations. Several other MAS proposals are being reviewed by campus Senates in preparation for CCGA review. Therefore, it is timely to begin a second round of program development by means of planning grants.

I am making available one-year grants to cover planning costs, and guidelines for proposals are enclosed. These guidelines reflect suggestions from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, based on its experience reviewing the first proposal. I would like to call attention to the fact that after the first round of planning grants, CCGA requested that we invite Master of Advanced Study proposals for programs of advanced liberal studies, as well as career-oriented programs. This request is reflected in the call for proposals. CCGA has also developed a set of review guidelines, enclosed with the call for proposals, that takes into account the aims and targeted students for these programs.

Proposals are due in the Office of the President on February 1, 2001. I hope you will bring this grant competition to the attention of all interested faculty.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard C. Atkinson

Richard C. Atkinson
President

Enclosure

cc: Members, President's Cabinet
Academic Senate Chair Cowan
CCGA Vice Chair Brunk
Council of Vice Chancellors

PLANNING AND START-UP FUNDING FOR MASTER OF ADVANCED STUDY PROGRAMS-Round 2

GUIDELINES FOR FUNDING

The Office of the President is pleased to announce the availability of new one-year planning grants and extensions of current planning grants for academic departments, schools or colleges that wish to plan a Master of Advanced Study (MAS) program. The Master of Advanced Study is conceived as a pathway to advanced professional education and to advanced liberal studies for working adults. This new degree will enable individuals to pursue advanced degrees congruent with their career or life goals.

The Master of Advanced Study would be especially suitable when:

- C The program would serve specific groups of working professionals with well-defined needs for advanced degree work: while some degrees will be tailored to career advancement, other degrees may enable individuals to pursue new career directions or advanced liberal studies.
- C The program would be offered on a schedule and/or in a location that would increase access for working adults.
- C The program is conceived as primarily self-supporting, though state-funded options within the campus graduate enrollment ceilings might also be appropriate.
- C The program might productively be offered in collaboration with University Extension.

Planning Grants to Develop Pilot Master of Advanced Study Programs

Interested departments can request new or renewal planning grants of up to \$25,000 per year for one year, with an option to apply for a second year. Planning grants can be used to support market surveys, development of new approaches to course delivery, dedicated computers, promotional materials and advertising, and other planning needs.

Special Invitation: Faculty interested in developing a MAS in advanced liberal studies are encouraged to apply. Peer private universities, including Chicago, Harvard, and Stanford, have found a sustained interest among working

professionals for a master's degree that expands their education in the liberal arts. Review criteria for MAS planning grants with a liberal studies focus will take into account the special interests of potential students in this kind of education.

Issues to Consider in Planning Pilot Programs

Academic departments, schools and colleges will need to prepare a business plan as part of developing pilot programs. The business plan should address the following:

- C Provide a description of the proposed pilot program.
- C Indicate the market for the degree. The potential market for the MAS program needs to be carefully assessed to assure viability.
- C Anticipate approaches, such as late day or weekend scheduling or instruction at off-campus sites, that will assure accessibility to students to be served by the program.
- C Evaluate alternative strategies for financing the program. The departments need to weigh the issues surrounding self-supporting fees carefully. The Extension Divisions of each campus have significant experience in setting fees and can bring that expertise to cooperative programs. Departments that do not choose to work with Extension will need to follow the guidelines for assessing program costs as a basis for setting fees, included in Appendix A.
- C Assess the quality of the program. The academic department, school or college should have a clear plan for assuring continued quality of its existing programs while creating a high quality MAS program. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs has developed a set of guidelines for review of MAS proposals, taking into account issues of advanced training for working adults (See Appendix B). CCGA has determined that since the MAS is geared to the non-academic student, proposers may choose not to include a capstone requirement.
- Assure that students have access to a source of financial support. While it is anticipated that many MAS students will have their fees covered by their employer, not all will. Access to support such as loan funds needs to be available to those students.
- C Consider faculty workload. A clear plan is needed to assure that existing

programs are sustained while embarking on a MAS initiative. A department developing a MAS degree will want to pay special attention to faculty compensation issues. The following options may be considered in compensating faculty:

1. Teaching as Part of an Assigned Workload. Under this general title, which covers faculty who teach in the new programs as part of their assigned teaching load, there are three options for compensating faculty. In option A, the department would buy out the faculty member's state-supported salary and the department would do this each time the faculty member teaches in the program. Hence, if a faculty member teaches one of the courses in a MAS program during the 1999-2000 school year, an appropriate portion of his/her salary during that year would be covered by fee revenue. This option assumes a temporary commitment to the self-supporting program.
2. Teaching as Part of Assigned Workload: In option B, the faculty member's salary is also covered by fee revenue from the program, but the appropriate percentage of salary would be covered on a permanent basis. Hence, the department would use fee income on a permanent basis to fund the proportion of the faculty member's salary equivalent to his/her teaching in the self-supporting program. This option assumes a more permanent commitment to the self-supporting program
3. Teaching as Part of Assigned Workload: In option C the department would cover the equivalent of time spent teaching in the self-supporting program by hiring a temporary replacement for the state-supported program. The fee income from the self-supporting program would be used to cover the cost of the temporary replacement. In this option, faculty members continue to receive their entire salary from state sources.
4. Teaching as an Overload: When a faculty member's instruction is seen as an assignment beyond the normal teaching load, there are two options for compensating faculty. In option A, a faculty member would teach as an overload in the self-supporting program and be compensated according to the current policy on Extension teaching (compensation limited to 20% of current salary); when adopted, the new UC policy on consulting would govern overload payments.

5. Teaching as an Overload: In option B, faculty would teach as an overload in the self-supporting program, but the department would use fee income from the program to provide the faculty member with research assistance, teaching assistance, or other types of support for the faculty member's research program.

In options 1 and 2 above, the department will have to assess the appropriate proportion of the faculty member's salary to be covered through fee revenue. In making a determination of the proportion of a faculty member's time to be allocated to teaching in these programs, the department should consider the full array of Senate faculty member responsibilities, which include teaching, research and service.

NOTE: Self-supporting MAS programs should conform to the June 1996 Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs. The Policy is included in Appendix C.

Senate Review

When final proposals for new Master of Advanced Study programs have been completed, they will need to go through the customary campus and Systemwide Senate review procedures. For self-supporting programs, the Office of the President Budget Office needs to receive for review the campus analysis leading to the proposed fee.

Guidelines for Proposals

Proposals for one-year grants to plan and initiate pilot MAS programs should include the following:

1. A narrative discussion of the proposed program, limited to five pages.
2. A schedule for development of the proposed MAS pilot program;
3. A detailed budget request;
4. The endorsement of department, school or college; if applicable, Extension Dean; and Academic Vice Chancellor.

Submission of Proposals for Planning Grants

Proposals should be sent via the campus Executive Vice Chancellor or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs no later than February 1, 2000 to Vice Provost Julius Zelmanowitz, 1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor, Oakland, CA 94607-5200.

APPENDIX A

Advisory Regarding Establishment of Fees for Self-Supporting Programs

Note: This advisory is intended to assist departments that wish to plan self-supporting programs but choose not to work with University Extension.

In consultation with UC campuses, the Office of the President has developed a standardized methodology which examines whether proposed fees in part-time, professional programs are sufficient to generate revenue at least equal to projected costs, that is, that the program will be "self supporting."

A program's full cost consists of direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are based on the proposed program's expenditures for faculty's salary and benefits, staff and general assistance salary and benefits, S&E, equipment, financial aid if offered, etc. Indirect costs are based on college-wide and campuswide expenditures.

The proposed fee revenue generated by the expected enrollment must at least equal full program costs. If a program is not expected to be self-supporting in its first year, the campus should present a plan whereby fee revenue is increased so that it is at least equal to the program's full cost during its third year.

Campuses that wish to establish a self-supporting program can contact Richard Santee, Budget Office, Office of the President to develop a cost analysis for the proposed program (510/987-9111; richard.santee@ucop.edu).

Appendix H Guidelines for CCGA Review of MAS Programs

The Master of Advanced Studies (MAS) is intended primarily for individuals who are engaged in full-time employment and wish to upgrade their skills and develop their knowledge in order to achieve professional advancement. However, the degree may well prove to be of interest to individuals who do not have vocational goals in mind, so the MAS may also prove to be a conduit by which UC can extend its mission of general education to a broad segment of the California population. Each realization of the MAS degree on a campus in any particular field or discipline must be submitted to CCGA in the usual manner of Academic Senate approval at the system level.

The MAS indicates that recipients of the degree have adopted a part-time rather than a full-time approach to their studies. It does not indicate that the degree in any way requires a less demanding course of study than full-time Masters' degrees. Consequently, CCGA reviewers should be particularly attentive to the composition, structure, and requirements of the degree. Proposers of MAS degrees should indicate whether they are following the Masters I or II plans and, when they deviate substantially from these plans, they should provide detailed justification for so doing.

CCGA should arrange for at least one internal (UC) and one external reviewer, in addition to the internal review material submitted by the Office of the President. The external reviewer should not be expected to evaluate the new MAS program in a national context, as is done with the evaluation of regular programs. Rather, the reviewer should be asked to comment primarily on the academic integrity of the proposed MAS.

The following are some of the questions and criteria CCGA reviewers might wish to consider as they review new MAS programs

- 1) **Is there a demonstrated demand for this degree program?** As the MAS is part-time and primarily vocational, does the proposal make a compelling case that a sufficient market exists either within the geographical region adjacent to the UC campus, or, in the case of those programs that will depend substantially on distance-learning, in the state of California? Does the proposal include a description and comparison of potentially competing programs? Wherever possible, proposals should include documentary evidence as to need, such as letters from prominent professionals in the field in which the MAS is being offered or the results of a market survey.
- 2) **Is the faculty committed to teach the MAS?** According to the 1996 UC Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate professional programs, all MAS programs should be staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as regular programs. Have adequate provisions been made to ensure the program will be permanently staffed so as to fulfill the requirements of this policy?
- 3) **Will the MAS negatively impact the regular programs of the academic unit offering the MAS?** Some faculty may teach in the MAS program as an overload and it is to be assumed that they will receive compensation for this, additional to their regular salary. Is there any danger that the regular programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels might suffer because of faculty teaching in the MAS? Is there any indication that teaching in the MAS might negatively influence the research output of faculty?

- 4) **What are the roles of the Academic Senate and University Extension?** In several cases the MAS program will be advertised and perhaps even administered by University Extension. Have the respective roles of these two entities been adequately defined? Do the two entities have equal expectations of the program?

What is the role of the department, interdepartmental program, graduate group, or certificate program? Does the administrative unit have full control over the conception and development of the program? Does it have full control over determining the curriculum and staffing of the program?

- 5) **What are the admissions requirements?** Admissions standards for part-time graduate programs should be appropriate to maintain a high quality comparable to regular programs. Does the decision as to who should be admitted into the program rest solely with Academic Senate faculty members?
- 6) **Does the proposed program have a capstone requirement?** As the MAS degree is to be structured on the Master I or II models, it is to be assumed that there is a capstone requirement. Certain programs may not, however, require one. If there is no capstone requirement, does the proposal make a convincing argument for its omission? (Note that a capstone requirement does not necessarily have to be a thesis or even a comprehensive exam. As the MAS is primarily vocational in intent, it can be expected that capstone requirements might be different from those expected in a full-time degree program). What provision has been made to ensure that students will have the opportunity, at the end of their studies, to engage in a thorough overview of the work undertaken through the entire program?
- 7) **Is the workload for the proposed degree program reasonable?** There is a particular difficulty and challenge in devising a master's program that both sustains the high standards required of UC graduate programs and enables students to study effectively while being employed full-time. Does the proposed program meet this challenge?
- 8) **Has fullest advantage been taken of the part-time nature of the program?** Given the part-time nature of the program, it will be possible to schedule instruction in non-traditional schedules, e.g. evening hours, intensive weekend or week-long sessions, field trips etc. Are the proposers resourceful in devising the program schedule?
- 9) **Is the advising system adequate?** It can be anticipated that faculty advising may be crucial to the success of individuals completing the MAS program. Given the distinct possibility that MAS students will not be as familiar with the UC system as full-time students, advising will be particularly important. Are adequate provisions made for substantial advising? Are the faculty committed to it?
- 10) **Have the financial aspects of the program been fully worked through?** According to UCOP's budget office, MAS programs must be either self-supporting or entirely state-supported. However, MAS programs that are envisaged ultimately to be self-supporting may be phased in with state funds. Is the argument that a proposed MAS program will ultimately be self-supporting convincing or not? How reliable is the evidence that it will eventually achieve self-

supporting status? If the program is not instantly self-supporting, are the phase-in financial provisions for the new program adequate? Will they draw resources from established full-time programs already taught in the department, interdepartmental program, graduate group, or certificate program? Has financial aid (either scholarships or loan funds) been provided sufficient to provide access for qualified students and to ensure diversity in the student community?

- 11) **Is regular review of the MAS program guaranteed?** As all MAS programs will be administered by academic departments, interdepartmental programs, graduate groups, or certificate programs, the MAS programs should be reviewed at the time of the regular review of the administrative unit conducted at the campus level. Do the proposers demonstrate a full awareness of this requirement?

APPENDIX C

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 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 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 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.

*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.

- 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.