Graduate Division response to the revised SSP policy

Page 2, section A-1:
The criteria for SSP are very loose and almost any graduate program would qualify.
Recommendation: To be in line with the goals of a SSP, we recommend changing criteria “a” to:
   a. fulfill a demonstrated workforce need.

Criterion “c” specifies that the SSP “be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction”.
Recommendation: The criterion should indicate whether the SSP could be offered solely as online instruction or ought to consist of a hybrid model.

Page 3, section 2:
The "short phase-in period" needs to indicate that it is within three years as it is stated later on in the revised policy on page 10 that “Programs are expected to become fully self-supported within three years”.
Recommendation: Indicate the phase-in period is within 3 years.

Page 4, section 2:
Two important notes for UCSF:
1) The draft policy states that SSPs “should be established by academic departments and staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as state supported programs”. UCSF has a variety of interdisciplinary programs that are not departmentally based and thus the statement should reflect this particular situation, especially in light of the fact that other campuses are also heading towards interdisciplinary graduate programs.

2) UCSF has a large proportion of faculty outside the ladder-rank series so the policy should be inclusive of faculty in the Academic Senate series that are qualified to teach and conduct research but are not in ladder-rank series such as In-Residence and Clinical X.

Recommendation: We propose that the statement be changed to:
“Any self-supporting program should be established by academic departments or units and staffed with faculty in the Academic Senate series on the same basis as state supported programs.

Page 5, section 5 (also Page 7, section G):
As proposed in the draft revised policy, the role of UC Extension is more than just a helping hand in the administration of the Program. It becomes a shelter for setting up a tuition not overseen by the University. In essence, the SSP is purchasing the services of University Extension and therefore the SSP should pay UC Extension the cost of administering the SSP. Since UC and not UC
Extension confers the degree, the SSP tuition should be set just like any other SSP that does not use the services of University Extension.

**Recommendation:** Revise the policy to reflect Presidential approval in setting the SSP fee despite the role of UC Extension in administering the program.

Page 5, section D-1:
This statement implies that instruction in SSPs can be entirely by distance learning technologies. This is in conflict with the recommendation of the Commission of the Future, which mentions the use of hybrid instruction, i.e. traditional classroom teaching as well as distance learning.

**Recommendation:** Change statement to reflect hybrid instruction.

Page 8, section 4:
While the Education fee is to be retained by the program after the phase-in period, the Registration fee should be shared with the Graduate Division that oversees the enrollment and progress of the students enrolled in the SSP.

**Recommendation:** Consider deleting the University registration fee from the statement.