Guidelines for the Third Year Review of New Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs must comply with all aspects of the July 2016 University of California Office of the President (UCOP) Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) and the August 2016 CCGA adopted Guidelines for Review of New and Continuing Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs.

PROGRAM EVALUATION:
Following approval of the proposal, SSGPDPs are required to submit an annual progress report to the Graduate Council. Three years after the admission of the program’s first cohort, the Graduate Council will conduct an independent review of the SSGPDP. This review will involve the collection of a written progress report from the program director. In the preceding years, the SSGPDP will be reviewed annually by the Office of Planning and Budget; the resultant annual reports should be made available to the program director and the Graduate Division and appended to the third year progress report to enable the Graduate Council to consider both the academic merits and the financial feasibility of the program. The Graduate Council may request assistance from the Council on Planning and Budget and other relevant Councils to conduct a more thorough assessment of the program’s financial feasibility and campus impact. Following a successful third year review by the Graduate Council, the SSGPDP will be incorporated into the Academic Senate’s standard program review process. Should immediate concerns arise as a result of the third year review, the Graduate Council will address them directly with the program director and monitor the program’s progress in addressing the concerns. Should the concerns not be satisfactorily addressed within a reasonable, specified period of time, the Graduate Council will move to suspend admissions to and/or discontinue the SSGPDP as afforded under the Academic Senate’s Appendix V procedures and described in the CCGA guidelines. Any voluntary suspension or termination of a SSGPDP by the faculty/department(s)/School(s) involved requires prompt reporting to Graduate Council via submission of a “Request Form to Modify Graduate Degree Requirements.”

1. PROGRAM INTENT AND RECRUITMENT: Per the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and the August 2016 CCGA adopted Guidelines for Review of New and Continuing Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs, SSGPDPs are graduate programs that primarily serve professionals seeking to advance their careers.
   - Discuss the number and quality of applicants, yield, and diversity and demographics of applicants and enrolled students.
   - Do the program’s applicants reflect the original targeted population(s) described in the proposal?
   - Has the program allowed the University to serve additional students above and beyond those supported through resources provided by the State and fulfill demonstrated higher education and workforce needs?

2. CONGRUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION:
   - How has the program contributed to meeting campus strategic goals and priorities?
   - In what ways has the program enhanced the reputation of the department(s), School(s) and/or University?
3. **LADDER FACULTY INVOLVEMENT:** Senate faculty are responsible for all UC Irvine degree programs, including SSGPDPs. Discuss the ladder faculty’s role in the SSGPDP.
   - What percentage of the ladder faculty of the participating unit(s) are engaged in the program?
   - How have the ladder faculty been compensated and/or what is the average instructional overload? Are faculty members teaching courses on an on-load or off-load basis?
   - What mechanisms does the SSGPDP have in place to ensure that any participating faculty teaching on an overload basis appropriately report their hours as an outside activity, per the Academic Personnel Manual?
   - How many faculty/lecturers have been hired as a result of the revenue stream generated by the SSGPDP?

4. **RELATION TO STATE-SUPPORTED ACADEMIC PROGRAMS:** Discuss the impacts of ladder rank faculty being involved in administration of, or teaching in, the program and if applicable, how the unit is mitigating any adverse impacts on the core teaching, research, and service missions of the unit.
   - Has the SSGPDP affected the usual teaching workload of the faculty participating in the program and non-participating faculty in the unit?
   - What steps, if any, have been taken to mitigate any adverse impacts on research and service?
   - What are the maximum capacity enrollments for undergraduate majors, state-supported master’s students, and Ph.D. students for the participating unit(s)? Is the SSGPDP potentially restricting or enabling growth in these state-supported programs?

5. **CURRICULUM:**
   - How has the curriculum met the academic goals of the program and the needs of the profession?
   - Does the curriculum overlap with state-supported courses? If SSGPDP and state-supported students are enrolled in any of the same courses, please provide justification and explain the accounting in place to ensure that costs are appropriately divided.
   - Are courses offered during the standard teaching day, or in the evening? Are courses offered on weekends?
   - Is the program offered online, on-campus, or using a hybrid method of delivery?
   - Has the program relied on digital technologies in the delivery of instruction? Have those technologies enhanced learning and provided access to a larger and more diverse student population?
   - If the program is offered online, how does the program ensure that students have appropriate levels of contact with faculty?
   - Is the program offered full-time, part-time, or both? If both, what percentage of students are enrolled full-time and part-time?

6. **FINANCIAL:**
   - Report direct and indirect program costs, revenue, and use of revenue, by year for the last three years.
   - How much revenue has the program generated by year for the last three years?
   - To what extent do student tuition and fees cover the direct and indirect costs of the program?
   - Have other non-state fund sources supplemented the program?
   - Is the program fully self-supporting? If not, what is the plan to become so?
   - Discuss the repayment and/or fulfillment of all financial and other obligations to campus or external entities.
• How has the program benefited the unit(s)/campus financially? Discuss how any net revenues have been shared amongst the entities involved (department(s), School(s), campus) and how they are being used to support academic programs and priorities on campus.
• What amount and percentage of program net revenues have been used to provide return to aid for students in the SSGPDP and to support state-supported graduate students? How has return to aid been used to improve accessibility to the SSGPDP?

7. GRADUATION METRICS:
• What are the graduation rates for each year?
• What has been the average time to degree? Is this consistent with the normative time to degree outlined in the proposal?
• What are the program’s placement rates? If your program participants are fully employed, what employment gains have graduates experienced as a result of their participation in and completion of the SSGPDP?

8. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION:
• Provide the evaluation results for current students, recent graduates, and those with job placement.
• Are students satisfied with the campus services available to them? Are additional services needed?

9. FACILITIES AND STAFF:
• List all facilities utilized for the program. Are the facilities adequate? Do these facilities conflict with other state-supported programs for time or space?
• Specify all staff positions utilized for the program. Are the staffing numbers adequate? Are the staff positions funded by the SSGPDP, with state-supported funds, or both?

10. PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT/INTERNSHIPS: SSGPDPs must enhance students’ professional development to an extent that justifies the program fee.
• List all opportunities for engagement and/or internships for students within the program.
• How have these professional engagement/internship opportunities contributed to advancing students’ learning and professional careers?