COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION
(CAPRA)
Tuesday, December 10, 2013
2:30 – 4:00 pm
KL 362
Documents found at UCMCROPS/CAPRA1314/Resources

AGENDA

I.   **Chair's Report –** *Anne Kelley*
   A. Update from UCPB meeting on December 3
   B. Update from Division Council meeting on December 3

II. **Consent Calendar**
   A. Approval of the agenda

III. **Course Buyout Policy**   Pg. 1-11
   On November 11, Provost Peterson submitted a revised course buyout policy in response to the Senate's comments earlier this semester.
   Action requested: CAPRA to review the Provost's revised policy. Committee's comments will be compiled by the committee analyst and transmitted to the Senate chair by the deadline of Friday, December 13.

IV. **Committee on Research's Memo on Library 2020 Space Plan**   Pp. 12-16
   On November 15, COR sent a memo to the Senate Chair outlining its concerns over the Library's 2020 Space Plan. Senate Chair has invited all Senate standing committees to comment on COR's memo. Deadline for comments is Friday, December 13.
   Action requested: CAPRA to review COR's memo.   Committee's comments will be compiled by the committee analyst and transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of December 13.

V.   **Systemwide Review**   Pp. 17-33
   A. Proposed revisions to policies on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs (SSGPDP). CAPRA and Graduate Council are the lead reviewers.

Action requested: CAPRA to review the proposed changes to SSGPDP. Committee's comments will be compiled by the committee analyst and transmitted to the Senate Chair by the deadline of January 13, 2014.

VI.   **Other Business**

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4439

November 8, 2013

TO: Ignacio Lopez-Calvo, Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Thomas W. Peterson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

RE: Course Buyout Policy

The attached course buyout policy has been revised and vetted by the deans. We would like to thank DivCo for their comments on the earlier version of the proposed course buyout policy. In response to your comments, we have revised the policy to address several of your concerns. Specifically, we have addressed the following points:

1. The price of the buyout is consistent with the policy that 6 equivalent courses per year is a 100% teaching load for a lecturer.
2. As UC Merced does not currently have departments, it was felt that the money would be returned to the schools through the Deans. At their discretion, some portion of that money may be negotiated to either the individual faculty member or the relevant unit
3. The exception for special awards is handled under the Exceptions section, where it states that they may be approved by the Chair, Dean, and EVC.
4. This point is also addressed as in (2) above in the section, "Use of salary savings from external course buyouts", at the discretion of the Dean, some fraction of the released salary funds may be returned to the PI.

To address the last 3 points raised by DivCo under the Program perspective, additional language was inserted to ensure that the Chairs and Deans consult with the graduate group chairs to assure that the graduate curriculum is not adversely affected. In addition, the section "Policy: Minimum Teaching requirements" now explicitly states that Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.

As we stated in our September 6 memo, we will put this policy in place for five years, with a re-evaluation of the policy at that time.

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time (via course buyout) and funds available for research and scholarship. It also sanctions sponsors covering legitimate costs of faculty effort in research during the academic year thereby freeing up university research funds to invest in other forms of scholarly activity.
Course Buyout: Maximum # courses	1 annually. Also restricted to no more than 3 courses over a 5 year period. Particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Course Buyout: Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only). This is consistent with 6 equivalent courses per year being a 100% teaching load.
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Course buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in a normal portfolio of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts. Course reduction normally occurs in actual semester of buyout, but regardless the research effort must be contributed and certified during the semester that the sponsor funds are used.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Minimum Teaching requirements	After consultation with the unit chair and graduate group chair, the Dean should ensure that the faculty member teach at least one course that significantly contributes to the program (e.g., required or undergraduate course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses). Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	In the case that the faculty member chooses to reduce teaching load, 100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout will be retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs. Conversely if teaching release is not taken, then at the discretion of the Dean, some fraction of the released salary funds may be reinvested in appropriate research and scholarship expenses of the faculty.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
ANNE KELLEY, CHAIR
amkelley@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

September 19, 2013

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Division Council

From: Anne Kelley, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation   *Anne Kelley*
(CAPRA)

Re: CAPRA's Comments on the Draft Course Buyout Policy

Per Division Council's request on September 6, CAPRA reviewed the attached draft course buyout policy.

CAPRA discussed the policy at its September 17 meeting. The committee agreed that buying out one course per year is reasonable. However, the committee was not unanimous in its opinion on the provision that faculty members must teach an undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major.

Some CAPRA members pointed out that a graduate program may be negatively impacted by faculty members not teaching a course especially since graduate courses cannot be taught by lecturers. Moreover, the decision regarding the level of courses that faculty members should teach ought to be left to the individual programs rather than be mandated in a policy.

Other CAPRA members reiterated the importance of high-quality faculty teaching undergraduate courses and were in favor of the stipulation in the policy that faculty members must teach one undergraduate course.

Some CAPRA members also felt that the cost to buy out a course (1/6 of 9-month salary plus benefits) is unreasonably high. Since the hole in the instructional program caused by a course buyout will usually be covered by hiring a lecturer, either directly to teach the bought-out course or to teach another course after teaching assignments are reshuffled, it does not seem reasonable for the cost of buying out a course to greatly exceed the cost of hiring a lecturer for one course. Members felt that the cost of buying out a course should be a fixed dollar amount that accounts for the cost of hiring a lecturer for one course, perhaps plus some small additional amount for administrative overhead.

1

CAPRA thanks you for the opportunity to comment on this policy.

cc: CAPRA members
        DivCo members
        Senate office

2

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

October 1, 2013

Provost/EVC Thomas W. Peterson

RE: Course Buyout Policy

Dear Provost/EVC Peterson,

The Academic Senate completed its review of the Course Buyout Policy and Division Council discussed the policy at its September 24, 2013 meeting. Division Council is not in favor of the policy as it does not address the comments provided in a memo dated June 8, 2012 to then EVC/Provost Keith Alley by AY 2011-12 Senate Chair Susan Amussen.

Attached please find AY 2011-12 Senate Chair Amussen's memo to EVC/Provost Alley, and AY 2013-14 Senate committee comments.

Sincerely,

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair
Division Council

cc: Division Council
             Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

June 8, 2012

EVC/PROVOST KEITH ALLEY

RE: COURSE BUYOUT POLICY

Thank you for soliciting DivCo's comments on the draft policy for course buyouts. We assume this was at least in part a response to the proposal made by the SSHA faculty, which built on a GRC memo based on extensive research into the practices of other UC campuses on this topic. DivCo was pleased to see that a draft policy exists, but we have questions about its operation both from the perspective of faculty who seek to buy out a course, and from the perspective of undergraduate and graduate program leads.

From the faculty perspective, the policy appears to discourage, rather than encourage, faculty to obtain grants that buy out their teaching, at least compared to other UC campuses. We do not think this is wise for a fledgling campus trying to encourage extramural funding.

1. Price of the buyout: According to the research undertaken by the faculty, 17% is the highest amount charged in the UC system. For example, Riverside asks only for 10% of salary for a one course buyout, and 25% for two courses.

2. What happens to the money? At other campuses, the money is either given to the Department/Academic Unit, or split between the Department and the Dean. Unlike every other UC campus, the proposed policy gives all the money to the Deans, and none of the money to the unit. The policy should specify that some portion of the funds obtained through a course buyout should be used for teaching needs in the academic program, and that some portion be given to the academic unit as is done at all other UC campuses. On many campuses, those units can also use some portion of the funds to augment the faculty member's research funds. Some such flexibility gives faculty more incentive to include such funds in their grant proposals.

3. While we understand the general restriction to buying out no more than one course a year, the policy needs to contain an explicit proviso which allows flexibility when faculty members receive awards with particular requirements: for instance, Spencer Foundation grants, or NIH Career awards, would require a complete release from most

or all teaching obligations. This might be phrased as "Exceptions to this policy can be made, in consultation with the Dean and Program leads, for awards (such as NIH Career Awards) that require more release time than this."

4. The policy provides no incentive to request AY funds in a grant proposal without taking a teaching reduction. On some campuses, at least some portion of such funds would come back to the faculty's research funds as an incentive to bring more extramural funding to the university. The exclusion of this possibility is short-sighted, as both the campus and the faculty member can benefit from additional extramural funds.

From the Program perspective, we need to be sure that the deans consult not just with "chairs" (which usually means, in our context, Academic Unit chairs) but also the leads of graduate and undergraduate programs with which a person is affiliated.

1. If a faculty member is teaching a required course, or an elective course that impacts students' progress towards degree, there needs to be a provision ensuring that either the course is being taught by someone else, or that it is not necessary that semester, such that there is no negative impact on students.

2. Teaching requirements: The teaching requirements specified in the policy seem more appropriate to SSHA than to the other Schools, where faculty who have bought out one course will only teach one course that AY. In that case, it makes sense for the Dean and relevant program leads (graduate and undergraduate) to determine where a faculty member's teaching is most important. The provision that the faculty member must teach an undergraduate course fails to recognize that a graduate program may be adversely impacted by a faculty not teaching a course, and graduate courses may be more difficult to cover than undergraduate ones. Particularly given our small size, it is possible that it will be more important that a faculty member teach a graduate course than an undergraduate one. This is an area where flexibility will be important.

3. The policy should note that particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies than those specified in the campus policy.

Sincerely,

Susan Amussen
Chair

cc: Divisional Council
        Senate Executive Director Susan Sims

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
POST OFFICE BOX 2039
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
(209) 228-4439
FAX: (209) 228-4423

MEMORANDUM

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Keith Alley, EVC/Provost

Subj.: UC Merced Course Buyout Policy

Date: May 25, 2012

Attached is a draft Course Buyout Policy that has recently been developed in conjunction with the Deans of all three Schools. We request that the Divisional Council review this policy and provide feedback to the EVC regarding the policy and any concerns regarding its implementation.

Thank you.

Cc: David Ojcius, VPAP
     Nancy Ochsner, AVP
     Mark Aldenderfer, SSHA
     Juan Meza, SNS
     Dan Hirleman, SOE
     Susan Sims, Exec Director

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholary work
Maximum # courses	1 annually
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

Course Buyout Policy: External Buyouts from Extramural Funding	
	UC Merced Campuswide
Who is eligible?	Senate faculty with extramural grant-funding
Purpose	Allows faculty members to expand time available for research and other scholary work
Maximum # courses	1 annually. Also restricted to no more than 3 courses over a 5 year period. Particular Schools or academic units may have more restrictive policies.
Cost	1/6th of 9-month salary + benefits per course (3-4-unit courses only)
Policy: In Residence & Service requirements	Buyout participants expected to remain in residence for the duration of the course buyout and must continue to be fully engaged in normal range of service commitments to department, campus, and profession.
Policy: Funding	Faculty member must have extramural funding to pay for external buyouts; Buyout funding reduction must occur in actual semester of buyout.
Policy: Sabbatical leave	Program may not be used in conjunction with sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave credit continues to accrue.
Policy: Teaching requirements	In the buyout year, faculty member must teach at least one undergraduate course that significantly contributes to the major (e.g., required course), or general education and/or represents significant service (e.g., large survey courses).
Approval	Requires Chair's, Dean's, and EVC's approval
Exceptions	By request and must be justified and then approved by Chair, Dean, and EVC. The Deans and Chairs will also consult with the Program leads.
Use of salary savings from external course buyouts	100% of state-funded salary dollars released by the course buyout is retained by the School. The first call on the released funds will be replacement of unmet teaching needs.
Reporting	Deans must report annually to EVC on amount of dollars released and how the funds were used.

Provost EVC <provostevc@ucmerced.edu> ✐

September 6, 2013 4:08 PM

To: **Senate Chair** <ucmsenatechair@gmail.com>
Cc: **Tom Peterson** <tpeterson4@ucmerced.edu>, **Mark Aldenderfer** <maldenderfer@ucmerced.edu>, **Dan Hirleman** <dhirleman@ucmerced.edu>, **Juan Meza** <jcmeza@ucmerced.edu>, **Fatima Paul** <fpaul@ucmerced.edu>, **Ruth Brisco** <rbrisco@ucmerced.edu>
Course Buyout Policy

1 Attachment, 11 KB

IGNACIO LOPEZ-CALVO
CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

Dear Ignacio,

On behalf of Provost Peterson I am forwarding the most recent version of the Course Buyout Policy that has been developed and vetted with the Deans of all three Schools. The Provost and Deans are seeking approval of the policy for five years, with a re-evaluation of the policy to take place after that. We are requesting that the relevant committees of the Academic Senate review the policy and provide feedback to the Provost by October 1, 2013. Thank you.

Best,
Susan

Dr. Susan Sims
Special Assistant and Chief of Staff
Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
University of California, Merced
209.228.4657
ssims3@ucmerced.edu

UCM Course....xlsx (11 KB)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
RUTH MOSTERN, CHAIR
rmostern@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

November 15, 2013

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Division Council

From: Ruth Mostern, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

Re: COR's Comments on the Library's 2020 Space Plan

At its November 6 meeting, COR reviewed the Library's 2020 Space Plan which is appended to this memo. COR strongly believes that an excellent and adequately funded Library is critical to the research mission of UC Merced. We hope to see the Senate develop a collaborative, positive relationship with the Library, and we trust that Senate support can assist the Library in obtaining resources adequate to a research university as it continues to serve the campus's research mission.

However, COR has serious concerns with the Library's 2020 Space Plan and wants to convey these concerns to Provost Peterson and Vice Provost for Budget and Planning Feitelberg.

First, the Kolligian Library was purpose-built for library use and COR is surprised that that Library is proposing to develop new spaces instead of restoring the KL building to its original purpose. Furthermore, we believe that it would serve the Library and campus purposes most efficiently if library services were consolidated in one building.

Second, COR notes that the primary focus of the Space Plan concerns the development of study hall spaces. COR suggests that another unit should manage the planning of study halls, as COR feels that is not a core Library function.

Third, the Library's 2020 plan is based on an assumption that print resources will grow incrementally at a rate of 5-7,000 newly published volumes per year. However, this is not a consensus position of the Library's stakeholders. There are significant deficiencies in the Library's core legacy print collection.

The Library Working Group is discussing how best to develop a print collection appropriate to a research library. The Library's Space Plan needs to account for this.

Finally, the Library's 2020 Space Plan does not make any reference to an expansion in Library staff and equipment (e.g. scanning and recording facilities that are needed for digital project development), nor to the needed core IT infrastructure that is required for expanded bandwidth and data curation.

We hope to see the Library Space Plan revised to take into account the concerns of the Library's stakeholders and to better align with the mission of a research university.

cc: COR Members
        Senate-Administration Library Working Group
        Senate Office

Library Space for UC Merced: A Vision for 2020

The UC Merced Library currently provides spaces for the campus community to study, do research, and collaborate; in addition, it provides a portion of the space needed for campus events. As of 2013 the Kolligian Library Building seats approximately 900-1000 and contains physical collection storage space for up to 200,000 volumes. Given the current collection size of 110,000 print books, a historical print-collection growth rate of 5,000 to 7,000 volumes per year, and the expected emergence of the e-book as the preferred format for scholarly publishing, it is unlikely that UC Merced will need additional stack space by 2020. Similarly, the compactness of the proposed 2020 campus footprint coupled with the availability of remote access to the library's digital information resources means there will never be a need for freestanding branch libraries or subject/departmental libraries occupying one or more floors of campus buildings.

However, by 2020 the UC Merced campus will need additional library commonspace to support individual study and group collaboration, both of which are crucial to student success. With the 2012-2013 campus population of 5,700 students, existing library space is already proving inadequate—during regular academic terms the library's seats were frequently occupied at rates of 50%-70%. These extraordinarily high occupancy rates are due to the fact that 1) the library provides attractive spaces for study and collaboration and 2) there are few other places on campus where students can go. While it is good that library space is well used, such high rates of occupancy contribute to a noisy/busy environment, overload the wireless network infrastructure, and put extra strain on library services, furniture, and fixtures. Obviously, without additional spaces similar to those now available in the library, the campus cannot support a 2020 student population projected to be 43% larger than the 2012-2013 population.

Creating Library Commonspace at UC Merced
A solution to the campus's 2020 library space problem is to plan for and build two or three 5,000-square-foot library commonspaces to be incorporated in future buildings. We coined the term "library commonspace" to describe a space roughly similar in size, ambiance, and functionality to the current KL355 space, but with two-to-three collaborative workrooms included in, or adjacent to, the main commonspace.

The current square-footage of library space available for study and collaboration is approximately 70,000 square feet, so an addition of 10,000 to 15,000 square feet represents a 10% to 20% gain for the campus. While this increase falls short of corresponding to a 43% increase in the student body, such factors as increased reliance on online courses and additional un-programmed and public spaces in new campus buildings will take some pressure off of library spaces.

1

The purpose of each library commonspace is to directly support the learning outcomes of UC Merced students. Each commonspace will achieve this by providing an appropriate combination of individual and collaborative spaces as well access to appropriate information resources and technology.

Physical Configuration

Each library commonspace will occupy approximately 5,000 assignable square feet, with the configuration of furniture and rooms within each space influenced by how it is intended to be used and to what extent it balances support for individual study with support for collaborative learning. Flexibility will be key in the design of all library commonspaces; even so, it is inevitable that library commonspaces will need to be re-configured every seven-to-ten years to address changing needs.

Technology

Each library commonspace will be outfitted with appropriate technology to support student learning outcomes. This includes digital technology, of course, but it could also include print or other technologies. As with furnishings, the technology in library commonspaces must be flexible and provided with regular upgrades as needs and technologies change. That said, library commonspaces are not computer labs and should never be treated as such.

The design and technology of library commonspaces could be influenced by the academic focus of the campus buildings in which they are housed. One can imagine that a library commonspace located in a largely humanities-focused building might include technology specifically designed to support work in the digital humanities, while a similar space in a heavily engineering-focused building might incorporate advanced computer-aided design technologies.

Library commonspaces should also serve as locations for readings, guest lectures, receptions, and other special events so long as such use does not excessively interfere with the overall purpose of supporting student success. This reflects the current use pattern of KL355.

To prevent library commonspaces from being converted into cube farms or computer labs the first time the host building experiences a space crunch, library commonspaces must be managed as campus-wide resources rather than falling under the direct control of any single administrator or faculty group.

Connection to the Library

In consultation with other stakeholders, UC Merced librarians should play a lead role in the design and equipping of library commonspaces and have responsibility for their day-to-day management. While it is possible that a librarian could be permanently officed in a library commonspace, it is more likely that librarians will support these spaces via real-time

audio/video technology. It is also possible that librarians will keep regular office hours in library commonspaces and/or accept appointments to consult with students, faculty, or staff in a library commonspace.

3

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

November 12, 2013

CHANCELLORS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR JACOB

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed please find the proposed revised Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Policy that includes implementation information. This draft policy is a revision to the 2011 Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs and its associated implementation guidelines. The proposed policy was developed and endorsed by the 2012-13 Academic Planning Council (APC), the joint Academic Senate/Administration Committee tasked with working on policies of this nature. A roster of the 2012-13 APC members is enclosed.

This transmittal is a request to the Academic Council for formal review of the policy and its implementation by the Academic Senate and to the Chancellors for review by the campus administrations. For campus review, this request is being sent directly to Chancellors, with copies to the Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs), per the request of the Chancellors that major communications and requests for information from UCOP are addressed to them. In addition, the proposed policy and implementation is being shared with other campus constituent groups convened by UCOP -- the Graduate Deans, the Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget, and the Extension Deans.

The University now has approximately 60 self-supporting graduate professional degree programs, enrolling over 4,500 students and generating over $130 million annually in revenue from student charges. By policy, this revenue supports all costs of the programs and also the costs incurred by the departments/schools and campuses on behalf of the programs.

The enclosed new proposed policy builds on the 2011 revision to the policy and explicitly recognizes that self-supporting graduate professional degree programs are a necessary educational strategy to allow the University to serve a greater number of students above and beyond that which state resources will support. The proposed policy provides that only graduate professional degrees can be self-supporting – self-supporting Ph.D. programs, graduate master's degree programs primarily leading to a Ph.D., and all undergraduate degree programs would not be eligible for self-supporting status.

Among other things, the new policy addresses the very limited circumstances under which a state-supported graduate professional degree program can convert to self-supporting status. The policy also revises the existing implementation guidelines (now included as Section V. of the enclosed draft policy) to help departments and campuses facilitate the establishment of self-

supporting programs and to clarify the process for receiving Presidential approval for setting and increasing student charges for each of the approved programs.

The members of the 2012-13 Academic Planning Council and I believe this policy strikes the appropriate balance between encouraging the development of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs to serve additional students and diversify University revenues and ensuring that these programs do not detract from the core state-supported mission of the University.

Please submit your written responses on the proposed policy by February 7, 2014 via email to Aimee.Dorr@ucop.edu with a copy to Todd.Greenspan@ucop.edu. All feedback received by February 7th will be considered by the Academic Planning Council as it works to complete the policy proposal that will be sent to President Napolitano for her approval. We hope to present it to her before the end of March 2014.

I look forward to receiving your responses.

Cordially,

Aimée Dorr
Provost and Executive Vice President

Enclosures

cc: Academic Council Vice Chair Gilly
        Executive Vice Chancellors
        Vice President Lenz
        Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget
        Council of Graduate Deans
        Deans of University Extension
        2012-13 Academic Planning Council Members
        Executive Director Winnacker
        Director Jennings
        Director Greenspan

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs Policy

Academic Officer:	President of the University of California
Responsible Office:	Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President
Issuance Date:	[Issuance Date]
Effective Date:	[Effective Date]
Scope:	This Policy applies to all UC campuses and academic units.

Contact:	
Email:	
Phone #:	

I.   POLICY SUMMARY

This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP.[1]

---

[1] Nothing in this Policy constitutes a contract, an offer of a contract, or a promise that any student charges ultimately authorized by the University will be limited by any term or provision of this Policy. The University expressly reserves the right and option, in its absolute discretion, to establish student charges at any level it deems appropriate based on a full consideration of the circumstances, and nothing in this Policy shall be a basis for any party to rely on student charges of a specified level or based on a specified formula.

II.   DEFINITIONS

a.   **Self-supporting** – Self-supporting means that all program costs, both direct and indirect, are covered by revenues generated by the program such as student charges or from alternative revenues that are not disallowed funds as defined in Section II(g) below.

b.   **Program costs** – Program costs include both direct and indirect costs.

c.   **Direct costs** – Direct costs for SSGPDPs include, but are not limited to, costs related to instruction, program support, student services, financial aid, faculty and staff salaries and benefits, supplies, and equipment.

d.   **Indirect costs** – Indirect costs are costs that cannot be charged to a particular project or activity but are incurred by the University or an organizational unit of the University as a result of undertaking the project or activity. Indirect costs for SSGPDPs include but are not limited to the charges levied by school, college, campus, and systemwide entities for a program's share of academic and administrative support, libraries, building use, and operation and maintenance of physical facilities.

e.   **Charges (SSGPDPs)** – Charges are funds paid by students to attend SSGPDPs which may include approved Compulsory Campus-Based Student Fees and Course Materials and Services Fees. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, they are disallowed funds as defined in g. below.

f.   **Tuition and fees (state-supported programs)** – Tuition and fees are funds paid by students to attend state-supported programs and include but are not limited to Tuition, Student Services Fee, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST), and Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees.

g.   **Disallowed funds** – Disallowed funds are funds the SSGPDP may not rely on for program costs. Disallowed funds include State General Funds and tuition and fees as defined in f. above. Although students in SSGPDPs may be required to pay Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees, revenue from these fees may not be used to support the SSGPDP.

h.   **Compendium** – The Compendium is the *Compendium of Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units*. The Compendium draws on current University policies to articulate systemwide review processes for proposals to establish, transfer, consolidate, change the name of, and discontinue or disestablish undergraduate degree programs (in certains cases), graduate degree programs, schools, colleges, and research units.

http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/compendium_jan2011.pdf

20

III. POLICY TEXT

A. Introduction. Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) allow the University of California (UC or University) to serve additional students above and beyond the resources provided by the State while fulfilling demonstrated higher education and workforce needs. Models of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs include, but are not limited to, those that serve non-traditional populations, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students, and/or students whose education is supported by their employers. Many SSGPDPs are (1) offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online or hybrid instruction; (2) alternatively-scheduled (e.g., during evenings, weekends, and/or summers); and/or (3) offered in alternative locations (e.g., off-campus).

This Policy facilitates the establishment and operation of SSGPDPs at the University and its campuses while ensuring that these programs do not use disallowed funds.

When the University received adequate State support to honor its commitment to the California Master Plan and to expand graduate academic and professional programs in response to State and societal needs, UC directed self-supporting programs towards working adults and other non-traditional student populations. These programs currently provide alternative venues and opportunities for access to quality programs leading to graduate professional degrees (e.g., Master's of Advanced Studies). Given the decline in State support, this Policy now recognizes that self-supporting graduate professional degree programs are also a necessary educational strategy to allow the University to serve a greater number of students above and beyond that which State resources will support.

This Policy governs Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) at the University of California, including, but not limited to, establishment, discontinuance, setting student charges, and requirements for converting a state-supported graduate professional degree program to a SSGPDP. However, nothing in this Policy is intended to prescribe campus policy or pre-empt a campus's discretion with respect to how it distributes resources with the exception that disallowed fund sources may not be used to fund SSGPDPs

B. Description of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs. SSGPDPs are graduate programs that provide education and skills that correspond to anticipated professional careers. They provide expanded educational opportunities and can be directed towards those students with anticipated capacity to pay higher fees (for example, because the fees are paid by the employer). All direct and indirect costs shall be covered by charges

21

paid by SSGPDP students or by other funds that the sponsoring academic unit allocates to the SSGPDP. SSGPDPs may not use disallowed funds.

SSGPDPs are an alternate mechanism to enable the establishment of new graduate professional degree programs and, in some circumstances, the maintenance of existing graduate professional degree programs. This Policy governs both circumstances. With the exception of the source of funds and the costs the funds must cover, all SSGPDPs must adhere to the same policies as state-supported programs. Both state-supported programs and SSGPDPs require Academic Senate oversight and review to ensure that all degree programs meet UC standards of academic rigor and quality. Also, all faculty (both ladder and non-ladder) in both state-supported programs and SSGPDPs operate under UC academic personnel policies and practices.

C. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status. Programs ineligible for self-supporting status include: all undergraduate degree programs, all academic master's degree programs primarily leading to a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree, and all Ph.D. programs.

D. Location of offerings. SSGPDP courses and other program requirements may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or online, using distance technologies as appropriate (*consistent with Academic Senate Reg. 694*).

E. Comparable quality to regular state-supported graduate programs. SSGPDPs are held to the same standards of quality as any other UC graduate professional degree programs. Student admission and performance standards for SSGPDPs are governed by the Academic Senate.

F. Comparable faculty. As for all UC degree programs, ladder faculty are responsible for SSGPDPs. Ladder faculty who teach in SSGPDPs are appointed, evaluated, and advanced under the same processes and criteria as other ladder faculty regardless of whether a portion of their regular compensation comes from SSGPDPs. The nature of certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion than usual of non-ladder rank faculty (e.g., clinical faculty, adjunct faculty, lecturers, and visitors).

G. Faculty workload and compensation. SSGPDPs shall comply with the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) with respect to how faculty, both ladder rank and non-ladder rank, are compensated. Faculty are expected to comply with all relevant reporting requirements. Teaching in a self-supporting program does not constitute workload for purposes of State reporting. Faculty teaching in SSGPDPs shall be handled either through a buy-out or through

22

additional compensation depending on whether the teaching replaces part of the faculty member's expected full-time load (a buy-out) or is in addition to the full-time load (additional compensation). SSGPDPs shall not in any way diminish a school's or department's responsibilities to the full complement of state-supported programs.

H. Initiation and approval of SSGPDPS.

1. <u>Initiation</u>. Departments, groups of departments, or schools may propose a new SSGPDP or a conversion of an existing state-supported program to a SSGPDP. Proposals shall originate with an academic unit that is already authorized to conduct graduate work.

2. <u>New Program</u>. The establishment of a new SSGPDP must be approved according to procedures and requirements specified in the Compendium.

3. <u>Conversion</u>. Conversion of a state-supported graduate professional degree program to self-supporting status is possible, but the expectation is that conversion will be infrequent and uncommon. Graduate professional degree programs converting to self-supporting status must meet the same criteria and are subject to the same review criteria as are new SSGPDPs. This includes criteria related to financial sustainability, financial accessibility, faculty appointments, and course approvals.

   i. <u>Conversion when changing academic requirements</u>. Programs that are changing academic requirements shall be reviewed through the same processes as required of a newly-created graduate professional degree programs.

   ii. <u>Conversion when not changing academic requirements</u>. A proposal to convert a state-supported program that includes no change to the program's academic requirements shall be reviewed through Academic Senate processes at the campus and at the systemwide level to evaluate context and justification for the conversion and to assure meritorious status of the program proposed for conversion. In order for a conversion proposal to be reviewed at the systemwide level, the program must have undergone and received a meritorious academic review within the previous five years. At the discretion of systemwide review bodies, systemwide review may be expedited.

I. Phase-in period. All SSGPDPs shall be fully self-supporting within three years of inception. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program shall submit to UCOP a cost analysis and fiscal phase-in plan for review and approval.

23

J. Failure to become or remain self-supporting. If a new or converting self-supporting program is not successful (i.e., does not reach financial sustainability within the required three years), the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use disallowed funds for those purposes. Similarly, if an existing SSGPDP is no longer financially self-supporting, the campus shall be responsible for all costs of continuing or phasing out the program and shall not use disallowed funds for those purposes.

Any SSGPDP (existing, new, or converted) seeking to become a state-supported graduate professional degree program shall be subject to the same campus approvals required to establish new state-supported graduate academic or professional degree programs and enrollments. Consistent with the requirements for the discontinuation of any UC academic program, a discontinued SSGPDP must ensure that students have the opportunity to complete their degrees or transfer to other programs.

K. Review of SSGPDPs. Graduate Councils or other campus review bodies appointed by the Academic Senate shall review SSGPDPs as part of regularly-scheduled campus program reviews on the same basis as state-supported academic programs are reviewed. Once established, the SSGPDP shall be under the purview of the campus Graduate Council and Graduate Division to ensure adequate progress of students according to campus criteria. Courses for SSGPDP are subject to normal campus procedures for approval, revision, and termination.

L. Admission and enrollment. Admission standards for SSGPDPs shall be comparable to those in effect for analogous state-supported programs, if such programs are available. Admissions criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field, as applicable to the specific graduate professional degree offered. Students must be admitted through the Graduate Division through the regular admissions process.

Enrollments in SSGPDPs do not count for purposes of calculating the number of students supported by the State. SSGPDP enrollments will be reported separately from enrollment of students in state-supported programs. During the approved phase-in period, the distribution of enrollments between state-supported and self-supporting will conform to the specifications of the approved plan.

M. Approval by President of student charges and phase-in plans. In addition to the program approval requirements above, proposed student charges and the phase-in plan for each SSGPDP shall be submitted to the President for approval.

24

N. Student charges. The President will review and approve proposed student charges for each SSGPDP upon establishment or conversion, as well as subsequent proposed annual increases or decreases in such charges. The President will report annually to The Regents on the level of student charges for each approved program.

Student charges for SSGPDPs will cover all program costs within the required three-year period unless the campus chooses to use other non-disallowed funds to assist in meeting program costs.

The level of student charges shall be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs as defined in the Policy and further detailed in the Implementation Guidelines.

University employees enrolled in SSGPDPs are not eligible for reduced course charges. This does not preclude a department from subsidizing a portion of the program charges from non-disallowed funds. Program deficits, including deficits during the approved phase-in period, are the responsibility of the campus; disallowed funds cannot be used to cover any deficit.

State-supported degree programs and SSGPDPs must separately account for their use of resources. Campuses shall not charge a blended tuition/fee level for any course or program.

O. Financial accessibility. SSGPDPs must have a financial accessibility goal for their student population and a student financial support plan for achieving this goal. It is expected that the plan will address access for students from a wide range of income levels. Examples of possible student financial support include scholarships or grants from the program's own resources (i.e., return-to-aid from student charges), privately raised funds, waivers of student charges, participation in federal and/or private loan programs, or other external support. For the purposes of state and federal student financial aid programs, "student charges" has the same meaning as "tuition."

P. Consultation. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program.

IV. COMPLIANCE / RESPONSIBILITIES

All UC campuses and academic units are required to comply with this Presidential Policy. The President has full authority over implementation and may delegate that authority to other

officials in the Office of the President. The Academic Planning Council (or its successor committee) is designated as the joint Administration/Academic Senate body authorized to recommend Policy revisions to the President.

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (SSGPDP) POLICY

The President issues the following Policy implementation procedures for the SSGPDP Policy:

A. Program approvals. Prior to operation, all SSGPDPs must obtain necessary program approvals pursuant to this Policy and the processes detailed in the Compendium. Similarly, all SSGPDPs that are being discontinued or converted back to state-supported status must adhere to the requirements of this Policy and the Compendium. New SSGPDPs, and state-supported programs seeking to convert to SSGPDP status, may apply for review of proposed student charges [see B.] prior to completion of program approval processes. However, no student charges will be approved in advance of final program approval.

B. Annual process for certification of self-supporting status and Presidential approval of self-supporting program charges. The President will annually approve student charges for each SSGPDP. In order to receive Presidential approval for student charges, each SSGPDP and each campus with one or more SSGPDPs shall follow the following procedures:

1. Annual program templates.
   For each SSGPDP, a UCOP template shall be filled out that covers the following elements:

   a. Program approval status. The completed template shall indicate the program approval status for the SSGPDP, the date and results of its most recent academic program review, and/or the dates the next academic program review will begin and be completed.

   b. Current and proposed student charges. The completed template shall include, at a minimum, the current level of student charges and the projected student charges for the next year. Approved Compulsory Campus-based Student Fees may be charged to SSGPDP students when it can be shown that SSGPDP students benefit from the services funded by those fees.

26

c. Financial accessibility. The completed template shall include a description of the SSGPDP's student financial support plan and the extent to which it is attaining its financial accessibility goal. For programs that have converted or are proposing to convert from state-supported status, the description shall compare the program's student financial accessibility with that of other UC programs offering similar degrees, whether self-supporting or not.

d. Cost analysis. The completed template shall include an annual cost analysis that demonstrates that the proposed student charges cover full direct and indirect costs, or (to the extent that student charges are insufficient to cover these costs) that no disallowed funds will be used to subsidize the program. The required elements and format of the cost analysis shall be specified in the UCOP template.

New SSGPDPs are subject to the same cost analysis. Programs are expected to become fully self-supporting within three years, though campuses may continue to subsidize programs with non-disallowed funds at their discretion. Program deficits, including any deficits during the phase-in period, must be covered by the campuses; disallowed funds may not be used to cover any deficit. The template shall require campuses to identify in advance fund sources that will be used to cover any projected deficits and to identify fund sources being used to cover any current deficits.

e. Consultation. The completed template shall include a section identifying the stakeholders who were consulted and when and how the consultation took place, and providing a short summary of the feedback received from each category of stakeholders. Input on program characteristics and the level of student charges must be regularly sought from program stakeholders and must cover a multi-year period. Stakeholders must include students in and faculty from the program. Prior to establishing a new program, student input shall be sought from students likely to apply to such a program.

2. Annual campus submittals.

Each campus with one or more SSGPDPs must provide an annual submittal consisting of (1) a cover letter from campus leadership to the Vice President—Budget and Capital Resources requesting approval of student charges for the upcoming year and (2) the annual program templates for each of the existing or proposed SSGPDPs on that campus. Specifically, the cover letter shall include:

    a. A statement that appropriate campus leadership has reviewed and approved the attached templates for each SSGPDP on that campus. The statement must certify that each program is operating on a self-supporting basis (or is using non-disallowed funds to cover any deficit) and is in compliance with this Policy.

    b. A request to approve the proposed level of student charges for each existing or proposed SSGPDP for the upcoming year.

    c. A table showing, for each SSGPDP, the current level of student charges, the proposed level of student charges, and the percentage increase or decrease, if any. UCOP will provide a template for this table to ensure that student charges can be compared across programs.

    d. A statement that the campus Chancellor approves the student charges request (if the letter is not from the Chancellor).

3. <u>Timeline for submittals</u>.

    a. November preceding the next academic year – Campuses receive templates from UCOP together with instructions on the process for the required annual submittals.

    b. February 1 – Budget and Capital Resources (BCR) at UCOP receives completed campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP. Staff designated by the Vice President-BCR and the Provost begin to review proposals.

    c. March 1 – Provost and Vice President-BCR receive the results of UCOP staff review, including campus annual submittals with the attached templates for each SSGPDP.

    d. April 1 – President makes decisions and campuses are notified of approved program student charges for the upcoming academic year.

    e. The President reports this information to The Regents annually.

C. Miscellaneous implementation guidelines:

1. Reporting of enrollments.
   SSGPDPs should be identified in the Corporate Student System with a separate major code from state-supported programs and with an attribute code flagging enrollments in each SSGPDP as self-supporting.

2. Faculty workload.
   All faculty participation in the SSGPDP must be funded directly from SSGPDP revenue in proportion to the faculty member's workload commitment to the program. If the faculty member's participation is in lieu of some of his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then the SSGPDP must reimburse the faculty member's department an amount equivalent to the cost of that particular faculty member's time. Consistent with the requirement that the SSGPDP must cover all program costs, the total cost of faculty salary, benefits, and retirement must be funded by SSGPDP-generated or other non-disallowed funds. If the faculty member's participation is in addition to his or her responsibilities as a full-time UC employee, then he or she should receive additional compensation which must be calculated and recorded in accordance with relevant Academic Personnel Manual policies and reporting requirements.

VI. RELATED INFORMATION

Regents' Delegation of Authority to the President to Set Fees for Self-Supporting Degree Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/ssp_delegtopres.pdf

UCOP Self-Supporting Degree Programs Information
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/academic-planning/planning-policies-and-other-activities/self-supporting-programs.html

VII. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

To be developed

VIII. REVISION HISTORY

July 30, 1979 – Policy on Part-Time, Off-Campus Professional Graduate Degree Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/79_pol_slfspprtngprog.pdf

June 24, 1996 – Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/96_ssp_pol_implmntn.pdf

September 23, 2011 – Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/self-supportpolicy-2011.pdf

_____. 2013 – Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs Policy

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
2012-13

CHAIR Aimée Dorr Provost and Executive Vice President University of California Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland CA 94607-5200 510-987-9020 aimee.dorr@ucop.edu	**VICE CHAIR** Robert Powell Chair, Academic Council University of California Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland CA 94607-5200 510-987-9303 robert.powell@ucop.edu

SENATE

VICE CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL William Jacob, Vice Chair Academic Council University of California Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland CA 94607-5200 510-987-0711 william.jacob@ucop.edu	**ACADEMIC SENATE (CCGA)** Ruth Mulnard Program in Nursing Science University of California, Irvine 252J Berk Hall Irvine, CA 92697 949-824-7016 ramulnar@uci.edu
ACADEMIC SENATE (UCEP) John Yoder Plant Sciences University of California, Davis 101 Asmundson Hall Davis, CA 95616 530-752-1741 jiyoder@ucdavis.edu	**ACADEMIC SENATE (UCPB)** Jean-Bernard Minster Geophysics University of California, San Diego SIO, IGPP Room 2210 8765 Biological Grade, EAMS Code 6317 La Jolla, CA 92037 858-534-5650 jbminster@ucsd.edu
ACADEMIC SENATE (UCORP) Michael Kleeman Civil & Environmental Engineering University of California, Davis 3125 Engineering III Davis, CA 95616 530-752-8386 mjkleeman@ucdavis.edu	**ACADEMIC SENATE (UCAP)** Harry W. Green Earth Sciences University of California, Riverside 1224 Geology Building Riverside, CA 92521 951-827-4508 951-212-4328 cell harry.green@ucr.edu
ACADEMIC SENATE (DIVISION CHAIR) Christina Maslach Psychology University of California, Berkeley Tolman Hall, 3210 Berkeley, CA 94720 510-642-5292 maslach@berkeley.edu	**ACADEMIC SENATE (DIVISION CHAIR)** Joseph Konopelski Chemistry & Biology University of California, Santa Cruz 344 Physical & Biological Sciences 1156 High Street Santa Cruz, CA 95064 831-459-4676 joek@chemistry.ucsc.edu

ADMINISTRATION

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR Ralph J. Hexter Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor University of California, Davis 573 Mrak Hall Davis, CA 95616 530-752-4964 provost@ucdavis.edu *APC term: 2012-2014*	**GRADUATE DEAN** Joseph Childers Dean, Graduate Division University of California, Riverside 100 University Office Building Riverside, CA 92521-0208 951-827-4302 joseph.childers@ucr.edu *APC term: 2012-2014*
VICE CHANCELLOR, STUDENT AFFAIRS Jane Fiori Lawrence Vice Chancellor - Student Affairs University of California, Merced 5200 North Lake Rd. Merced, CA 95343 209-228-4482 jlawrence@ucmerced.edu *APC term: 2011-2013*	**VICE CHANCELLOR, PLANNING AND BUDGET** Meredith Michaels Vice Chancellor - Planning and Budget University of California, Irvine 454B Aldrich Hall Irvine, CA 92697-3025 949-824-4923 m.michaels@uci.edu *APC term: 2011-2013*
UNDERGRADUATE DEAN Barbara Sawrey Assoc Vice Chancellor – Undergraduate Education University of California, San Diego 9500 Gilman Dr., #0001 San Diego, CA 92093-0001 858-822-4358 avcdue@ucsd.edu *APC term: 2011-2013*	**GRADUATE DEAN** Robin Garrell Dean of Graduate Education University of California, Los Angeles 1237 Murphy Hall Los Angeles, CA 90095-1419 310-825-4383 rgarrell@grad.ucla.edu *APC term: 2011-2013*

UCOP Susan Carlson Vice Provost Academic Personnel University of California Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor Oakland CA 94607-5200 510-987-0728 susan.carlson@ucop.edu	**UCOP** Debora Obley Associate Vice President Budget Operations University of California Office of the President 1111 Franklin Street, 10th Floor Oakland CA 94607-5200 510-987-9112 debora.obley@ucop.edu

STUDENTS

GRADUATE STUDENT Hironao Okahana Ph.D. Program - Higher Education and Organizational Change Division Graduate School of Education & Information Studies University of California, Los Angeles 1009 Moore Hall Los Angeles, CA 90095 562-296-3219 hironao.okahana@ucla.eduu	**UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT** Safeena Mecklai Undergraduate Student Media Studies and Public Policy University of California, Berkeley Berkeley, CA 94720 safeena@berkeley.edu

STAFF

UCOP STAFF	UCOP STAFF
Todd Greenspan	Hilary Baxter
Interim Chief of Staff (2012-13)	Interim Director m (2012-13)
Academic Affairs	Academic Planning
University of California Office of the President	University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor	1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor
Oakland CA 94607-5200	Oakland CA 94607-5200
510-987-9430	510-987-9418
todd.greenspan@ucop.edu	hilary.baxter@ucop.edu
UCOP STAFF	**SENATE STAFF**
Rebecca Landes	Martha Winnacker
Planning Analyst	Executive Director
Academic Planning	Academic Council
University of California Office of the President	University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor	1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland CA 94607-5200	Oakland CA 94607-5200
510-987-9556	510-987-9458
rebecca.landes@ucop.edu	martha.winnacker@ucop.edu