

**Report of the joint Senate-Administration Task Force regarding Non-traditional programs,
including Self-Supporting Degree Programs and Certificate Programs**

Submitted by

Kathryn Atchison (Chair)

Stuart Brown

Glyn Davies

Robert Gurval

Courtney Lyder

Chris Lynch

William McDonald

Jan Reiff

Cathy Sandeen

Ross Shideler

Victor Tabbush

David Unruh

July 15, 2010

On January 26, 2010, the joint Senate-Administration task force for non-traditional and self-supporting programs, including certificate programs, was charged to “identify the issues that must be considered and addressed when developing self-supporting programs, and to provide recommendations for addressing these issues.” Briefly, the proposed topics of interest included:

- Discussion of the roles and responsibilities of all involved units involved in creating, reviewing, approving and maintaining the academic quality of self-supporting degree programs.
- Clarification of the meaning of and nomenclature for self-supporting programs and certificates.
- Policies and procedures for appointing, supervising, reviewing, and reappointing Directors of self-supporting programs, both degree and certificate.
- Administrative coordination within and across departments, schools, and divisions.
- Expectations for financial reporting and transparency.

The task force met on February 17, 2010 to accept the charge and to define the process by which the members would review and compress a large amount of background policy, practice, and information into a set of recommendations for Provost Waugh and Senate Chair Garrell by summer, 2010. Moving forward, in order to maximize the expertise and diversity of the members’ experience, it was agreed to organize the meetings around four specific topic areas regarding self-supporting program creation and management: (1) creation and development of self-supporting program, (2) review, approval, and re-review of a self-supporting program, (3) marketing, recruiting, and review/selection of students, (4) enrollment, registration, payment, and course tracking. Teams of 2-3 people led the discussion on each topic area.

In general, non-traditional and part time programs represent the University of California’s effort “to serve a public need” by extending the reach of UC’s academic programs to a broader audience by offering classes and programs at times, places and in sequences different from those designed to serve full-time students enrolled in its various degree programs (see Policy on Part Time Study, <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/3-17-81.html>). They involve a course, or sequence of courses or lectures that provide instruction in a specialized field leading to the award of a certificate. And, as described in policy laid out in the 1996 “Policy on Self-Supporting Part-time Graduate Professional Degree Programs” (<http://www.apb.ucla.edu/Other/SelfSupp.pdf>), all non-traditional and self-supporting programs are supported with non-state funds only.

A variety of non-traditional and self-supporting programs exist at UCLA. They go by different names (certificates, institutes, continuing education), have different characteristics, and responsibility for ensuring their ongoing quality falls to a wide range of Senate, departmental, and administrative units. Some programs may offer degrees, course credit or certificates recognized on official University or University Extension transcripts. These programs are approved and regularly reviewed according to well-defined Academic Senate processes or are designed under Senate policies for University Extension. Others are created solely within the departments, divisions, or schools. Participants in these programs receive a certificate of completion but the University does not maintain a permanent record of an individual’s participation in the program. Student selection processes vary as well, from comprehensive application and review, to minimum criteria for admission, to open enrollment. The

table below provides examples that demonstrate the variety and characteristics of programs UCLA currently offers.

Examples of Academic and Non-Academic Non-Traditional and Supporting Programs

Academic Programs	Student Selection	Review process	Faculty	Document of Completion
Degree program				
On-line self-supporting graduate degree programs	Comprehensive review	UCLA through OP	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Diploma degree
M.A.S. (Master of Adv. Study), Professional M.A., M.S.	Comprehensive review	UCLA through OP	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Diploma degree
Credit toward degrees				
Summer session courses	Open enrollment	Dept., Senate	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Recorded on transcript
XL courses through Extension (transferable to UCLA)	Open enrollment	Dept., Senate	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Recorded on transcript
Hosting international exchange students for credit	Department approval	199 course	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Recorded on transcript
Certificates and Non-Degree Programs				
Graduate certificate program (academic; SR735)	Application from Matriculated students	Full dept, Senate, OP	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Recorded on transcript
Extension Certificate programs bearing professional credit (X300 or 400)	Open enrollment	Full dept, Senate	Department approval	Certificate
Continuing professional education: non-Extension (Law, Medicine, Dentistry, etc.)	Open enrollment	Department review	Department approval	Certificate of Completion
Extension courses without academic credit (CEU)	Open enrollment	Extension Dean review	Extension Dean approval	Recorded on Transcript
Summer Institute certificates	Open enrollment	Department ¹ and FEC	Dept./Ladder equivalent	Certificate of Completion
Non-Academic Programs				
Summer activities for K-12 students	Open enrollment	Department or Unit Chair	Department/unit approval	Certificate of Completion
Exam preparation courses	Open enrollment	Extension Dean review	Extension Dean approval	Certificate of Completion

A variety of policies and documents exist at the campus and system-wide level that were reviewed and discussed in the task force's deliberation. A list of relevant documents can be found in the Appendix. Clear policy already exists for creating self-supporting part-time graduate professional programs as articulated in the 1996 "Policy on Self-Supporting Part-time Graduate Professional Degree Programs" (<http://www.apb.ucla.edu/Other/SelfSupp.pdf>) that we believe should be applied to all self-supporting degree programs. This process includes involvement of faculty, dean, Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), Academic Planning and Budget (APB), the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC), Graduate Council, and the Office of the President. While the process is lengthy, the task force

¹ Summer courses that are equivalent to regular session offerings in units, workload, and quality.

believes that the process works to ensure that new programs meet UCLA and UC standards of academic excellence and sustainability. Because policies and processes for establishing and evaluating self-supporting non-traditional and non-degree programs are less clear or non-existent, the task force established as its goal to make recommendations for additional policies and processes to assist departments in creating high quality self-supporting, non-traditional and non-degree programs.

Overarching Considerations: The task force expressed a strong belief that UCLA could and should expand the reach of its educational and research programs – its greatest assets – to a larger population of interested citizens of California and the world through novel non-traditional degree and non-degree programs that are self-supporting.

The task force suggested departments proposing a new program consult early with the appropriate Senate committees and administrative offices, ask questions, and get advice. Concomitant with this, it also recommends that those appropriate Senate committees and administrative offices be well-informed of the roles and responsibilities of others involved in the approval process in order to ensure the quality of advice and to facilitate the movement of a proposal from one step to the next. The task force also resolved that to propose and document a simple proposal guidelines to guide faculty through the process of developing new non-traditional and self-supporting programs.

Assuring academic excellence and a rich educational experience for participants are cornerstones on which policies related to the creation, review and approval of self-supporting programs should be based. These goals can only be accomplished if such programs grow out of the educational and research missions of the departments or academic units offering them and continue to be held to the standards initially established for them. To that end, each proposal should address the following issues:

1. **Faculty Involvement:** One key indicator for any successful UCLA program is the involvement of regular UCLA faculty. Any proposal for a new self-supporting program must indicate how it fits with the overall mission of the department or proposing academic unit and the commitment of regular series faculty to the creation of, instruction in, and ongoing evaluation of the program. Such programs should not divert faculty from their regular tripartite mission nor cause them to be spread too thin to be successful in that mission. The cost of faculty involvement and/ or teaching of these programs is the direct responsibility of the program.

Recommendation 1: Ladder rank faculty must be involved in the conception, review, approval, teaching, and ongoing evaluation of all proposed self-supporting programs.

2. **Selection and Admission of Students:** A successful self-supporting program requires a market niche and an ongoing pipeline of interested students. A self-supporting program should broaden the existing student population of UCLA and supplement its existing degree programs. Broadening the student body may include: preparing students for graduate programs, serving the working professional, providing continuing education, or education about new technologies or emerging fields of study. Non-degree self-supporting programs may be offered on an open enrollment basis. Students in self-supporting degree programs must meet UCLA degree qualifications as set by policy.

Recommendation 2: UCLA faculty should be integrally involved in determining: a. the appropriate audience for the program, b. the criteria for acceptance, and c. criteria for completion of all UCLA-sponsored self-supporting programs.

3. The appointment of an engaged and knowledgeable director for any proposed self-supporting program is critical to establishing a solid academic environment for the attending students. The director should have support of the faculty in the department, capability, responsibility and authority to manage and monitor the educational and financial aspects of the self-supporting program. Establishing the director position early in the process will help to guarantee that appropriate educational outcomes, faculty selection, and student criteria are established.

Recommendation 3: A faculty director should be appointed for the self-supporting program and should report to the dean/ department chair and be reviewed on an ongoing basis.

4. **Quality of a UCLA Education:** Baccalaureate and graduate degrees represent UCLA’s mission and strength. The task force believes it is critical to have a clear purpose and intent to complement this mission with non-degree programs. Currently, there is a proliferation of certificates, institutes and other types of programs offered at UCLA and, in many cases neither the difference between these programs nor the intent of the faculty proposing to offer them is clear. The Academic Senate Manual offers guidelines for Graduate Certificates that require monitoring by the department and the Academic Senate. Certificates offered through UCLA Extension also go through a rigorous proposal review and performance monitoring process. (See “Preparing the Certificate Program Proposal AA150.1” in Appendix) Both of these kinds of certificates are recorded on transcripts and tracked by the Registrar and Extension. Graduate Council has recently established procedures and guidelines for the approval and review of Interdisciplinary Certificates for Matriculated Graduate Students (ICMGS)

(http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/gc/documents/IDCforMatricGradStudents_ProceduresandGuidelines.pdf).

Apart from these instances, other self-supporting programs fall outside the standard Senate policies and procedures of a defined approval process; do not appear on student transcripts; and, currently there is no process on campus to track or to review for quality. The task force felt that this uncontrolled process for creating and implementing non-degree certificate programs has the potential to devalue the UCLA education. It is critical to formalize the nomenclature and review process for non-degree programs in a manner that is flexible, controlled, and marketable to an audience interested in enrolling. The process should assure the quality of a UCLA education and not discourage interdisciplinary interaction. In an attempt to define the type of program, approval process, use of university resources, and to differentiate these various names for programs, we propose the following considerations.

Recommendation 4: a. Departments should be charged with bringing non-degree graduate certificate programs into compliance with the regulations for 735 Certificate programs, the Graduate Council’s Interdisciplinary Certificates for Matriculated Graduate Students, or offer them in conjunction with University Extension using the policy AA150 provision.² b. A distinct

² This recommendation does not apply to courses of study which fulfill licensing requirements or on-going professional graduate continuing education.

nomenclature should be implemented for other non-credit bearing self-supporting programs and special academic events specifying that they may be described by the following terms, course of study, course of instruction, course sequence, workshop or symposium. None of these would convey academic credit or a certificate bearing the UCLA name and seal.

5. The task force observed that departments offering non-degree, non-credit bearing self-supporting programs typically do not have a consistent and permanent system for documenting student enrollment and completion. This becomes important in cases where students may request duplicate certificates of completion or future employers or graduate programs may seek verification of completion of a particular non-degree program. Two permanent student record systems currently exist at UCLA: the UCLA Extension student record system and the campus student record system. Within the campus student record system, course sequences like the 600-level of graduate course numbers which have been set aside for “professional education” courses for non-degree, non-credit bearing classes already exist. The University might explore the possibility of using this sequence or comparable sequences as a way of providing a permanent record of participation and completion of non-degree, non-credit bearing courses.

Recommendation 5: Departments offering non-degree, non-credit bearing self-supporting programs should make provisions to use either the campus student record system or the UCLA Extension student record system to document enrollment and completion of these programs.

6. Several departments described synergies that may arise when hosting both traditional and non-traditional graduate programs (fully employed and traditional MBAs, MS online in Engineering, Post baccalaureate in Classics). To students in the traditional program, these may include the increase in the number of electives offered by the non-traditional program and flexibility in available course times. Departments also described an interest in utilizing the non-traditional or self-supporting program to broaden their pipeline of applicants to the existing graduate degree programs.

Such synergies were not anticipated when the non-traditional program was proposed and may be very beneficial for both programs. The departments further stated that existing policies may impede departments from realizing synergies and benefits of offering nontraditional programs. As one example, UCLA’s policy limiting the number of University Extension concurrent enrollment courses³ that may be applied for credit in a degree program to two prevents students from taking advantage of new electives and may result in students who apply and matriculate in the traditional PhD program having to repeat courses already taken which impedes their PhD program.

Recommendation 6: As it is anticipated that non-traditional and non-degree programs will increase, Graduate Council should consider creating guidelines for departments and FECs on how students may access courses in non-traditional or self-supporting programs and their traditional degree programs. This should include modifying the restriction to offer interested departments to allow matriculated students to apply up to four UCLA Extension concurrent enrollment courses completed for students with a grade of “B” or higher to satisfy the degree requirements.

³ Concurrent courses are regular UCLA graduate courses that matriculated students in the same class may apply for degree credit.

7. Transparency in Financial Considerations: The current policies relating to alternatively scheduled and self-supporting degree programs, <http://www.apb.ucla.edu/Other/SelfSupp.pdf>, require that fees be established at a level sufficient to cover all direct and organizational and campus indirect costs. A financial pro-forma can be found in the Appendix. The policy also requires that such programs reach stable self-sufficiency by the third year of operation and that no General Funds be used in support of the programs after that point. If any subsidy using General Funds is to be provided during the initial three-year period, the request for subsidy must be clearly identified in the self-supporting degree program proposal and on the pro-forma. Summer Sessions and University Extension also have existing practices for costing the delivery of a self-supporting non-degree program through their auspices (See Appendix).

While the rationale for the establishment of both self-supporting degree programs and non-degree self-supporting programs is to broaden the University of California's service to the people of California, there is clearly a financial incentive for the establishment of such programs. It is important to clearly identify the responsibility and authority over the disposition of the program revenue as it relates to the overhead components, and any additional net revenue that might be generated through the establishment of fee levels at market rate. Current campus practice has been to leave the campus indirect costs with the program while some units that might be considered elements of an overhead cost, charge the program directly for services, e.g. accounting, graduate division, registrars, police, and purchasing.

Regarding disposition, the task force believes that transparency in the disposition of overhead should be implemented to assure that secondary support services receive a return of the support needed to maintain excellence in our campus infrastructure. In addition, some believe that all units that are calculated in the overhead components, and that provide services to self-supporting programs should automatically receive cost-recovery funds based on a common formula without the need to engage in annual negotiations with the programs' faculty/staff. Others believe that this is a resource decision and is currently dealt with through the application of Central Administrative Fees approved through the POSSSE process, or through Chancellorial decisions.

Recommendation 7: a. All degree and non-degree self-supporting programs should be held to the same financial policy standards, that is, they must be able to cover all direct costs and organizational and campus indirect costs within three years from inception. b. In addition, there must be a clear, documented agreement between the dean and the department regarding the disposition of net revenue (absent overhead) generated by the self-supporting program. c. The EVC and POSSEE should inform the campus regarding disposition of indirect funds to infrastructure units that provide service to the self-supporting degree and non-degree programs

8. Use of Technology: The very goals of self-supporting programs – to share UCLA's scholarship with a larger population of interested citizens of California and the world and to provide them with knowledge of emerging fields and new technologies – suggest the likelihood that many of those programs will involve the use of innovative digital tools and delivery methods for teaching and learning. The use of technology in the classroom can significantly enhance student access to lectures and enables students to focus on content and discussion in the classroom. Use of web-based

interactive learning tools should enhance both the teaching and the learning of concepts. This use of technology in education is recognized as important and is encouraged.

Recommendation 8: Proposals for new self-supporting programs that rely heavily on digital technologies in the delivery of instruction should explain in the proposal for the program how those technologies will enhance learning and provide access to a larger and more diverse student population.

9. Roles and Responsibilities for Self-Supporting Programs: It is expected that self-supporting degree programs and non-degree self-supporting programs will originate with departmental faculties and be evaluated by the dean cognizant of the department's mission and financial status prior to a formal proposal for the establishment of the program to the School/College FEC.

For new degree programs, Graduate Certificate programs described in the Academic Senate Manual, self-supporting programs administered through University Extension, and policies regarding course credit toward a degree, approval should go through the approved channels of review. This review process includes a mandatory consideration by the department, the appropriate FEC, the dean, and, where appropriate, the Graduate or Undergraduate Council, and Executive Committee of the Senate. For graduate degree programs and 735 Certificates, review by the CCGA and the Office of the President is also required. Once the program enters the formal Senate review process, the financial pro-forma is reviewed by APB as to the financial viability of the program. APB will provide its analysis to the relevant Senate committee for their deliberations, and will discuss the analysis with the EVC/Provost prior to his final consideration of the campus Senate review.

Non-degree academic self-supporting programs are often offered through either University Extension or Summer Sessions, and the existing review consists of the department and Extension and/ or college dean. We are not recommending any change to this current review process. If a department or other academic unit develops a non-degree academic self-supporting program proposal without the coordination and assistance of University Extension or Summer Sessions, the task force recommends following the same process of review, although with the addition of advisory input from a selected Senate group, such as the existing Senate Committee on Continuing and Community Education (CCCE) or the Committee on International Education and the review by APB. Departmental proposals would then go to the EVC/Provost for final approval.

Non-academic programs are not the purview of the Academic Senate. Nonetheless, approval should be required to justify the use of the UCLA name in conjunction with the quality of the program and to ensure that resources from existing degree programs or from campus infrastructure are not diverted to support such non-degree programs. Thus, if a non-academic program is offered by an academic unit, a proposal should be made by the faculty to the department chair, the dean and APB; and their recommendations should be forwarded to the EVC/ Provost for final approval.

Coordination of the various entities involved in creating, approving, offering and reviewing educational programs designed to be self-supporting is critical for their ongoing success. Because University Extension, the International Education Office, and Summer and Special Programs are so

critical to the development and maintenance of self-supporting programs, the task force was concerned that there are not clear guidelines as to which program operates which type of program and that differences appeared to exist in the cost-structure for supporting such programs. Comments were made that faculty are confused by the current lack of transparency regarding cost and support options for self-supporting programs. The task force members were pleased to learn that the Provost and Senate Chair are leading a process to clarify overlap in authority for academic and non-academic self-supporting programs.

Due to the complexity of the sets of policies and coordinating bodies involved in the process of submitting a non-traditional and self-supporting program, the task force believes that clear guidance be made available describing the proposal process. Draft Proposal Guidelines for a non-degree self-supporting program can be found in the Appendix. A broad guidance document was proposed by the Revenue Task Force in spring, 2009 that would consolidate the policies and describe the process for approval. Completion of this document would be helpful. Further, having a knowledgeable body available to answer faculty questions possibly within the Academic Senate, would facilitate the process and likely would speed the process of approval. An annual training program could be offered to inform faculty and chairs about the process to submit a proposed self-supporting program.

Recommendation 9: a. The process to submit a non-degree self-supporting program should incorporate a brief proposal based on the Proposal Guidelines (see Appendix) that guides the developing faculty through a structured process. b. For academic self-supporting proposals not being coordinated by University Extension or Summer Sessions the proposal should be reviewed by the department (or multiple departments if interdisciplinary), dean, FEC, APB, and an appropriate Senate body, potentially CCCE and/or CIE, with recommendations to the Provost. c. Non-academic self-supporting programs should be reviewed by the department chair, the dean and by APB, with a recommendation for approval to the EVC/Provost. d. Each original proposal must contain the vote of the faculty (eligible, in favor, opposed, and abstaining) for the program.

10. Self-supporting programs should be reviewed annually for the first 3 years by APB to determine the financial viability. The self-supporting program should then be reviewed in Year 3 by the Academic Senate and incorporated into the regular 8 year departmental review.

Recommendation 10: Once approved, the financial and academic aspects of self-supporting programs need to be reviewed regularly and incorporated in the departmental or research unit's review schedule.

Appendix

Policies related to creation, review, approval and implementation of self-supporting degree and non-degree programs

Bylaws of the Academic Senate; Sec. 51, “Curricular Authority”; Sec. 170 “Educational Policy”
<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/SenateLinks/UCBylaws.pdf>

Certificate of Completion of Graduate Education (735)
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/rpart3.html>

Delegation of Authority to the Dean of Graduate Division
<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committee/gc/DELEGATION.pdf>

Guide to Undergraduate Course and Program Approval
http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/ugc/documents/CourseApprovalGuide2009_FINAL_Rev.pdf

EVC Report on Approval Processes
http://www.evc.ucla.edu/reports/approval_processes.pdf

Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Certificates for Matriculated Graduate Students
http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/gc/documents/IDCforMatricGradStudents_ProceduresandGuidelines.pdf

Guidelines for the Graduate Admissions Process and Codification of the Policies and Procedures Governing Graduate Admissions
<http://www.gdnet.ucla.edu/gasaa/library/gccodific.pdf>

Interdisciplinary Certificates for Matriculated Graduate Students (ICMGS)
http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/gc/documents/IDCforMatricGradStudents_ProceduresandGuidelines.pdf

Policy on Part Time Study
<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/3-17-81.html>

Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs
<http://www.apb.ucla.edu/Other/SelfSupp.pdf>

Regulations of the Academic Senate
 Ch. 4, Sec. 730: Certificates
<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/SenateLinks/UCRegulations.pdf>

Responsibility for Approval of Name Changes of Graduate Degree Programs
<http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/da/da2021b.html>

UCLA Academic Senate Manual; Part II: Regulations of the Division,

Chapter III. Graduate Regulations. Section 6. Graduate Level Certificates

<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/FormsDocs/regs/ch3-6.htm#R702>

UCLA DA 705.02: Use of the University Affiliation by Faculty and Non-Senate Academic Personnel

http://www.delegations.ucla.edu/UCLA_DA_Results.asp?Sort=da_0705_02

University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, And Research Units

<http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/accomp/>

Example of Cost Calculations for Summer Sessions

Revenue =

- Program and/or unit fees x participants
- (Return-to-aid deducted from revenue if appropriate)

Direct Expenses =

- Marketing and promotion
- Instructional expenses
- Facilities rental
- Transportation
- Incidentals

Indirect Expenses =

- Campus overhead

Net

- Profit returned in full to sponsoring department(s)

Cost Analysis for Self-Supporting Program Fee Proposals**2010-11****Campus:** UCLA**Program:** 0**YEAR-AVERAGE ENROLLMENTS**

	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Estimated	2010-11 Projected
State-supported FTE Enrollment			
1 School Enrollment	602	592	615
2 Campus Enrollment (GC + Health Sci)	38,499	38,810	38,962
Self-supporting FTE Enrollments*			
3 Public Health	84.00	69	69
4 Law/LLM	57.72	71	72
5 Financial Engineering	33.00	35	39
6 Fully Employed MBA	592.00	610	635
7 Engineering	51.22	80	95
8 Executive MBA	140.00	143	146
9a Education	87.00	93	92
9b Dentistry	24.33	25	27
9c Cooperative MBA/Singapore	47.00	38	34
10 Total School Enrollment	686	661	684
11 Total Campus Enrollment	39,615	39,974	40,171
Year-Average Headcount Students - This Program			
12 class/cohort 1	40	30	39
13 class/cohort 2	44	39	30
14 class/cohort 3	0	0	0
15 Total	84	69	69
16 Conversion Ratio	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Fees by Class - This Program			
17 class/cohort 1	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
18 class/cohort 2	\$20,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
19 class/cohort 3	\$0	\$0	\$0
Estimated Fee Revenue			
20 class 1	\$880,000	\$660,000	\$858,000
21 class 2	\$880,000	\$858,000	\$660,000
22 class 3	\$0	\$0	\$0
23 Total Fee Revenue	\$1,760,000	\$1,518,000	\$1,518,000

*36 graduate units per year (24 at UCB) = 1 FTE student.

Based on Corporate Student System data.

Cost Analysis for Self-Supporting Program Fee Proposals**2010-11**

Campus: UCLA

Program: 0

YEAR-AVERAGE ENROLLMENTS

	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Estimated	2010-11 Projected
State-supported FTE Enrollment			
1 School Enrollment	602	592	615
2 Campus Enrollment (GC + Health Sci)	38,499	38,810	38,962
Self-supporting FTE Enrollments*			
3 Public Health	84.00	69	69
4 Law/LLM	57.72	71	72
5 Financial Engineering	33.00	35	39
6 Fully Employed MBA	592.00	610	635
7 Engineering	51.22	80	95
8 Executive MBA	140.00	143	146
9a Education	87.00	93	92
9b Dentistry	24.33	25	27
9c Cooperative MBA/Singapore	47.00	38	34
10 Total School Enrollment	686	661	684
11 Total Campus Enrollment	39,615	39,974	40,171
Year-Average Headcount Students - This Program			
12 class/cohort 1	40	30	39
13 class/cohort 2	44	39	30
14 class/cohort 3	0	0	0
15 Total	84	69	69
16 Conversion Ratio	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Fees by Class - This Program			
17 class/cohort 1	\$22,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
18 class/cohort 2	\$20,000	\$22,000	\$22,000
19 class/cohort 3	\$0	\$0	\$0
Estimated Fee Revenue			
20 class 1	\$880,000	\$660,000	\$858,000
21 class 2	\$880,000	\$858,000	\$660,000
22 class 3	\$0	\$0	\$0
23 Total Fee Revenue	\$1,760,000	\$1,518,000	\$1,518,000

*36 graduate units per year (24 at UCB) = 1 FTE student.

Based on Corporate Student System data.

**UCLA Extension
Self-Supporting MA Degree Template**

Variables:

Number of Students in each cohort:	
Number of Courses to complete degree program:	
Expected number of quarters to complete degree program:	
Expected number of courses taken per student per quarter:	
Number of courses offered per quarter:	

"Enrollments" generated per quarter:	-
Enrollment per course:	0

Revenue:

<input type="text"/>	Reg. Fee X	0	Students:		\$0
<input type="text"/>	Per Course Fee X	0	Students: X	0 courses per student:	\$0
Total Revenue:					\$0

Direct Expenses:

Per Enrollment:

Materials:	<input type="text"/>	X	- enrollments	\$0
------------	----------------------	---	---------------	-----

Per Course:

Instruction:	<input type="text"/>	X	0 courses	\$0
Space Costs:	<input type="text"/>	X	0 courses	\$0

Per Quarter:

Promotion	<input type="text"/>	\$0
UCLA Administration:	<input type="text"/>	\$0
UNEX Administration:	<input type="text"/>	\$0

Total Direct Expenses:		\$0
UNEX Administrative Overhead Percent		\$0
Campus Dept. Administrative Overhead Percent:		\$0
Total Expenses:		\$0

Net Revenue:		\$0
---------------------	--	------------

UCLA Percentage of Revenue:	<input type="text"/>	\$0
UNEX Percentage of Revenue:	<input type="text"/>	\$0

Proposal Guidelines for Non-degree Self-Supporting Programs

Please address the following points succinctly in your proposal to create a new non-degree Self-Supporting Program (SSP). Once the proposal has been voted on by the department, the department chair should submit the completed proposal, along with the vote of the department (ayes, nays, abstentions, and eligible voters) to the dean for evaluation and a letter of support. The completed proposal, along with the dean's letters, should then be submitted to the FEC for its approval. The FEC will forward the proposal and its recommendation Academic Planning and Budget and, depending on the target audience for the program, the appropriate Senate Committee its approval.

Understanding the Department's Intent for the SSP

1. What are the intended academic goals of the program? How does the proposed curriculum offer students an opportunity to achieve those goals? Please include a list of proposed courses as well as a brief description of their content.
2. Who is the intended audience, and does the SSP open up new or underserved audiences that fit within the university's mission? Please describe the analysis performed and results obtained to determine an appropriate market is available.
3. How much do the SSP and existing programs overlap in goals, mission and target audience? Does the SSP include existing UCLA courses, and if so, how do the SSP course offerings differ in location or scheduling from existing course?
4. What is the intent for creating the SSP and how congruent is it with the mission of the university and the department's educational program? How does the proposed program contribute to meeting campus strategic goals and priorities, as outlined in the 2010 Academic Plan (http://evc.ucla.edu/reports/streamlined_plan_100106.pdf) and 2010 Strategic Plan for Diversity (<http://www.diversity.ucla.edu/strategicplan/>)?
5. How will the program enhance the reputation of the department, school, and university? Please identify the marketing channels and media that will be deployed to promote the program.
6. If the SSP may offer course credit toward degree above, will this SSP create a *Substantive Change*, as defined by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (<http://www.wascenior.org/subchange>), such as making at least 50% of the required coursework for a degree available at another institute away from the campus *or* coursework offered through another forms of "distance" or "correspondence" education?

Understanding the Structure and Administration of the SSP

1. Describe the faculty, both departmental and non-departmental, who will be participating in the SSP. If courses will be taught by non-ladder rank faculty, how will the faculty be selected?
2. Describe the proposed student recruitment process? For degree programs, describe ways in which it varies from the departmental standard process.
3. What is the financial model, including a time-line for reaching financial stability that includes no use of State support? (Please complete and attach the financial template). Explain the revenue sharing plan between department and dean. Are you requesting a subsidy, and if so, for how many years?
4. What structures will be in place to ensure faculty oversight of and responsibility for the program?
5. What are the strategies that will be used to evaluate the quality, success, and learning outcomes of the program? How do these vary, if they do, from those established for the comparable programs in the department, IDP or school? Who will be responsible for collecting and maintaining these data if they are collected outside of the usual undergraduate or graduate channels? Are there other evaluation criteria beyond the specific learning outcomes that are appropriate and valuable from this SSP (e.g. research, teacher training, faculty development)?

Please submit for review any contractual agreement that might be contemplated between the university and any private company that might be retained to support the SSP, including recruitment of applicants.