

A Review of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy

**Resolving Contradictions and Redefining
the Program for the 21st Century**

**Submitted by CUCSA
June, 2008**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	2
Excerpt from the Minutes of The Regents' Subcommittee on Fees, December 15, 1953:	3
Calculating Fees and Clarifying Faculty Privileges	4
Establishing a Consistent Process for Admission.....	4
Applicability to Graduate Study	6
Applicability to Professional Schools	7
Appendix 1	9
Fee Waiver Program Policy Statements and Background	9
PPSM Employee Development, 51 Reduced Fee Enrollment	10
Planning and Budget Manual Section 6, Exemptions, Waivers, and Fee Reductions	11
Appendix 2	12
Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs	12
Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs	17

Executive Summary

CUCSA considers it a high priority to raise the awareness of university leadership about the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy and issues resulting from inconsistent implementation throughout the system. CUCSA strongly recommends that university leaders begin a thorough review of this program. We encourage leaders to create a team charged with:

- *Continuing the tradition of progressive leadership that created this program in 1953;*
- *Evaluating and resolving issues raised in this paper;*
- *Creating clear and comprehensive policies and guidelines specific to this program to ensure that the program's benefits are provided equitably to all eligible staff, academics and retirees;*
- *Articulating the vision and value of the program in the contemporary university setting;*
- *Advancing the impact of this program by eliminating as many barriers as possible for those who wish to participate.*

Introduction

The Reduced Fee Enrollment Program is an important component of UC's employment benefits portfolio, helping attract and retain talented staff. The program has been a feature of staff personnel policies for more than 50 years, and provides a tremendous opportunity for staff to pursue a UC education that will enhance their careers at the university. The program directly contributes to building a well educated, competent, and loyal staff workforce. However, the program is currently administered in differing manners at each campus. For many staff attempting to utilize the reduced fee program, the obscurity of the process can become a source of frustration and dissatisfaction.

Lack of comprehensive systemwide guidelines leaves implementation decisions to each campus. While adapting to local culture is often positive, in this case, it has led to misinterpretations of policy and inconsistencies in access to the program. Some of the problems can be easily resolved. For example, variations in fee calculation methodology can be resolved by modifying existing policy language to provide clearer definitions of terms. Other issues are more complex and are not addressed in current or historic policy documents. Such issues include admission requirements and applicability to graduate study.

The strong and progressive support of staff demonstrated by the Regents in 1953 is perhaps of greater importance to the university today than it was in the early years of the program. UC will compete in a tighter market for the best and brightest staff workforce in the years ahead. Reduced fee enrollment can be an important incentive if the variety of problems that today's staff encounter when attempting to use this program are resolved. CUCSA recommends a thorough review and update of the Reduced Fee Enrollment Policy to address many long-

standing contradictions, and to ensure that this excellent program can be a cornerstone of future staff recruitment and retention efforts.

Excerpt from the Minutes of The Regents' Subcommittee on Fees, December 15, 1953:

To begin this discussion it is useful to review the text of the December 1953 Regents' Minutes -- the earliest record CUCSA located when documenting the history of this program.

"The President advised that the University Personnel Rules provide that employees may enroll in University courses with the approval of their department heads and the personnel officer. Full-time employees have been limited to three units, or one course, and they pay all the usual student fees.

He went on to say that a proposal had been submitted to him that such employees be permitted to register on a reduced fee basis, and the Coordinating Committee on Fees after reviewing the proposal had recommended that employees desiring to register as students under the existing personnel rules be permitted to enroll upon payment of 50% of the incidental fee; that employees so registered be ineligible for the services and facilities of the Counseling Center, the Gymnasia or Student Health Services (other than for required vaccinations and screening examinations for contagious diseases); and that the reduced fee should not apply to summer sessions or University Extension courses. The President advised that approval of these recommendations would not result in additional cost to the University. Further, he advised that these employees are not able to take advantage of the Counseling Center, the Gymnasia or Student Health Service for which the incidental fee is collected. No reduction in summer sessions or University Extension courses was being recommended for the reason that these two activities are self supporting.

Regent McLaughlin stated that while his Subcommittee on Fees had not considered this problem, he believed it to be a simple matter of justice. The other members of the Committee concurred, and upon motion of Regent Carter voted to present the proposal to the Regents."

With this action The Regents established a program that is exceptionally important to staff. Over the years, access to this program was extended to academic employees and retirees. CUCSA presents the following information about the program's policy and implementation issues, and offers recommendations that we believe would resolve problems for staff. Although we have focused on the staff perspective, we believe that revisiting the original

intent of the program and creating clear implementation guidelines will benefit a broad cross-section of the university community.

Calculating Fees and Clarifying Faculty Privileges

Although the terminology used to describe student enrollment costs and the percentage of discount available to staff has changed over the past five decades, current guidelines in the Personnel Policies for Staff Members and the Planning and Budget Manual (see Appendix 1) state that staff are required to pay one third of registration fee and one-third of the education fee. These policy documents also repeat the prohibitions on using services and facilities of the university that are provided exclusively to students, as was first approved by The Regents in 1953.

However, fees paid by staff participating in the reduced fee program are calculated inconsistently by campuses, resulting in some staff also paying one-third of the special fees established to cover costs for student services and facilities such as recreation centers and sports complexes. The conflict arises when staff who have paid for a portion of a facility fee, expect access to services which are available only to students. CUCSA learned of instances in which staff successfully argued that they should have access to the facilities because they paid the fees, and were issued a student ID card in addition to their staff ID card.

Suggestions:

1. Provide explicit clarification of what fees are included and excluded from calculations for reduced fee program participants.
2. Include language clarifying that staff obtaining an education under the reduced fee program should not be considered "students" in the traditional sense. Staff enrolled in courses through the reduced fee program are a special category of student because their primary affiliation with the university is that of a staff employee.
3. Clearly state that staff are not entitled to student ID cards, nor can they use the specified student services and facilities.

Establishing a Consistent Process for Admission Under the Reduced Fee Enrollment Program

In researching this program's history, CUCSA observed that early statements of policy defining the program made no mention of admission requirements prior to enrollment under the reduced fee program. The first occurrence of such language appears in the January 30, 1974 revision of the Planning and Budget Manual. This 1974 policy states

"an employee who registers under this policy must meet the admissions requirements of the University."

This statement appeared in the next several generations of the Planning and Budget Manual, but is not included in several recent years of documentation of annual reduced fee enrollment guidelines published on the UCOP Budget Office web site. (<http://budget.ucop.edu/fees/200708/0708exempt.html>)

Even though the Planning and Budget documentation included the admission requirement language for several years and later dropped the reference, equivalent language is still included in the Personnel Policies for Staff Members which states:

"A regular status employee who meets the admission requirements of the University is eligible for two-thirds reduction of both the University Registration Fee and the Educational Fee when enrolled in regular session courses of up to nine units or three courses per quarter or semester, whichever provides the greater benefit to the employee."

Neither policy document offers any guidance or procedures for confirming that the staff member "meets the admission requirements of the University." As a result of this ambiguity, campuses default to requiring staff to be formally admitted in the highly competitive admission process. This creates tremendous inequalities in access to the program across the system.

CUCSA believes this outcome results from a basic lack of clarity of a single point: *staff enrolling in classes under the fee waiver program are a special category of students*. They are *staff* who are eligible to enroll in courses and earn credits under a special program that is only available to them because they are employees. CUCSA emphasizes this point, because lack of clarity on this single point generates the majority of inconsistencies in this program as campuses attempt to fit employee reduced fee use into policies created for traditional, full time students.

Another equity concern is access to reduced course fee programs for university employees who do not work at a comprehensive campus. Staff employees at campuses such as San Francisco, Cooperative Extension, and the Office of the President often must attend a neighboring campus. Guidelines on access to this program should address staff admission and enrollment at locations other than their campus of employment.

Suggestions:

1. Eliminate language that requires eligible staff to meet the admission requirements of the university.
2. If suggestion #1 is not accepted, establish a formal process and clear guidelines for reviewing admission status outside of the traditional, competitive admission process. Clarify whether the admission process differs if the employee is simply taking a few courses of interest versus working to complete a degree. Clarify whether admission requirements differ for undergraduate and graduate level coursework. Ensure that standards are applied equally at all locations.

3. Create a clear guideline for admission procedures for staff enrolling in courses at a campus other than their campus of employment.
4. Address corollary issues including whether continued enrollment under this program is dependent upon maintaining a particular grade point average, and whether courses can be taken for pass/no pass or audited.
5. Publish policies and guidelines related to this program separately from the Personnel Policies for Staff Members, since academics and retirees are also eligible to participate in this program.

Applicability to Graduate Study

An example of a complex topic that is not addressed in the Reduced Fee Enrollment policy documents is applicability of the reduced fee program to graduate study. The 1999 letter and policy statement issued by President Atkinson states that the reduced fee program is not applicable to part-time, self-supporting professional programs (see Appendix 2). However, historic and current policy documents do not clearly address whether the reduced fee program is applicable to all graduate programs not defined as a “part-time self-supporting professional program”.

It would be reasonable to conclude that the specificity of the aforementioned policy statement implies that staff can enroll in any other type of graduate program using the reduced fee enrollment program. However, there is at least one campus where the graduate council has ruled that staff are only allowed to utilize the reduced fee for non-professional graduate programs that offer a “part-time” masters degree program. While the graduate council on each campus plays a vital role in campus academic programs, leaving decisions about implementation of the reduced fee program to the council without providing clear policy guidance for their reference is unfair to both the council and the staff members wishing to use this program.

One of the underlying issues in considering applicability of the reduced fee enrollment program to graduate study is “time to degree” expectations. Here, again, CUCSA feels that it is important to highlight that *staff enrolling in classes under the reduced fee program are a special category of students*. They are staff who are eligible to enroll in courses and earn credits under a special program that is only available to them because they are employees. The program, by design, directly impacts the time it takes to complete a degree. It strictly limits units. It would be impossible for staff enrolling under this program to complete any graduate degree in the standard length of time. Does this mean that the reduced fee is not available for graduate study? There is no policy to indicate that this program is only available for undergraduate study. CUCSA believes that clear policy and implementation guidelines that acknowledge this intentionally-imposed restriction would help to resolve this problem. The policy should explain that the intent of the unit restriction is not to prohibit graduate study, but to limit units and course load in recognition of the fact that staff participating in the reduced fee program must work 50-100% time to qualify for the program.

Clear systemwide program guidelines are needed to ensure consistency in practice on all campuses, and to improve access for staff.

Suggestions:

Clearly state that the reduced fee enrollment program covers undergraduate *and* graduate programs.

1. Explain why time-to-degree is not to be treated in the same manor as is the practice for traditional graduate students.

Applicability to Professional Schools

The University of California is home to many world-class professional schools. Fees associated with these programs are significantly higher than other graduate academic programs. The amount of state funding provided for these schools also varies from traditional academic programs. So, it would be very easy to assume that these programs would not be eligible for the fee waiver program. However, the letter and policy statement issued by President Atkinson (see Appendix 2) very clearly specifies that the fee waiver program may not be used for “part-time self-supporting professional programs”. Does this mean that the full-time programs are open to staff enrolled under the fee waiver program?

Again, CUCSA was unable to locate any other policy documents discussing this issue. While it might be difficult to imagine a staff member attending medical school on a part-time basis, it is much easier to visualize a staff member completing an MBA under the fee waiver program. If we look at the educational opportunities provided by professional schools in terms of the coursework necessary to complete the program, it is easier to see similarities between professional school programs and other graduate academic programs. From this perspective, the fee waiver program issues that come to the forefront are the same as those raised for other graduate academic programs: admission requirements and time-to-degree.

CUCSA is not ‘advocating’ that all graduate professional programs be open to staff using the fee waiver program. Instead, we encourage university leaders to revisit the question, focusing on improving access for staff to all academic programs of the university. How might the university benefit if staff gained additional professional education? It would seem desirable to allow staff employees to hone their management skills in an MBA program, or to allow a nurse to seek an advanced degree, or perhaps an affirmative action investigator to study law. Are there ways to accomplish this with new guidelines for using the fee waiver program at professional schools? Would it be feasible if stricter access guidelines applied or perhaps greater length of service requirements applied?

CUCSA respectfully asks that this topic be addressed in a comprehensive review of the fee waiver program, and that the intent and applicability of the fee waiver program to professional school education be clearly articulated in policies and implementation guidelines.

Suggestions:

1. Evaluate the relevance of the subject matter of each professional school in terms of UC business, research, and patient care activities typically performed by staff. Identify which programs and skill sets would benefit university operations if such knowledge and skills were possessed by staff members.
2. Consider the fee structures for professional schools and identify any components of the fees that might be reduced or waived for part-time study by UC employees.
2. Define any special requirements for use of the fee waiver program at approved professional schools.

Appendix 1

Fee Waiver Program Policy Statements and Background

CUCSA researched the policy history of this topic, and identified four key statements of policy. These documents served as our compass, and were used to compare how the fee waiver program is currently implemented at locations throughout the system. These documents also illuminated how various local practices diverge from the intent of the program's sponsors. The four significant documents related to this program are:

1. Regents Minutes, December 15, 1953
2. Planning and Budget Manual
3. Personnel Policies for Staff Members
4. Letter and Policy from President Atkinson on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

The Regents' minutes quoted at the beginning of this document were identified as the earliest written statement indicating the purpose and intent of the program. When first adopted, the program was available only to staff employees. In April, 1967, Acting President Wellman expanded the program to include academic employees. No policy documents or Regents' Minutes were found that authorized extension of this benefit to retirees, but current language in the Personnel Policies for Staff Members extends this benefit to retirees.

The next two key policy documents, the Planning and Budget Manual and the Personnel Policies for Staff Members, restate in contemporary terminology, the parameters of the program. Article 51 of the Personnel Policies for Staff Members covers the fee waiver program, and the excerpt provided below was issued in 1999. CUCSA was not able to locate earlier versions of this item. Section 6 of the Planning and Budget Manual also addresses this program. CUCSA observed that the description of the fee waiver program in the Planning and Budget Manual remained consistent through all revisions that were identified dating from the 1970's to present. The only significant change during that period was the addition of the last sentence excluding part-time, self-supporting graduate professional education from the program. It was added following issuance of the 1996 letter and policy document from President Atkinson regarding self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs (see Appendix 2).

The letter and policy document from President Atkinson is the last of the four key policy documents identified by CUCSA. The only paragraph that applies to the fee waiver program is found in Section V:

"E. University employees enrolled in self-supporting part-time professional degree programs are not eligible for reduced course fees. However, this provision does not preclude the option of the UC employer subsidizing a portion of the fee.

CUCSA includes this document as a key policy to emphasize that when considering the issue of applicability of the fee waiver program to graduate study, the subjects of graduate programs in general, and graduate professional degree programs, should not be erroneously confused with policies on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs. The entire letter and policy documents are included in Appendix 2.

These 4 documents are the primary written resources on the program and provide insight as to the purpose, spirit and intended breadth of the program. The Regents originally approved this program as a benefit to staff employees. CUCSA considers this program an important component of staff retention and career advancement initiatives. CUCSA asks university leaders to engage in an active review of policies that support this program, to ensure it can continue to serve the goals of the university in the 21st century and provide a meaningful benefit to staff.

Key excerpts from the Planning and Budget Manual and the Personnel Policies for Staff Members are provided for your reference:

Personnel Policies for Staff Members Employee Development, 51 Reduced Fee Enrollment – August 1, 1999

"A. GENERAL

A regular status employee who meets the admission requirements of the University is eligible for two-thirds reduction of both the University Registration Fee and the Educational Fee when enrolled in regular session courses of up to nine units or three courses per quarter or semester, whichever provides the greater benefit to the employee. Full fees will be assessed when an eligible employee's enrollment exceeds both nine units and three courses.

Employees who are eligible to receive reduced fees under this policy are not eligible to receive an additional reduction in fees under the Policy and Procedures Concerning Part-Time Study.

B. ELIGIBILITY FOR STUDENT SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The reduced fee enrollment provision does not include access to student services and facilities provided through the University Registration Fee, which includes but is not limited to the Counseling Center, gymnasiums, or the Student Health Services, unless the employee is otherwise entitled to them.

Applicability: All Regular Status Staff Members"

The Planning and Budget Manual Section 6, Exemptions, Waivers, and Fee Reductions

"...The following individuals may enroll in regular session courses not to exceed three courses or nine units per quarter or semester, whichever provides the greater benefit to the employee, upon payment of one-third of the University Registration Fee charged at each campus and one-third of the Educational Fee:

Regular status staff employees in career positions and not represented by an exclusive representative; all academic employees appointed at more than fifty percent time in positions other than titles where student status is a condition of employment and not represented by an exclusive representative; and former University employees who have retired within four months of the date of separation from University service and who are annuitants of a retirement system to which the University contributes.

For staff and academic employees represented by an exclusive representative, the applicable memorandum of understanding should be consulted.

An employee so registered is ineligible for services and facilities of the counseling center, gymnasiums, or the student health services, other than those to which an employee is otherwise entitled. Fee refunds are allowed under the same procedures applicable to regular students (see Section 7).

The reduced fee program does not apply to any self-supported degree programs, such as part-time or Evening MBA programs."

Appendix 2

June 24, 1996

CHANCELLORS

Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Dear Colleagues:

Enclosed is the new Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs. The enclosed Policy has incorporated many of the recommendations arising from an extensive review and comment by campuses and by the Academic Senate. I believe that it now offers both strong encouragement and firm guidance to campuses that wish to extend their academic offerings to new groups of students in new ways.

Appended to the new Policy are Implementation Guidelines. The Guidelines have also benefited from advice from the campuses and Senate. The Executive Budget Committee, Academic Planning Council, and Council of Vice Chancellors are continuing to discuss issues related to support permanent ladder faculty FTE positions. However, I believe that these discussions can continue in tandem with issuance of the Policy and Guidelines.

Please direct any questions that you have about this new policy to Provost Jud King.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Atkinson
President

Enclosure

cc:

Provost King
Council of Vice Chancellors
Academic Council Chair Leiman
Associate Vice President Hershman
Assistant Vice President Smith
Members, Academic Planning Council

POLICY ON SELF-SUPPORTING PART-TIME GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

Preamble

The University has entered an era in which state funding for higher education has been reduced and is not expected to represent in the future the proportion of the University's budget that it has in the past. This poses two potentially interrelated challenges: How can the University extend its degree programs to serve new groups of students? And how can the University find new and creative ways to fund its degree programs?

In 1994, the UC Task Force on Part-time Professional Master's Degree Programs advocated that UC expand such opportunities for groups of clearly defined students not now served by UC's regular programs. In 1995, the Advisory Committee on Policy for High Fee Part-Time Professional Programs urged the University to create a climate of encouragement and support for creative new approaches to delivering part-time professional education. This policy is a revision of UC's 7-30-79 Policy on Part-Time Off-Campus Professional Graduate Degree Programs, based on advice from both these groups.

The purpose for offering part-time graduate professional degree programs is to serve a public need. Once the need has been identified, the next decision should be whether the program should be self-supporting. As a matter of course, it is likely that the more specifically a program addresses training needs for a profession, the likelier it is that the program should be self-supporting. Market factors play a key role in making this decision and guiding appropriate fee levels.

Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs should adhere to the same UC academic standards as do other graduate degree programs.

The University should consider expanding flexible part-time pathways to graduate professional degrees to accommodate academically qualified working adults who cannot be full-time students. Extending the opportunity to enroll part-time in professional master's graduate degree programs to those who need to continue their employment while studying is consistent with the University's mission in graduate professional education. As provided by Academic Senate Regulation 694, courses to satisfy the requirements of such programs may be given, either in whole or in part, at off-campus sites. The following outlines University policy relative to self-supporting part-time graduate professional programs, offered in both on-campus and off-campus locations and through electronic means.

I. General

- A. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be undertaken only when a demonstrated need for a part-time program in a specific field of study exists. Justification for expansion of part-time programming depends on a careful definition of the pools of employed people who need such degrees and the ability of the University to provide appropriate graduate degrees of quality to them.
- B. Such programs shall not be undertaken if they strain the resources of the department that sponsors them or have an adverse effect on regular programs on campus. If the campus determines that the part-time graduate professional degree program should be offered on a self-supporting basis,* such programs should set the goal of becoming fully self-supporting as quickly as possible; "self-supporting" means that MI program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead, should be covered by student fees or other non-state funds. The sponsors of each proposed self-supporting program should submit a fiscal phase-in plan with their request for approval of proposed student fees to the Office of the President.
- C. By expanding self-supporting programming that serves practitioners, the department may have access to additional field-based resources (working students, their employers, and field-based lecturers) that it might not otherwise be able to afford. Therefore, these programs should be undertaken in partnership with the profession served.
- D. Courses may be offered on-campus, at appropriate off-campus locations, or in a combination of on-campus and off-campus facilities. The possibility of using distance technologies (computer- and video-based, e-mail, etc.) should also be engaged as appropriate.

II. Relationship to Regular On-Campus Programs

- A. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs should be held to the same standards of quality as regular programs, as determined by the appropriate Graduate Council. Because students should meet the same standards of quality in the part-time and regular programs, provisions should be made that allow students to transfer between programs. Campuses may also determine

*In this policy, "self-supporting" is used for part-time programs that are supported with non-state finds only; the State General Fund subsidy has been removed from the part-time program.

which courses are available to students in both programs, keeping in mind that regular and part-time programs should have comparable availability of faculty and courses.

- B. Any part-time programs should be established by academic departments And staffed with ladder-rank faculty on the same basis as regular programs. Certain practice-oriented degree programs may warrant a higher proportion of non-regular faculty (e.g., clinical/adjunct faculty, lecturers, visitors) but that proportion must be in keeping with the standards of each campus' Graduate Council. Courses offered in these programs should be taught by a mix of faculty members that parallels the mix of faculty in regular programs. When regular programs employ some combination of Senate faculty and guest lecturers or consultants, courses for part-time programs may use a similar combination. Under no circumstances shall anyone teach in part-time programs whose appointment has not been subject to the appropriate academic review.
- C. Self-supporting programs will not be funded from State General Funds and Reports of state-funded enrollments will exclude students in self-supporting programs. However, these enrollments will be reported to the Office of the President as a separate category which is not counted against the campus budgeted (statefunded) enrollment target. During the approved phase-in period, distribution of enrollment between state and non-state targets will conform to specifications of the phase-in plan.
- D. The Dean of the school or college offering the program and the Academic Vice Chancellor are responsible for assuring that program publicity and marketing meet the highest standards of quality and accuracy.
- E. Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be administered in cooperation with University Extension where and when appropriate.

III. Initiation and Review Procedures

- A. Departments, groups of departments, or schools offering graduate professional degree programs under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division may propose that such programs be offered in whole or in part at off-campus sites or by distance learning technologies.
- B. Such proposals must be approved by campus Graduate Councils, as well as by appropriate campus administrators.
- C. Graduate Councils or other duly appointed campus review bodies shall review such programs as part of regularly scheduled campus program reviews, on the same basis on which regular academic programs are reviewed.

IV. Admission and Enrollment

- A. Admission standards for the part-time program should be comparable in effect to those for the regular program.
- B. Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.
- C. Access to courses offered as part of these programs must be equally available to all qualified students. No preference in enrollment may be given to members of any non-University sponsoring organization.
- D. Admission criteria may specify some type or period of work experience in the field.

V. Student Fees and Program Funding

- A. The President is responsible for reviewing and recommending to The Regents any proposed self-supporting program fees for part-time graduate professional degree programs and subsequent increases or decreases.
- B. Self-supporting program fees should be levied such that as quickly as possible they will cover all program costs.
- C. Self-supporting program fees should be based on a full and accurate assessment of all program costs, including but not limited to faculty instructional costs, program support costs, student services costs, and overhead. The proposed self-supporting fee, its phase-in plan, and its justification shall be submitted with the proposal for the program to the President. When the self-supporting fee has been fully implemented, no State General Funds will be provided to the program. If the program fails to reach full self-support in line with its phase-in plan, state funds will be withdrawn from its support.
- D. When the self-supporting program fee has been fully implemented (i.e., when all State funds have been withdrawn from the program), the campuses may not collect the Educational Fee or the University Registration Fee.
- E. University employees enrolled in self-supporting part-time professional degree programs are not eligible for reduced course fees. However, this provision does not preclude the option of the UC employer subsidizing a portion of the fee.

- F. Program deficits will be covered by the campuses; however, state funds cannot be used to cover any deficit, except during the start-up years under the approved phase-in plan.

VI. Programs that Do Not Correspond to Currently Authorized Graduate Professional Programs

- A. Proposals may be considered for self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs that do not correspond to regular programs that a campus is authorized to offer.
- B. Such proposals shall be subject to the same procedures for approval as apply to all proposals for new graduate degrees.
- C. These programs should originate with a unit that is already authorized to conduct graduate work on the campus at the level that is at least equal to the level of the proposed graduate professional program.
- D. If approved, such programs shall be conducted in accord with the policies set forth in this statement.

Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Part-Time Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Faculty FTE

All faculty must be funded directly from the revenue of self-supporting programs in proportion to the faculty member's workload commitment to the program. This includes the involvement of faculty from other departments. Alternatively, faculty can be paid for overload teaching within the 120% salary limitation that governs teaching in University Extension. Appropriate campus review committees should be vigilant to ensure that the overload option and 120% salary limitation are used appropriately.

Office of the President Budget Office Review and Oversight: Upon final approval of this policy, the Office of the President Budget Office will have responsibility to ensure compliance.

Review and Approval of Phase-in Plan: Both existing and new self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs are covered by this policy. Proposals for new self-supporting part-time professional degree programs, including a plan and timetable for phasing in fees that will assure self-support, should be submitted to the Office of the President Budget Office, which will coordinate the internal Office of the President interoffice review. Proposals should include information on the status of all current self-supporting programs

on the proposers' campus and a worksheet showing cost components on which the self-supporting fee is based.

Fees: Office of the President Budget Office, working with the campuses, has already developed a methodology for establishing the minimum special fee a program should charge to assure that it is self-supporting; the Office of the President Budget Office will work with the campuses to apply that methodology to any proposed program.

Campuses with programs that do not charge at least the minimum special fee as determined by the agreed-upon methodology, and therefore are not fully self-supporting, will submit a proposal that specifies when the program will be self-supporting. The Office of the President Budget Office interprets the proposed policy language "as quickly as possible" to mean that normally a program will achieve self-support within three years.

Upon Regental approval of the special fee, the Office of the President Budget Office will monitor implementation of the phase-in plan. If the program does not reach self-sufficiency within the time specified in its plan, state funds will be withdrawn from its support.

Enrollments: Proposals for phasing in a special fee and phasing out state support should also include a plan for reporting enrollments during the phase-in period. During the phase-in period, program enrollments will be counted as state-funded based on the proportion of the minimum fee that is being charged. If the fee charged is 75% of the minimum, for example, then 25% of the enrollment will be counted as state-funded."