

**2019-2020 ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW OF
UNIVERSITY EXTENSION**

Internal Reviewers

Olga T. Yokoyama, Humanities, Graduate Council, Review Team Chair
Simon Board, Economics, Undergraduate Council

External Reviewers

Susan Greenbaum, Dean, Professional Studies, New York University
John LaBrie, Dean, Professional Studies, Clark University

Date of Site Visit: January 14-15, 2020

Approved by Undergraduate Council: April 10, 2020

Approved by Graduate Council: May 1, 2020

Appendix I: External Reviewers' Report

Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

Please note: The Self-Review report was previously distributed. If you need a copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at programreview@senate.ucla.edu.

2019-2020 ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Introduction

This report of the Internal Review Team for the 2019-2020 review of University Extension (UNEX) follows eight years after the prior Academic Senate Program Review of UNEX in 2011-2012. The current review draws primarily on a two-day site visit held on January 14-15, 2020, the prior Academic Senate Program Review Report from 2011-2012, the UNEX self-review of 2019, and the Huron Report of 2018; for the figures and other specific information, we relied on the Self-Review report and other data provided by the Academic Senate. We concur with the previous two reports in that “this is a somewhat daunting task, because of the sheer size of the UNEX enterprise”.

This review comes at a time of transition. The new Dean Eric Bullard began his appointment in January of 2020, a week before our visit. At this time, neither of the two Associate Dean positions had been filled. Moreover, three of his seven administrative departments and two of his nine academic departments were run by Interim Directors.

The review committee met with Dean Eric Bullard, Interim Senior Associate Dean Carla Hayn, Interim Senior Associate Dean Sonia Luna, and all the Academic Program Department Directors and Administrative Directors. We also met with some Continuing Educators, Program Staff, Instructors, campus Faculty, and UNEX students. The team also toured two UNEX facilities, 10920 Lindbrook and 1145 Gayley.

The unusual nature of this review, both in terms of scope and timing, means that we will depart in parts from the usual structure of 8-year review. For example, we do not discuss “Goals and Plans” since Dean Bullard needs time to understand the capabilities of UNEX before defining and planning his vision. We build heavily on the external report (hereafter ER) which is remarkably systematic and comprehensive. Naturally, we do not concur with everything in the ER, and so will add our own narrative as well as a UCLA-specific perspective.

History

UNEX was officially established in 1917 as the southern branch of the University of California Extension. For the next fifty years, UNEX progressively evolved to become a self-standing unit with a unique curricula and instructor cadre directed to serve the communities of Greater Los Angeles and Southern California Region. In 1968, by state mandate, UNEX was no longer allowed to use public funds to support itself, and became fully self-supporting. Also in 1968, governance and administration of the various University of California extensions changed from reporting directly to UCOP to reporting to the Chancellors of the campus with which they were aligned. This brought UNEX under the wing of the UCLA administration. In the course of its existence, UNEX has grown to be one of the largest continuing education institutions in the UC system and nationally. As the external reviewers underscore, it has been one of the leaders in the field of continuing education in terms of both its programmatic scope and its geographic reach. In the last decade,

UNEX has offered between 5,700 and 7,000 courses per year, with over 30,000 students accounting for annual enrollment between 70,000 and 90,000.

The recent history has been turbulent. The last review (2011-12) presented a glowing picture of the organization, stating that “Dean Cathy Sandeen has built a UNEX organization for the 21st Century.” In 2013, UCLA appointed a new dean who aimed to create a global footprint in online education. Over his tenure revenue rose from \$58.2m in 2012/13 to \$67.1m in 2015/16, but then fell to \$61.4m in 2017/18. Meanwhile, the number of staff and costs grew, leading to a loss of \$2.7m in 2017/18. In January 2018, the dean announced that 25% of staff would be laid off, leading many employees to voluntarily leave UNEX. In February 2018, the University commissioned a consulting report from Huron that had three recommendations: (1) Narrow the focus to build on core competencies, (2) Develop a comprehensive approach to financial planning, and (3) Improve morale by increasing transparency and making UNEX’s values tangible.

Interim Senior Associate Deans Hayn and Luna joined UNEX in May 2018, and formally took over in the Fall of 2018. Their major objective was to stabilize the fiscal outlook and they were very successful at this. By leaving positions open and eliminating less profitable courses, they achieved, in 2018/19, a profit of \$3.7m with revenue of \$59.2m and reserves of \$26.5m.

Organization

Within UCLA, UNEX is the largest single instructional program, consisting of nine academic departments that offer 116 certificates and 54 specialization programs and that consistently award over 2,000 certificates per year; UNEX does not grant degrees. UNEX employs 261 FTE staff. Of these 138 are in Administrative Departments (Facilities, Finance, Human Resources, Instructional Design, IT, Marketing, Student Services), while 123 are employed by the nine academic departments.

There are two important structural features that are peculiar to UNEX. First, there are very few staff employed to design curricula or teach.¹ Arts, for example, has around 30 staff, with only 4 of them planning curricula or designing courses or programs (i.e. Program Directors or Continuing Educators, hereafter PD/CE) under the general supervision by the Academic Director for the Arts; the rest of the Arts staff manage the programs, instructors and students. Most of the teaching at UNEX is done by 1,400 to 1,500 primarily part-time instructors in any given year. The majority of UNEX instructors are by-agreement employees, with a small percentage working as independent contractors. A majority of them are working and retired professionals, although some are professional instructors; a very small number of UCLA faculty and graduate students are also employed.

The second characteristic is the heterogeneity of the different academic departments. This heterogeneity leads to a great variation in the departments’ needs and priorities. For example, Humanities and Sciences Department works with over 30 campus departments and manages the majority of UCLA Extension’s concurrent enrollment courses; the Education Department’s nearly

¹ PD/CEs may not teach in their own programs, so as to prevent a conflict of interest.

all courses are online, and its enrollments are greatly affected by the regulatory changes introduced by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing; and Digital Technology, a small young department established in 2017, is struggling to hire and retain instructors who are active practitioners in quickly developing digital technology.

People

Leadership: Dean Bullard has a great deal of experience of professional education within LA and is well placed to succeed. It is now his responsibility to put in place a new team of upper level management to support his vision and initiatives. The external committee members underscore the enormity of the task and the critical importance of filling the positions of the Associate Deans. The final composition of the organizational leadership structure will be soon determined by Dean Bullard in consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Academic Senate.

Staff: The Huron report indicated that staff morale was low and turnover high. Fortunately, this situation is not current any more. We share the ER's observation that the staff's commitment to UNEX was quite high (ER, p. 4). The middle level staff spoke with unexpected enthusiasm about their experience during the unsettling times of rampant staff departures in 2018, which led them to form self-governing groups that worked to improve the overall organization and performance. These staff members hope that Dean Bullard will not only allow them to continue their constructive self-organization but that he will also encourage other staff members to follow the trend. They also hope that he will continue to pursue the high level of transparency introduced by the Interim Deans Hayn and Luna.

PD/CEs: The PD/CEs spoke to the review committee of the distinct nature of each department, with its characteristic needs, teaching methods and goals, as well as marketing strategies. Indeed, the wide disciplinary variety, specific desired outcomes, and the distinct clientele of the departments clearly justify different approaches. At the same time, the review committee heard concerns about the perceived "silo" nature of UNEX, with its lack of unity across the board (including lack of cross-system quality control in instruction), decentralization and even disconnect within the system. Perhaps the most conspicuous example of this mentioned was the lack of unified remuneration principles that was voiced by some instructors. Given the existence of these ostensibly contradictory but equally important concerns, establishing a workable balance between the distinctness and unity will remain a concern for the PD/CEs.

The relationship between UNEX departments and the relevant campus departments, which was found to be insufficient in the previous review of 2011-12, remains a point of concern among UNEX educators. Although the nature of cooperation desired varies from group to group, all PD/CEs appear to wish for more of it and regret what they perceive as a lack of response on the part of campus units. The position of campus departments was more difficult to gauge. One campus department's representative described his successful efforts to convince his colleagues of the importance of involvement in UNEX course approval and instructor qualification supervision. The low representation during the site visit of the UCLA Department chairs and Senate faculty who frequently collaborate with UNEX (only three areas were represented), however, may in itself be indicative of a low level of interest on the part of the campus departments.

Instructors: The UNEX instructors the review team met, while self-selected, were enthusiastic about the quality of the students, the flexibility UNEX provides to develop new classes, and the technological help they receive from UNEX for online classes (currently 31% of UNEX courses are online). New course proposals seem to be born out of spontaneous, organic development, and instructors' and PD/CEs' intuition. Some instructors teach at UNEX after work for personal satisfaction, some are retirees who simply love teaching, and a portion tries to piece together teaching jobs at community colleges and UNEX. PD/CEs typically seem to find instructors through informal networks (e.g. friends, other instructors, UCLA contacts), although there are also ads on the website. The instructor pool has a wide range of ages (e.g. 27% are over 65) and is quite ethnically homogeneous (i.e. 74% White, 8% Asian, 7% Hispanic, 4% Black).

A few concerns were mentioned, as discussed in the ER (p. 8). First, instructor compensation is considerably lower than at comparable institutions; moreover, it appears to be set ad hoc, lacking any unified transparent compensation policy. Instructors are aware of this. They would also appreciate if UNEX recognized teaching excellence (e.g. via awards or titles). Some expressed a desire of professional advancement to full-time status and accessibility to health insurance. Second, some instructors also expressed their desire of more opportunities to work with other instructors in order to cultivate a sense of community and joint purpose; they would welcome more workshops or retreats. Third, we were told that many courses do not offer office hours, perhaps because of a lack of available office space and/or lack of remuneration for the office time.

Students: There is a wide range of people who study at UNEX, from young international students to retirees. Many are post-college professionals seeking personal growth or professional development (e.g. 53% of students are 25-45). As a result, the demographics of the student body reflect the west side of LA (i.e. 42% White, 23% Asian, 14% Hispanic, 5% Black). As discussed in ER (p. 11), the students that we met, also a self-selected group, rated the teaching highly, although there were stories of poor quality or "cruel" instructors; a Business Program student complained that one instructor was primarily interested in promoting his own business. Some students liked the flexibility provided by online classes, although most also stated that, everything else being equal, they liked face-to-face instruction better (this preference was also shared by the instructors). When asked why they chose UNEX, students were appreciative of its affordability and the variety of classes offered. They also praised UNEX's certificates, which students compared favorably with highly priced MA degree programs at other institutions. They generally found student services at UNEX satisfactory. We also heard that students could withdraw multiple times from a class without a note on their transcript.

A few concerns were raised about the students by the instructors, who felt that many international students had trouble; the difficulties vary from English skills to cultural adjustment. Students also had several polite requests. Some students wished that their hard work could be recognized by a degree (e.g. the Landscape Architecture program consists of 27 courses while offering only a certificate); many would enthusiastically enroll in degree programs if they were offered by UNEX. Student also lobbied for common space to meet with other students or studios to prepare their projects. Indeed, many were looking for a sense of community, echoing a similar sentiment among the instructors.

Strengths

Brand: To quote the ER: “UCLA Extension continues to be a nationally branded and well-known enterprise in the field of professional and continuing education. While its programmatic impact is in the greater Los Angeles market, its influence has in the past reached far beyond the borders of Southern California and into the heartland of this country and globally.” In the Southern Californian community, UNEX is indeed the locally most visible face of UCLA itself.

Impact on LA: The quality of the students and instructors constitute UNEX’s greatest strength. UNEX educates over 30,000 students a year, changing the direction of students’ careers and broadening their perspectives. UNEX attracts very high quality students from a broad range of ages who are attracted to the variety of high-quality classes (in comparison, community colleges mainly serve students under 25²). UNEX also has an impressive pool of instructors who consider teaching at UNEX to be a point of pride. Each of UNEX’s departments makes a different contribution to LA. For example, its Education department educates teachers across CA. The American Learning Center has talented professional instructors and first-class facilities to train international students before they join UCLA or other American institutions. And Osher Lifelong Learning Program brings a sense of fulfilment to many retirees’ lives.

The “mission-aligned areas” (as Vice Provost Turner refers to them in her Issue Statement) represent a special kind of strength among UNEX offerings, that of serving the community. These courses and programs are no less important than the practical, career-oriented market-responsive offerings. Mission-aligned areas like Education, which in the recent restructuring of UNEX suffered a disproportionately great number of cuts and suspensions (e.g. programs like Educating and Supporting Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder, or with Emotional Disturbances) provide irreplaceable continuing education by a public university of UCLA’s caliber. Another mission-aligned “former strength” that was eliminated because of fiscally unsustainable enrollment level is ALC’s English as a Second Language for non-native residents of Los Angeles.

Certificate Programs: UNEX offers a great number and variety of certificate programs, which clearly constitute one of its strengths. Many of them are very highly regarded by students and employers, and have the potential to become degree programs should UCLA decide to move in this direction. Indeed, UNEX’s Architecture Interior Design program has a partnership with California State Polytechnic University at Pomona that culminates in a Master of Interior Architecture degree. This continuing education format makes the program unique in the nation; it also brings \$1m in annual revenues, and has a 90% job placement.

Administrative skills: UNEX is an immense exercise in coordination. Reaching over 30,000 students each year requires an impressive marketing effort, ranging from targeted ad buys to brand building. With 1,400 to 1,500 part-time faculty, UNEX’s Instructional Design team must constantly train new instructors, professionals who may have little prior experience of teaching. UNEX’s Information Technology group has designed online-class software that instructors find

² The demographics of UNEX and Community Colleges are quite different. For example, Santa Monica College is about 70% under 25, and 40% Hispanic.

<http://www.smc.edu/ACG/InstitutionalResearch/Documents/Fast%20Facts%20Fall%202018.pdf>

convenient and effective. And, UNEX's Student Service enrolls and manages all these students in over 5000 classes each year. These administrative skills, while easy to take for granted, are, in fact, a great strength of UNEX

Cooperation with the main campus: Given the scale on which it operates and the administrative skills it possesses, UNEX has much to offer the main campus, and some such cooperation is already in place. Examples of successful cooperation between UNEX and UCLA campus departments include:

- Concurrent Enrollment allows UNEX students to enroll in UCLA classes. This exists with UCLA's ROTC Program (approximately 250 enrollments in 2018-19), the Department of Classics (70 students enrolled in the Classics Post-Baccalaureate Program), and Samueli School of Engineering (its self-supporting Masters of Science Online program partners with UNEX to offer individual classes to non-matriculated students). Concurrent enrollment in many other campus departments is possible also by individual student petition.
- The Articulated Partnership with the UCLA School of Dentistry provides administrative support, enrollment management and various student services to the international students enrolled in the School's multiple certificate programs.

Areas in Need of Attention

The transitional state of UNEX represents both a great opportunity and a formidable challenge. Restructuring the administrative framework under Dean Bullard, keeping fiscal health intact and further improving, and developing UNEX so as to continue the impressive century-long tradition further into the 21st century is clearly the process that will be watched by all stakeholders. Apart from this general and all-encompassing challenge, a number of specific areas that require attention can be listed based on the specific results of the current review.

Fiscal position: Despite the successful financial turnaround in 2018/19, UNEX is predicted to lose around \$750k in 2019/20. The fundamental problem is that, due to the low tuition fees (\$800 for a typical 10-week course), UNEX operates at low margins. This means that, say, raising instructor fees by \$1000 per course (from around \$2800 currently) will lead to a \$5m deficit (recall revenue is around \$60m). Both the ER and this report discuss many ways forward but, as Dean Bullard's predecessor discovered, ambitious projects can become very expensive. Given the need for extra revenue, we were surprised that prices of courses were chosen by each department, with remarkably little data about the sensitivity of demand to price (let alone how to bundle courses). For example, it is not clear that one should charge the same price for a marketing class (that is a tax write-off) and a writing class intended for self-fulfillment. Relatedly, the location and timing of classes seems to be determined by convenience rather than to maximize enrollment.

Providing structured and dependable support to mission-driven programs is another area in need of attention. These courses were forced out of existence in the emergency-driven process of rebuilding the financial health of UNEX over the course of the last two years (such as some programs in Education and the ALC mentioned above, as well as the closure by the Education Department of Applied Behavior Analysis Certificate Program that had enrolled about 180

students per quarter due to the unaffordability of a clinical psychologist PhD to supervise it; the explanation provided to the review committee by a representative of Psychology Department was, however, different). Directing attention toward them would put into relief UNEX's, and by extension, UCLA's mission in the larger community. The previous review's recommendation (3) to the Executive Vice Chancellor and others is worth revisiting in this connection: "Although UNEX needs to be sustainable, they should also operate in ways that are consistent with the "UCLA brand," which is not a for-profit enterprise and still tilts toward viewing education as a public more than a private good."

One additional fiscally relevant point concerns Summer School classes. After the 2011-12 review, concerns about competition between UNEX and the main campus led UCLA to insist that UNEX raise its prices for summer classes. This "matched pricing" led to a substantial drop in UNEX's summer classes and the resulting loss of students to other continuing education institutions in the follow-on classes later in the year. UNEX, however, believes that the summer student pools between UNEX and Summer School are quite different, with UNEX serving students who are not currently matriculated. If it is true that (i) "matched pricing" in summer caused lower demand in subsequent quarters, and that (ii) there is little overlap of students, then allowing UNEX to set their own summer prices seems reasonable. In cases of conflicting enrollment, UNEX could compensate campus departments for those matriculated students who take the UNEX class in the summer.

Structural Organization: As discussed in the ER, there are four main structural challenges. First, having a solid leadership structure immediately under Dean Bullard so that he can focus on strategic questions rather than being overwhelmed by minutia. Second, balancing the unique needs of each department and the need for cross-departmental coordination in terms of marketing, quality control, and remuneration; this balancing may be facilitated by the self-organizing cross-departmental staff meetings that should be encouraged. Third, in some departments additional PD/CEs may be useful to design programming and maintain quality; this may include a way of empowering and rewarding exceptional instructors. Lastly, some reorganization of academic departments may be worth considering: some departments (e.g. Arts, Humanities & Sciences) are very broad and variegated, some (e.g. Digital Technology) are quite specific, and others (e.g. International Programs) offer no courses and serve a coordinating role.

Diversity: The ER (p.10) notes that student demographics reflect the west side, rather than the whole of LA. Diversity among instructors and students (there are no statistics of staff demographics by race or ethnicity) indeed leaves much to desire. While the age demographics among students is quite diverse (10% of students are above age 65), racial balance is tilted heavily towards Caucasians and Asians (with 73% response rate in 2018-19, Caucasians were about 42%, with Asians 23%). The low racial statistic of URMs is seriously troubling, as it is considerably lower than in the college, and by far not representative of the Southern Californian demographics in general. Given the prominence of UNEX in LA county, this is unacceptable. The challenge of improving these numbers is considerable, as it would have to be tackled in a concerted fashion: by financial support, outreach, and opening UNEX spaces in underserved communities of LA (c.f. the ER's suggestion regarding creative rental agreements with YMCA and other community organizations).

Increasing minority representation among the instructors would also lead to diversify the student demographics. While the age demographics among instructors is diverse (over a quarter of them are above age 65), their racial balance is also tilted heavily towards Caucasians and Asians (almost three quarters of instructors are Caucasians, followed by 8% Asians). The ER recommends UNEX uses targeted recruiting (e.g. using UCLA alumni networks) to supplement more informal approaches.

Quality: Concerns about the quality of UNEX instructions were raised in the previous review, and will require constant attention due to the large number of part-time instructors. Quality control begins with checks on quality, of which there are three within UNEX. First, for any course that receives UCLA credit (X and XL courses), the instructors and syllabi must be approved by the relevant UCLA department. While we spoke to one campus Chair who was quite involved in this process, informal conversations suggest that rubber-stamping is not uncommon. The Chairs have no relationship with UNEX, have not met the instructors, and do not get involved in the course design process. Moreover, the decentralized nature of UNEX means that there is no single database to verify that all the courses received appropriate approval. The approval process for X and XL courses thus clearly needs attention.

The second check on quality is provided by the PD/CEs who put together programming and recruit instructors. Given the large number of courses and instructors that each PD/CE oversees, this is a formidable challenge, especially in broader departments which cover a wide array of subjects, and in fast-moving departments where the state-of-the-art is constantly changing.

The third check on quality are the students. Given the high-quality of the students (who often have undergraduate degrees), they are clearly aware when the material is repetitive or an instructor is insufficiently considerate. Unified treatment of student feedback would be desirable, as well as a system to ensure that appropriate action is taken when concerns are raised.

Course development: The committee sees a potential benefit of standardizing the process dealing with new course or program proposals and their marketing. While the new course and certificate program development has been quite remarkable (58 new programs and certificates created since the last review) and the instructors the committee met with were generally happy with the freedom and support they receive in contributing to the curriculum, a more coordinated and structured approach, including formal group brainstorming opportunities may be in order. This process could involve advisors from main campus and industry. Some of this creativity may, of course, happen organically once the instructors and other stakeholders are given the physical space and opportunities to meet one another. Providing incentives to the instructors and recognition for their initiative-taking would be effective, as well.

Collaboration: The last 8-year review and the Huron report both discussed the lack of collaboration between main campus. In particular, the last 8-year review recommended establishing protocols for working relationships, proposing that the University establish a joint task force. There seem to be two reasons the potential for cooperation has not been fully achieved: a lack of information about UNEX's capabilities, and a lack of incentives for collaboration.

The first step is about information. Different parties need to be aware of the opportunities for collaboration. To begin with, UNEX needs a website that advertises its capabilities and describes cases of successful cooperation, and the existence of this website needs to be brought to the attention of campus deans and department chairs. The opportunities will naturally bubble up from different departments.³

The second step concerns incentives. Two paths are conceivable here. First, interested UCLA departments create a point person to handle UNEX relations, serving as quality oversight, an expert advisor, and an information conduit. This person could be an emeritus or a regular faculty rather than the over-burdened Chair. Second, the University may want to appoint a facilitator who can encourage unresponsive departments to be more cooperative, and make sure UNEX, in turn, is answerable for quality concerns. This person may have a small budget to reward “advisors” with research funds (like the Fiat Lux program).

Facilities: The ER (p. 6) discusses the challenges with facilities in depth. First, they point out the need to understand and optimize utilization to save on rent. This may mean taking more advantage of UCLA classrooms, and more efficiently using administrative space. Second, they ask for “an overarching space strategy that is informed by an academic plan”. With the goal of making locations agree with the programming and UNEX’s access mission, they recommend UNEX try to make better use of “nimble solutions”, such as local schools, community centers, YMCAs and corporate training centers.

Degree programs: The ER (p. 13) recommends UNEX offer bachelors and masters programs. The home institutions of the external reviewers have resolved the question of extension’s degree granting capacity by allowing professional degrees up to the Master’s level. The renaming of their extensions as “Schools of Professional Studies” at both New York University and Clark University goes farther than a mere naming strategy. These universities’ strong support for allowing extension to evolve into a degree granting institution reflects a national trend (cf. also the Columbia University School of Professional Studies, or the CUNY School of Professional Studies, inter alia) that may well be justified. In fact, UNEX’s own Architecture Interior Design program, which does

³ At the risk of reinventing a wheel, we site some examples that arose as we talked to colleagues around campus:

- UNEX could provide marketing for summer programs (not offered by UNEX) and self-supporting programs.
- UNEX could manage enrollment for self-supporting programs (as with the School of Dentistry).
- UNEX could offer online classes that have been filmed by departments.
- UNEX could employ graduate students as instructors. One issue is that UNEX pays less than main campus, but this is less concerning if the instructor is managing online interaction for a previously recorded class.
- UNEX could develop relationships with the community of UCLA emeritus faculty, who they could use for both advice and instruction.
- UNEX’s ALC can teach high-level English skills to students, post-docs and visitors before their formal arrival at UCLA, and design specialist classes for self-supporting programs.
- UNEX could use academic advisors from UCLA departments to (i) help find part-time instructors, (ii) ensure syllabi are up-to-date, and (iii) assist with the development of new programs.
- UNEX can provide courses for undergraduate students to continue their education while taking time off from their full-time studies (e.g. for students taking family or medical leave).
- “Partnership UCLA” and UNEX could share information about UCLA alumni interested in teaching.

not overlap with main campus, already leads to a high-demand Master's Degree in a collaborative partnership with California State Polytechnic University at Pomona.

There are different views of this (even on this review team). On the positive side, this will make UNEX more attractive for students, allowing UCLA to help a more diverse group of students, especially those who were unable to become regular students after secondary school or were forced to drop out due to personal hardships. On the negative side, the potential lack of quality control both in terms of incoming students and instruction could undermine the value of a UCLA degree for students on the main campus. Related to this point, if such a change were made, one might want to change the name of UNEX to the "School of Professional Studies", as has happened at other campuses.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

While it would seem appropriate to review the recommendations from the 2011-12 review and check their results systematically, the stormy period that intervened since and the emergency measures taken to address the fiscal problems that arose under the previous dean have interrupted the progression of events. For this reason, we will not take the route of reporting our findings on the implementation of the previous recommendations but will present our own recommendations based on the state of affairs as we found them to be at present juncture.

Recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Academic Senate Chair:

1. To improve collaboration between main campus and UNEX, there needs to be better information and better incentives. As a first step, the EVC should consider appointing someone to act as a conduit. This means ensuring a flow of information, encouraging campus Department Chairs to lend assistance, requiring UNEX to uphold the highest quality standards, and acting as a mediator at times of conflict.
2. Given the growing importance of self-supporting degree programs on main campus, a principled approach to the relationship between UNEX, the first self-supporting unit at UCLA, and the new self-supporting degree programs needs to be developed, perhaps with the participation of the Committee on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs.

Recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget, and the Dean of UNEX:

3. Dean Bullard should be given the freedom and support to organize the structure of UNEX. This includes appointing two Associate Deans and possibly raising the number of Program Directors/Continuing Educators (PD/CEs).
4. UNEX and the University need to work with each other to ensure efficient use of their joint facilities. Can UCLA make better use of UNEX facilities during the day? Can UNEX make better use of UCLA general assignment classrooms in the evening?

5. UNEX should appoint academic and professional advisors to work with the PD/CEs to maintain quality and develop new offerings. It will likely need the University's help to find the best advisors.
6. The University should explore the potential benefits and limitations of offering degrees through UNEX.⁴

Recommendations to the Dean of UNEX:

7. UNEX should develop a database to ensure all classes that require approval have received it.
8. Create space for students to enhance their sense of community both through informal contact and through work (e.g. laboratories); for instructors to hold office hours; for instructors to meet one another across disciplines, and organize opportunities/events with the same objective.
9. UNEX should consider developing a systematic way to develop and refine new class ideas, while involving finance and marketing at an earlier stage and incorporating the academic and professional advisors (per (5) above).
10. UNEX needs to be more systematic in how it compensates part-time instructors, including healthcare benefits. It should also consider creating a career path for instructors in order to retain the best instructors, incentivize high quality teaching and course development, and raise their professional pride.
11. UNEX needs to create a website that advertises its capabilities and describes cases of successful cooperation with different parts of campus; the existence of this resource should be brought to the attention of campus deans and department chairs.

Final Recommendation: The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils recommend scheduling a mandatory progress review meeting in Spring 2021. The timing of the next review will be determined after the progress review meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

Olga T. Yokoyama, Humanities, Graduate Council, Review Team Chair
Simon Board, Economics, Undergraduate Council

⁴ In addition to the standard program approval process, granting a degree through UNEX would require an amendment to the Standing Orders of the Regents of the University of California.

Appendix I: External Reviewers' Reports

UCLA Extension 8-year Review 2019-2020
External Reviewer's Report

Dean Susan Greenbaum, *New York University*
Dean John LaBrie, *Clark University*

January 21, 2020

Introduction and Background

On January 13-15, 2020, we conducted an onsite program review of UCLA Extension (UNEX). The review was commissioned by UCLA's Academic Senate and is part of a regular eight-year cyclical review mandated by the UCLA Faculty Senate. UNEX was last reviewed in academic year 2011-2012.

The review team consisted of two internal to UCLA reviewers (Dr. Olga Yokoyama, review chair and Dr. Simon Board) and two external reviewers (Dr. Susan Greenbaum, Dean of the School of Professional Studies at New York University and Dr. John G. LaBrie, Dean of the School of Professional Studies at Clark University). This report consists of findings, reflections and recommendations of the external reviewers only. According to our understanding of the UCLA Senate Program Review Process, the internal reviewers will produce a separate summation report following submission of the external reviewer's report.

Prior to the onsite visit, the review team was provided a collection of background material about UNEX. These materials included but were not limited to:

- The 2011-2012 UNEX Self Study and the corresponding reports and responses that were generated as a result of that review process
- The UNEX 2019 Academic Senate Review Self-Review Report 2011-12 to 2018-2019
- Fall 2019 UNEX Program Catalog
- Engagement Summary on Strategic, Operational, and Financial Assessment of UCLA Extension produced by Huron Consulting (May 2018)
- Issue Statements from:
 - Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education
 - Chair of the Committee on continuing and Community Education
 - Chair of the Council on Planning and Budget
- University Extension Trend Review (August 2019 published by the Office of Academic Planning and Budget)

Over the course of the review process, the review committee also asked for and received various other materials that helped inform the findings within this report.

The review committee held a series of onsite meetings and interviews with a wide range of stakeholders including staff, instructors, students of UNEX as well as members of other campus constituencies. The interviews were scheduled and arranged by the Faculty Senate office. The schedule was not at the direction of the review team. With over one hundred people interviewed in the span of 48 hours, the external reviewers feel comfortable that it has captured the essence of the organization and confident that its recommendations are representative of the work needed to improve the overall quality and standing of UNEX.

Before commencing with our recommendations, we feel compelled to say a few words about UCLA Extension and its place as one of the great Extension Schools in the United States. Founded over 100 years ago, UCLA Extension continues to be a nationally branded and well-known enterprise in the field of professional and continuing education. While its programmatic impact is in the greater Los Angeles market, its influence has in the past reached far beyond the borders of Southern California and into the heartland of this country and globally. It remains the California System's largest Extension School and is rich in history and tradition. The materials that make up this review clearly indicate a recent past that is not representative of an organization at its apex. However, it cannot be denied that an academic enterprise that touches over 30,000 individuals annually is still a force to be reckoned with. UNEX is a major positive asset for UCLA.

Recommendations

Summary and Update of 2011-12 Review Recommendations

As part of the eight-year review, the reviewers are asked to comment on the progress of the recommendations which were made within the last review. The 2011-2012 review had three broad recommendations.

1. Assure a rational deployment of institutional resources
2. Examine compensation structure for instructors
3. The Administration should evaluate how UNEX partners with the rest of the campus.

It is the reviewers' assessment that these three broad issues remain major themes for UNEX in 2020. We suspect that the details and the material facts have changed somewhat in the eight-year period; however, these three items remain important areas for UNEX to address. This is not to say that progress has not been made—quite the opposite. We found a great deal of instances of collaboration and good will between UNEX and other UCLA departments. Rather, these broad

themes represent the ongoing work of a unit whose core mission is about university and community engagement. Therefore, they are likely to emerge as themes in future reviews as well.

UNEX Structural Organization

UNEX's core organizational structure remains fundamentally unchanged for a number of years. At its core, it is a series of programming units (also referred to as academic departments) and administrative departments. These units report to the Dean of Extension. Currently, the dean has 30 direct reports--an unsustainable number. The structure is taxed further due to the administrative and financial disruptions of the past several years. For example, at the time of writing the self-study, the unit included no less than eight directorial level staff who held interim appointments or who were seconded from other university units. The dean's office has not been staffed for an extended period of time.

This has resulted in an organizational structure that is prime for reimagining and restructuring. Over the course of the two-day site visit, many interviewees openly opined about various structures that would benefit the organization. There have been several documents and reports that have also made organizational structure recommendations. However, it is the opinion of the external reviewers that the new dean, Eric Bullard, be given the time and space to determine for himself what administrative structure the unit should have. At the time of the site visit, the new dean had been on the job for less than two weeks.

While we remain silent on the overall administrative structure, there are two notable exceptions that we do wish to highlight. The breadth and depth of the work needed at UNEX goes well beyond the dean alone. Both the academic programming portfolio and the administrative departments need focused attention and direction in the coming months. Furthermore, the dean will also have a strategic, external and institutional role to play that will frequently pull him away from the day-to-day work of UNEX. Therefore, we strongly advocate that the dean immediately be allowed to search for two senior level people to assist him in this work

The Senior Associate Dean of Academic and Faculty Affairs (this is a working title for purposes of this report) would oversee, manage and aid in restructuring what is now referred to as the "Academic Departments". This role should have direct supervision of the program directors/managers and program managers should not report directly to the dean.

The Senior Associate Dean of Finance and Administration (again, this is a working title for the purposes of this report) would oversee, manage, and aid in the restructuring and realigning of the various administrative and financial support units. This role should have direct supervision of the various heads of administrative departments.

Understaffing the senior leadership team at this moment in time places the UNEX at a risk. The dean's work on vision and rebuilding relations both on campus and off, could easily be derailed in a swirl of administrative minutia, crisis management and non-strategic time-consuming activities such as email management.

We repeatedly heard concerns of the siloed structures of the various academic units within UNEX. As reviewers, we are neutral on the nature of the current structure of the academic/programming clusters, however, it is clear that administrative barriers exist and cross unit collaboration is hindered. There does not seem to be a robust culture of cross unit collaboration and experimentation. This impeded individual staff and faculty's ability to interact beyond their own units.

There were several organizational matters that emerged in our interviews that we would recommend that the unit consider incorporating into its new structure. These were seen as strengths of the current organization and should be preserved in some fashion.

- Departmental communication. While the communication structure for the staff was not exactly ideal, it was, however, effective. During the recent leadership transition, the interim leadership conducted town halls and made themselves available to the staff. As a result, the staff felt respected and connected to what was happening to the organization. Consequently, the dean should consider elements of this transparency as he progresses in his orientation to the school.
- Front-line and mid-level management groups formed organically during the leadership void as a way to stay abreast of what the organization was doing and also to troubleshoot problems. These functional groupings that often went beyond the program clusters, appear to have served the organization very well. It created opportunities for inter-unit dialogue, problem solving, sharing of best practices and comradery. Finding a way to preserve this practice is sure to have benefit.
- While the new dean is brand new and has not had the chance to meet everyone on staff, he is walking in his new role with tremendous goodwill. While people are pleased there is new leadership, which seems to give them a sense of security and hope for the future, they are waiting to hear the vision of the new leader. They expressed hope that the basic culture of the organization is respected. As the new dean formulates a new structure and vision for the UNEX, he should consider how he incorporates voices and traditions of the organization in the process.

Campus Collaboration

One of the clear common themes between the last review period and this review period is the notion and the importance of collaboration between UNEX and other UCLA academic departments. It is clear that the senior leadership of the university wishes to see a higher level of UNEX engagement both on campus and in the greater Los Angeles community. While this issue presented as a problem in the reports eight years ago, the situation today is perhaps much more nuanced.

On the one hand, there is a great deal of inter-campus collaboration between UNEX and other UCLA departments. The self-review report identifies numerous examples. Here are a few that were brought to our attention in the interviews:

- All courses and new instructors at UNEX are vetted and approved by the respective UCLA academic department that has content oversight of the area. While this is a formal academic governance process, it also provides ongoing opportunities for the UCLA Departments to stay connected and informed of UNEX's programs.
- The search process for full-time American Language Institute (ALI) instructors incorporated faculty from the Education department. This allows laddered faculty to see the caliber and seriousness of the unit's hiring process.
- Annual TEDxUCLA events are coordinated by UNEX and feature faculty from Medicine, the Arts, GIS etc.

On the other hand, there appear to be low hanging fruit from an inter-campus engagement and collaboration process that could use more structure and emphasis. Here are a few examples:

- ALI could provide strategic academic assistance to both undergraduate and graduate units within UCLA departments who enroll high levels of international students. The opportunities range from providing academic writing workshops, accent reduction sessions, cultural integration classes etc. Utilizing the ALI resources would help with student retention and enhanced international student integration into the classroom.
- UNEX provides many credit bearing academic courses which can be transferred into a department and count towards a student's degree. UNEX may in fact be a place where students who are struggling academically in a traditional degree program could take course work on a part-time basis to improve their GPA or to get back on track to finishing their degree. This would help improve retention and keep the student associated with UCLA rather than diverting them to another institution of higher education (IHE).

- UNEX has a vast instructor network that spans greater LA's premier and iconic industries. This instructor network could be leveraged by UCLA career services for student internship placements, experiential project work and an enhanced employability strategy.
- UNEX is an ideal place where PhD candidates who wish to pursue an academic career can gain teaching experience. This also has the added benefit of bringing tenured faculty closer to the UNEX curriculum and mitigate the false narrative that UNEX's academic integrity is somehow questionable.

These are but some of the ideas that percolated over the two-day site visit. It is notable that there are many viable and creative ideas ready for the taking.

Our recommendation here is directed to both the senior leadership of UNEX as well as to the senior leadership of UCLA. Collaboration and partnership need two willing and able partners. The UNEX dean needs to articulate clearly to the campus deans the School's willingness to collaborate. In doing so, this will enable and empower program directors to be campus ambassadors, which is also strongly encouraged. This empowerment at the programming level creates many more points of contact and increases the likelihood of an expanded list of collaborations moving forward.

Fellow UCLA deans and academic department chairs also need to be encouraged and perhaps incentivized to partner with UNEX. The Provost Office can be instrumental in signaling and encouraging strategic collaborations between UNEX and UCLA academic departments. We offer a working premise: If the dean of UNEX is evaluated based on his ability to collaborate at UCLA, then perhaps his counterparts should be extended the same expectation.

Facilities

One of the points that the review committee was asked to comment on was UNEX Facilities. We had occasion to tour several sites but we did not have enough time to see all currently held properties.

The quality of the spaces and classrooms we toured were first rate. The staff leadership in this area also came across as very professional and organized. The last eight years have seen a good deal of space disruption and it appears that trend is likely to continue.

On the subject of physical plant, there are two points that emerged. One is space utilization/cost and the second point is space planning generally.

We were provided some detailed data of classroom space utilization. While the data appeared interesting, it was difficult to contextualize the information we had at our disposal. There are anecdotal reports of some classrooms being empty during the day, but over-booked in the evening. This is not surprising given the nature of the UNEX programming. If one examines UCLA-wide classroom utilization and needs, there may be opportunities to optimize usage.

Some faculty noted that their courses are scheduled until 10 PM but the building is locked exactly at 10 PM, leaving no end-of-class transition time for faculty and students. End-of-class time can be instrumental in consulting with students about projects or points of confusion in the class lectures. This fix may be as simple as adjusting course scheduling to end at 9:30 PM. Students—especially in the design programs—wanted to have collaboration and drafting labs to do group projects. Lack of access to these types of facilities created logistical and programmatic difficulties for the students.

Administrative space that we observed seemed underutilized. At the same time, some staff expressed a desire to all be under one roof. While having excess administrative space gives the unit opportunity to grow, space is the department's second largest expense after salaries. The fiscal costs may in fact be excessive, but it is hard to determine given the particulars of this area of Los Angeles and the prevailing real estate lease rates. This is an area where a highly skilled Sr. Assoc. Dean for Finance and Administration could be helpful in investigating all the angles to this issue.

The second issue is one of strategy and planning. There does not seem to be an overarching space strategy that is informed by an academic plan. The current physical footprint seems more the result of incremental and ad hoc growth rather than driven by strategic need or programming priorities. For example, various locations, such as the downtown center, do not seem to have any distinctive programmatic focus. So, while students are usually in class for a certificate program in Westwood, they occasionally have to go to the downtown center for classes because of classroom availability. Another example is how UNEX achieves its access mission. There are no classroom facilities in some high-need neighborhoods where programming staff would like to reach out to underserved populations. Finally, faculty do not appear to have dedicated space to meet with students during office hours. Swing space or hoteling space could be a practical and easy solution here.

What is recommended in regards to physical space is to first determine an overarching academic plan and strategy that is then supported by space and physical locations. The capital and staff investments on space are considerable and without an academic plan to inform future leases, UNEX runs the risk of complicating or hindering the delivery of its mission and programmatic aspirations.

Some alternative, more nimble solutions could be explored. Other urban IHEs have encountered many of the same space issues that UNEX is experiencing and have developed creative solutions for their needs. For example, WeWork-style space could be used for instructor office space or for staff who primarily work remotely. Corporate training centers that are used primarily during the day could be leased in the evening on an as needed basis. Community centers such as the local Boy and Girls clubs or YMCAs in minority communities have classroom facilities that could be co-branded and used to serve minority communities in the evening. These options, while very different than exclusively owned and branded UNEX space, could have the added value of reducing costs, increasing community awareness and remaining nimble.

Faculty

Our meetings with the faculty were some of the most enjoyable. They are creative, passionate and champions of UNEX. They were clearly proud of their affiliation with UCLA Extension and cared deeply for their students. As the faculty are vetted by UCLA academic departments, there appears to be qualified subject matter experts in the classroom. As reviewers, we did not examine academic CVs as part of our review.

The issue of faculty compensation continues to be an issue of concern as it was in the last review. It is clear that the compensation issues from eight years ago have not been systematically addressed. There are several considerations here.

- The amount of compensation does not seem to be in keeping with the market rate. Currently UNEX appears below some community colleges in how much is paid for a comparable course. This clearly does not serve the UCLA brand well and most likely denies UNEX quality faculty who consider compensation when choosing where they will teach part-time. We were told repeatedly that faculty compensation was not raised in any systematic way due to budgetary issues. However, other areas of the organization (space, administrative staffing, professional development etc.) do not seem financially starved. This issue of faculty compensation appears to be culturally informed to some degree in the budgeting process to the detriment of the instructor pool. This issue needs to be raised to the highest priority in the budget planning process.
- Faculty salaries are not determined by the School, but rather at the departmental level. This leads to unevenness and leaves the institution open to possible charges of subjectivity.
- There are no annualized or regular cost-of-living adjustments. The longer this goes on, the more painful it will be when the organization needs to meet market rates.
- There is no career track or laddering system in place for faculty performance or faculty longevity. While this is not top priority for many faculty, by doing so, it sends a powerful signal that the university cares about its instructor community.

Beyond the issue of compensation, faculty expressed the desire to get to know each other better. They referred to unit level retreats that were greatly appreciated. More of this type of community and engagement activity would be very welcome. This can also add greatly to the organization's academic and programmatic review process, as a heightened level of inter-instructor engagement will undoubtedly increase idea generation.

Staff

The review materials provided seemed to indicate that staff morale was quite low. Over the past 18-24 months there has been high turnover and the budgetary situation seems to have had an impact on morale. The Huron report is clear about its findings in regard to this issue.

We found that this issue was not as pervasive as what seemed to be indicated in the documents provided (Huron, Self-Study etc.). In fact, we found repeated evidence from staff that their commitment to the UNEX and students was quite high. One staff member described working at UNEX as 'UNEX Magic'. There were a number of recommendations made by staff that were quite constructive and achievable. For example:

- Staff retention has dramatically improved over the past 12 months. In fact, a number of new HR initiatives have been put in place which appear to be working. These should be continued and refined over time.
- Communication across the UNEX has dramatically improved in the last 12-18 months and staff seemed well informed of issues. They express hope that the new Dean will continue this practice of open communication (Town Halls etc.)
- Staff and Faculty who have had the occasion to interact with the new dean have a very positive opinion of him and are optimistic about the future of his leadership. In fact, we observed him greeting and chatting informally in the hallways with staff and students which seems to indicate a high comfort level with inter-personal engagement. This appears to be an indicator of his desire and openness to have direct unfiltered communications.

Staff did not bring up issues of professional development or compensation. However, the large group nature of the staff meetings may not have been conducive to discussing those issues. UNEX leadership in conjunction with HR should remain aware of these issues as they have great influence on retention and work satisfaction.

One issue that was mentioned that should be explored is the notion of career tracks. Junior and mid-level staff do not necessarily see a career track for themselves within the organization. UNEX is a relatively large educational enterprise and creative career laddering is not an impossibility. Career tracks would go a long way in keeping talent within the organization and making the overall administration more resilient.

Diversity and Inclusion

LA is one of the nation's most diverse and ethnically rich communities. It was clearly evident during the review. We encountered many staff, faculty and students from different ethnic and national backgrounds. We encountered no issue of pervasive racism or sexism, but our review was ill-structured for that type of discovery.

While the unit is quite diverse, there are improvements to be made. For example, the instructor community is overwhelmingly Caucasian and very under-represented by African-American instructors. It was pointed out that the students reflected the Westwood neighborhood, which may not be indicative of the greater LA community. Also, physical educational centers tended to be located in more affluent neighborhoods which also tended to be less diverse and not representative of LA County as a whole.

While there are staff who are assigned to investigate how to serve the broader community more inclusively, more will need to be done. Clearly the cost structure of the courses is a major issue. Again, a comprehensive academic plan could be useful in addressing this issue. Strategic subsidies, at-cost programs, or the development of community partnerships can sometimes go a long way to making programs more affordable. Philanthropy can be valuable, but donor money for these activities in higher education has proven to be unreliable over the long haul so donor support should not be viewed as a silver bullet.

Strategically seeking out faculty from the various communities in the city should also be implemented. Due to the exceptionally bare bones academic programming staff, many faculty come to UNEX through the referral of a colleague or a friend. This has the net result of replicating the current ethnic and racial make-up of the instructor pool--which we have pointed out is overwhelmingly Caucasian. Active and targeted instructor recruitment should be instituted to help diversify the instructional community.

Students

There is not one student profile at UNEX, but rather dozens of student profiles. These range from international students as young as 15 who come to UNEX during the summer to experience an American university to community retirees in their 80's and 90's taking courses in the Osher

Lifelong Learning Center. There are students seeking their fortunes in the film and music industry and working professionals seeking a credential to position them for their next promotion. Serving this expansive group is a complex enterprise. It can also be very exciting to know that UCLA is engaged in these various communities.

That having been said, there were themes that emerged in our dialogue with students. First and foremost, the students were highly enthusiastic about their engagement with UNEX. It should be noted; however, that the students who met with the review team were largely self-selected and therefore their experience should not be assumed to be a true representative sample of the composite views within the student body. Even so, the enthusiasm that they conveyed was infectious. Those we spoke with found the programs to be rigorous and current.

There are issues that should be monitored carefully around the student experience. As supportive as they were about the institution, they felt that a percentage of their faculty were poor instructors or not teaching the most up-to-date techniques. They felt some instructors were not very responsive. One student retold a story of a bad instructor and her frustration that caused her to drop a course without a refund. “They only ask us to fill out a faculty evaluation when we finish a course and not when we drop a course.” This quote caused many other students in the class to nod their head. This could be an issue around students returning for more courses in the future or retention toward certificate completion or recommending others to enroll. Systematic student climate and student engagement surveys outside of the normal instructor evaluation process should be able to identify the issues and items which need improvement. Students did mention that it appeared that underperforming instructors were not invited to return, but this is anecdotal information.

Several students also commented that some tiered courses were redundant in content information or assignments/assessments. This was particularly problematic when both courses were required courses and not simply electives. It appears that better integration of curriculum planning could easily solve this issue. As it came up several times, it should be noted by the programming units and investigated further.

Of note and generally speaking, we did not detect any major deficiencies with student services. Students found registration easy and the payment process smooth. Many students had not engaged with an advisor and many students didn’t know that support staff positions even existed to help them navigate the system. While student mental health issues did not come up often, the one story that did come up seemed to be handled with a great deal of care and respect.

While some students really appreciated the online courses, others refused to take anything but face-to-face courses. This seemed to be a normal reaction of student engagement in professional education programs more broadly.

When asked if students would like UNEX to offer credit-bearing degrees, most students expressed enthusiasm for the concept. Some pointed out that some of the certificate programs (is: Landscape Architecture) already took 3 years at a part-time pace to complete a graduate certificate, while many masters degrees could be finished in the same time frame.

Several students in design programs expressed the desire to have campus accessible space (card access) for them to complete team projects during off hours. These courses required drafting tables or more specific equipment and doing these sorts of team-based projects in one's home with several students was very difficult and problematic. In fact, there may be the need in other programs for this sort of accessible student space.

Academics, Program Quality and Curricular Renewal

While the mix of academic programs at UNEX is broad, there does not appear to be a systematic review process in place for quality assessment and control. It is not clear to the reviewers how programs are improved beyond the individual faculty member updating their courses or random recommendations from subject matter experts who may be teaching in the program. In fact, there may be a process, but it was not highlighted in the self-review or in our dialogues with program directors or faculty. The issue here is the very broad programming horizon offered in UNEX and the very small number of academically qualified program staff who clearly are not subject matter experts in all academic areas.

What is clear from our conversations with students is that some academic quality oversight is needed. As UNEX does not have a full-time standing faculty, it will need to address this issue in alternative ways. Again, this is a place where a capable and empowered Sr. Associate Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs would be useful.

UNEX needs a systematic and periodic curricular and academic renewal process, which applies to all programming areas equally. While the process can be designed in many ways, the review must include subject matter experts who are current in their field. (This is another point of engagement that can leverage UCLA academic units effectively.).

Academic product innovation also needs a systematic development process. The process should include academic, financial and marketing staff to sit down at the beginning and throughout the process to determine the viability of new programs. Currently, this process is done in isolation and outside of a formal collaborative process. By the time a program is ready to be launched, it is unclear if the proper market research, financial planning and positioning and as well as market considerations have been covered. While this type of comprehensive planning process at first seems overly complex and not very nimble, in the life cycle of program planning to program launch, it can reduce program failures and financial losses.

It is also important to recall that UNEX is an academic enterprise that is market-focused and market-driven. Its financial model is by mandate self-supporting. A clear and focused process that integrates marketing and financial planning in the academic renewal or program innovation space is an expectation at most continuing and professional education units across the country. The incorporation of a financial planning and marketing component into the academic planning process should not be viewed as a violation of the academic planning process.

Degree Program Granting Status

While much is said in the popular press about the perceived deterioration of the value of a college degree in today's employment market, it remains a truism that an academic credential is still the most reliable way to ensure lifelong and full-employment in our economy. The other trend that is often heralded as a major new innovation is the arrival of the nano-degree or micro-degree. Nano-degrees are very short, topical and focused courses or series of short courses that prepare the student for employment. From an employability factor, these short-term degrees have not yet shown substantial evidence that they indeed lead to employment or promotion for the student. The jury on these credentials is still out. However, credit bearing undergraduate and graduate credentials continue to be seen as aiding in the employability of the students who hold the degrees.

As a substantial portion of UNEX's students are engaged in the pursuit of career growth and enhancement, the introduction of credit bearing credentials should be considered. We make this recommendation knowing full well that this issue may be controversial in some areas of UCLA's academic community, but we do it in the spirit of making a recommendation based on our national and professional experience as external reviewers.

If UNEX were able to leverage its current substantial portfolio of credit bearing undergraduate courses, it could easily develop a degree completion program that would lead to a BA/BS. These degrees, often targeted to part-time working adults, would be ideal since UNEX already offers many of the courses needed for degree completion. It would also be a way for UCLA to serve under-represented communities in the city since minority communities have the highest percentage of people who carry some academic credit yet do not hold a degree.

Also, UNEX is extremely well positioned to offer targeted, professionally-oriented graduate degrees. E.g. the program in Landscape Architecture. If it were offered as a professional master's degree, it would be even more attractive to potential students than it currently is. Professional master's degrees should be seen as additive to UCLA's overall graduate portfolio. Professional master's degrees in emerging or applied fields where UNEX already has faculty and courses should also be considered. A serious examination of this line of programming should be

considered as UNEX and UCLA more broadly seek new programming areas, new revenue streams and new student markets.

Advisory Boards

It appears that at one-point UNEX maintained Advisory Boards for programs or program clusters. Apparently, this practice has been suspended or is dormant due to the recent difficulties of the past several years. These should be revisited and updated. Program level advisory boards can be points of engagement of UCLA academic units, industry representatives, alumni, and community groups. If charged, constructed, and directed correctly, they can be extremely helpful in corporate and B2B activities, fundraising, instructor identification, trend analysis and overall community engagement. As reviewers, we saw many areas where a well-constructed advisory board for program areas and one school-wide board of advisors for the dean would be very useful.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we are extremely optimistic for the future of UNEX. We feel under the new leadership it can finally tackle strategically, the ongoing issues that are holding back the growth of this School. We hope this report has assisted in better understanding how UNEX is seen as a valuable enterprise to UCLA and to Southern California more broadly.

Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule

UCLA Academic Senate Program Review
UCLA Extension

Site Visit Dates: January 14-15, 2020

Review Team Members:

Olga Yokoyama, Review Team Chair, Graduate Council, Humanities
Simon Board, Undergraduate Council, Economics
John LaBrie, Professional Studies, Clark University
Susan Greenbaum, Professional Studies, New York University

All meetings will be held in Conference Room 17-101, 17th Floor, 10960 Wilshire unless otherwise indicated.

Monday, January 13, 2020:

7:00 Dinner meeting: Initial organizational session for review team members only (**Luskin Conference Center- Plateia**, 425 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095; 310-794-3563)

Tuesday, January 14, 2020:

8:00 Breakfast discussion with Dean **Eric Bullard**, Interim Senior Associate Dean **Carla Hayn** and Interim CFO/COO **Sonia Luna** [*Catering arranged by the Academic Senate Office*]

8:30 Meeting with Dean **Eric Bullard**

9:00 Meetings with UNEX Academic Program Department Directors

9:00 Arts
9:15 Humanities & Sciences
9:30 Education
9:45 American Language Center
10:00 International Programs
10:15 Custom Programs
10:30 Business, Management, and Legal
10:45 Digital Technology
11:00 Engineering and Technology

11:15 Break

11:30 Meeting with Administrative Directors
Budget and Financial Services
Facilities Management
Information Technology Services

12:00 Meeting with Administrative Directors
Marketing
Student and Alumni Services
Instructional Design and Learning Services
Community Engagement

12:30 Meeting with Administrative Director
Human Resources

1:00 Lunch – review team members only [*On Site – Lunch will be catered by the Academic Senate*]

- 1:30 Meeting with UCLA Department Chairs and Senate Faculty who frequently collaborate with UNEX
- 2:00 Meeting with Continuing Educators
- 2:30 Meeting with Program Staff Group 1 [No directors/managers]
- 3:00 Meeting with Program Staff Group 2 [No directors/managers]
- 3:30 Break
- 4:00 Meeting with Dean **Eric Bullard**
- 4:30 Meeting with International Students enrolled in Extension courses
- 5:00 Meeting with Students enrolled in Extension courses for personal growth
- 5:30 Meeting with Students enrolled in Extension courses for career advancement
- 6:00 Meeting with Students enrolled in Extension courses for career redirection
- 6:30 Confidential/Individual Meetings [This meeting(s) will occur off-site]

Wednesday, January 15, 2020:

- 8:00 Breakfast (review team members only) [This meeting will occur off-site]
- 8:30 Confidential/Individual Meetings [This meeting(s) will occur off-site]
- 10:30 Meeting with UNEX Instructors who teach in the following programs (at least one from each)
American Language Center
Arts
Humanities
Education
International Programs
- 11:00 Meeting with UNEX Instructors who teach in the following programs (at least one from each)
Business, Management, and Legal
Custom Programs
Digital Technology
Engineering and Technology
- 11:30 Break/Tour of Facilities
- 12:30 Lunch – review team members only [*On Site – Lunch will be catered by the Academic Senate*]
- 1:00 Closed session (review team members only)
- 3:00 Meeting with Dean **Eric Bullard**
- 3:40 Transit to Murphy Hall
- 4:00 EXIT MEETING (2121 Murphy Hall). The meeting includes Review Team Members, Dean **Eric Bullard**, Interim Senior Associate Dean **Carla Hayn**, Interim CFO/COO **Sonia Luna**, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost **Emily Carter**, Vice Provost for Graduate Education **Robin Garrell**, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education **Patricia Turner**, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion **Jerry Kang**, Undergraduate Council Chair **Adriana Galván**, Graduate Council Vice Chair **Tom O’Dell**.

Program Staff Contact:

Jakquelyn Taylor-Sullivan (310-825-7098; jsullivan@unex.ucla.edu)

Academic Senate Staff Contact:

Taylor Lane Daymude (310-205-8199; tlanedaymude@senate.ucla.edu)