

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

May 7, 2009

A special meeting of the Committees on Educational Policy and Finance was held by teleconference on the above date at the following locations: UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, 1675 Owens Street, San Francisco; International Room, Tom Bradley International Hall, Los Angeles Campus; Moss Cove A and B, Student Center, Irvine Campus; 355 Highlander Union Building, Riverside Campus; Ballroom B, Price Center, San Diego Campus; Chancellor’s Conference Room, 5123 Cheadle Hall, Santa Barbara Campus; 501 S. Alta Avenue, Dinuba; 700 S. Flower Street, Los Angeles; 2220 Lodgepole Circle, Modesto; 777 California Avenue, Palo Alto; 3110 Main Street, Santa Monica; 12006 Bennett Flat Road, Truckee; Board Room, 1806 N. Nimitz Street, Victoria, Texas.

Members present: Representing the Committee on Educational Policy: Regents Cole, Garamendi, Island, Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Reiss, and Scorza; Ex officio members Blum, Varner, and Yudof; Advisory members Powell and Stovitz; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen
Representing the Committee on Finance: Regents Garamendi, Gould, Island, Lozano, Scorza, Varner, and Wachter; Ex officio members Blum and Yudof; Advisory members Bernal, Croughan, and Nunn Gorman; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Kieffer, Makarechian, Ruiz, Schilling, Shewmake, and Zettel, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Interim Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Darling, Lapp, and Taylor, Senior Vice Presidents Dooley and Stobo, Vice Presidents Lenz and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 11:50 a.m. with Committee on Finance Chair Gould presiding.

1. READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING

For the record, notice was given in compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a special meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee on Finance, to accommodate a scheduling change.

2. APPROVAL OF THREE-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAM FEES AND PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL DEGREE FEE INCREASES FOR 2009-10

The President recommended that the Regents:

- A. Accept the three-year plans of professional degree program fees, shown in Displays 1-A, 1-B, 1-C, and 1-D, for planning purposes. This includes accepting the three-year plans for five new professional degree programs: Law at the Irvine campus, Preventative Veterinary Medicine at the Davis campus, Dental Hygiene at the San Francisco campus, Public Policy at the Irvine campus, and Physical Therapy at the San Francisco campus. The Law, Preventative Veterinary Medicine, and Dental Hygiene programs propose first charging professional degree fees in 2009-10, while the Public Policy and Physical Therapy programs propose first charging professional degree fees in 2010-11.
- B. Approve the proposed professional degree fees for 2009-10, shown in Display 2, for implementation for the 24 programs that are fully compliant with the *Three-Year Plan for Professional Degree Program Fees and Proposed Professional Degree Fee Increases for 2008-09* as approved in September 2007, which amended the Policy on Fees for Professional School Students.
- C. Approve as an exception to the *Three-Year Plan for Professional Degree Program Fees and Proposed Professional Degree Fee Increases for 2008-09* professional degree fees for 2009-10, shown in Display 3, for the 12 programs whose in-state fees are expected to exceed the estimated fees at their public comparison institutions in 2009-10 but which otherwise comply with the requirements set forth in the *Three-Year Plan for Professional Degree Program Fees and Proposed Professional Degree Fee Increases for 2008-09*.

DISPLAY 1-A: Professional Degree Fee Levels – Residents

	2008-09 (actual)	2009-10 (proposed)	% Incr.	2010-11 (proposed)	% Incr.	2011-12 (proposed)	% Incr.
Law (a)							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 21,242	\$ 25,283	19.0%	\$ 29,979	18.6%	\$ 35,395	18.1%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 18,439	\$ 23,049	25.0%	\$ 28,213	22.4%	\$ 31,034	10.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 24,408	N/A	\$ 28,213	15.6%	\$ 31,034	10.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 21,075	\$ 24,408	15.8%	\$ 28,213	15.6%	\$ 31,034	10.0%
Business							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 21,630	\$ 25,675	18.7%	\$ 30,373	18.3%	\$ 35,114	15.6%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 16,804	\$ 18,484	10.0%	\$ 20,332	10.0%	\$ 22,366	10.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 17,456	\$ 18,678	7.0%	\$ 19,985	7.0%	\$ 21,384	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 22,049	\$ 25,161	14.1%	\$ 29,047	15.4%	\$ 33,468	15.2%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 16,345	\$ 18,306	12.0%	\$ 20,200	10.3%	\$ 22,200	9.9%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 16,804	\$ 19,392	15.4%	\$ 22,378	15.4%	\$ 25,824	15.4%
Dentistry							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 18,087	\$ 19,353	7.0%	\$ 20,708	7.0%	\$ 22,158	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 18,087	\$ 19,896	10.0%	\$ 22,880	15.0%	\$ 26,312	15.0%
Medicine (a)							
<u>Berkeley (Jt. MD/PhD)</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 14,984	0.0%	\$ 14,984	0.0%	\$ 14,984	0.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
Pharmacy							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 13,635	\$ 15,395	12.9%	\$ 17,155	11.4%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 13,634	\$ 15,395	12.9%	\$ 17,155	11.4%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 12,459	\$ 13,705	10.0%	\$ 15,075	10.0%	\$ 16,583	10.0%
Preventative Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	N/A	\$ 4,000	N/A	\$ 4,280	7.0%	\$ 4,580	7.0%
Nursing							
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 4,054	N/A	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,905	10.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 3,685	\$ 4,055	10.0%	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,904	10.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 3,685	\$ 4,054	10.0%	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,905	10.0%
Optometry							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 10,925	\$ 12,018	10.0%	\$ 13,219	10.0%	\$ 14,541	10.0%
Theater, Film, & TV							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 6,758	\$ 7,231	7.0%	\$ 7,737	7.0%	\$ 8,279	7.0%
Public Health							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 4,859	N/A	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
Public Policy							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,995	10.0%	\$ 5,494	10.0%	\$ 6,044	10.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 5,199	N/A	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
International Relations & Pacific Studies							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 4,584	\$ 4,905	7.0%	\$ 5,248	7.0%	\$ 5,615	7.0%
Physical Therapy							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 11,000	N/A	\$ 11,770	7.0%
Dental Hygiene							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	\$ 10,000	N/A	\$ 10,700	7.0%	\$ 11,449	7.0%

(a) Fee amounts do not include the \$376 Special Fee for Law and Medical Students approved in 1990.

DISPLAY 1-B: Professional Degree Fee Levels – Nonresidents (a)

	2008-09 (actual)	2009-10 (proposed)	% Incr.	2010-11 (proposed)	% Incr.	2011-12 (proposed)	% Incr.
Law (b)							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 21,242	\$ 25,283	19.0%	\$ 29,255	15.7%	\$ 32,205	10.1%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 18,439	\$ 21,750	18.0%	\$ 24,810	14.1%	\$ 29,027	17.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 22,803	N/A	\$ 26,618	16.7%	\$ 29,280	10.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 19,351	\$ 22,803	17.8%	\$ 26,618	16.7%	\$ 29,280	10.0%
Business							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 19,065	\$ 22,630	18.7%	\$ 26,771	18.3%	\$ 29,449	10.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 16,804	\$ 18,484	10.0%	\$ 20,332	10.0%	\$ 22,366	10.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 16,345	\$ 17,489	7.0%	\$ 18,714	7.0%	\$ 20,024	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 16,994	\$ 21,157	24.5%	\$ 25,221	19.2%	\$ 28,297	12.2%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 16,345	\$ 18,306	12.0%	\$ 20,200	10.3%	\$ 22,200	9.9%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 16,040	\$ 16,040	0.0%	\$ 16,040	0.0%	\$ 16,040	0.0%
Dentistry							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 15,818	\$ 16,925	7.0%	\$ 18,110	7.0%	\$ 19,378	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 18,087	\$ 19,896	10.0%	\$ 22,880	15.0%	\$ 26,312	15.0%
Medicine (b)							
<u>Berkeley (Jt. MD/PhD)</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 14,984	0.0%	\$ 14,984	0.0%	\$ 14,984	0.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 14,984	\$ 16,033	7.0%	\$ 17,155	7.0%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
Pharmacy							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 13,635	\$ 15,395	12.9%	\$ 17,155	11.4%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 13,634	\$ 15,395	12.9%	\$ 17,155	11.4%	\$ 18,356	7.0%
Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 12,459	\$ 13,705	10.0%	\$ 15,075	10.0%	\$ 16,583	10.0%
Preventative Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	N/A	\$ 4,000	N/A	\$ 4,280	7.0%	\$ 4,580	7.0%
Nursing							
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 4,054	N/A	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,905	10.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 3,685	\$ 4,055	10.0%	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,904	10.0%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 3,685	\$ 4,054	10.0%	\$ 4,459	10.0%	\$ 4,905	10.0%
Optometry							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 10,925	\$ 12,018	10.0%	\$ 13,219	10.0%	\$ 14,541	10.0%
Theater, Film, & TV							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 6,758	\$ 7,231	7.0%	\$ 7,737	7.0%	\$ 8,279	7.0%
Public Health							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 4,859	N/A	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
Public Policy							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,995	10.0%	\$ 5,494	10.0%	\$ 6,044	10.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 5,199	N/A	\$ 5,563	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,541	\$ 4,859	7.0%	\$ 5,199	7.0%	\$ 5,563	7.0%
International Relations & Pacific Studies							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 4,498	\$ 4,723	5.0%	\$ 4,959	5.0%	\$ 5,207	5.0%
Physical Therapy							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 11,000	N/A	\$ 11,770	7.0%
Dental Hygiene							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	\$ 10,000	N/A	\$ 10,700	7.0%	\$ 11,449	7.0%

(a) Some schools have opted to set professional degree fee levels for *nonresident* students lower than those for *resident* students in the same program in acknowledgment of the \$12,245 in Nonresident Tuition that nonresident students must pay in addition to mandatory fees and professional degree fees. Total charges for nonresident students continue to be significantly above those for resident students.

(b) Fee amounts do not include the \$376 Special Fee for Law and Medical Students approved in 1990.

DISPLAY 1-C: Total Fees for Professional Degree Students – Residents

	2008-09 (actual)	2009-10 (proposed)	% Incr.	2010-11 (proposed)	% Incr.	2011-12 (proposed)	% Incr.
Law							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 30,944	\$ 35,847	15.8%	\$ 41,384	15.4%	\$ 47,718	15.3%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 28,515	\$ 34,005	19.3%	\$ 39,992	17.6%	\$ 43,712	9.3%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 35,784	N/A	\$ 40,309	12.6%	\$ 43,921	9.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 31,103	\$ 35,274	13.4%	\$ 39,992	13.4%	\$ 43,811	9.5%
Business							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 30,926	\$ 35,832	15.9%	\$ 41,373	15.5%	\$ 47,031	13.7%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 26,504	\$ 29,064	9.7%	\$ 31,735	9.2%	\$ 34,668	9.2%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 27,815	\$ 29,693	6.8%	\$ 31,720	6.8%	\$ 33,909	6.9%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 31,850	\$ 35,810	12.4%	\$ 40,621	13.4%	\$ 46,051	13.4%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 25,790	\$ 28,438	10.3%	\$ 31,124	9.4%	\$ 33,990	9.2%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 25,962	\$ 29,377	13.2%	\$ 33,272	13.3%	\$ 37,718	13.4%
Dentistry							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 28,462	\$ 30,928	8.7%	\$ 33,148	7.2%	\$ 35,545	7.2%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 27,925	\$ 30,649	9.8%	\$ 34,639	13.0%	\$ 39,174	13.1%
Medicine							
<u>Berkeley (Jt. MD/PhD)</u>	\$ 24,717	\$ 25,578	3.5%	\$ 26,420	3.3%	\$ 27,338	3.5%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 24,877	\$ 26,835	7.9%	\$ 28,747	7.1%	\$ 30,809	7.2%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 25,795	\$ 27,500	6.6%	\$ 29,343	6.7%	\$ 31,334	6.8%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 24,173	\$ 25,902	7.2%	\$ 27,771	7.2%	\$ 29,789	7.3%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 24,989	\$ 26,901	7.7%	\$ 28,964	7.7%	\$ 31,190	7.7%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 24,579	\$ 26,455	7.6%	\$ 28,486	7.7%	\$ 30,687	7.7%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 25,202	\$ 27,165	7.8%	\$ 29,292	7.8%	\$ 31,595	7.9%
Pharmacy							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 22,943	\$ 25,530	11.3%	\$ 28,199	10.5%	\$ 30,400	7.8%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 23,421	\$ 26,090	11.4%	\$ 28,848	10.6%	\$ 31,143	8.0%
Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 24,263	\$ 26,538	9.4%	\$ 28,846	8.7%	\$ 31,375	8.8%
Preventative Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 12,293	\$ 17,138	39.4%	\$ 18,339	7.0%	\$ 19,641	7.1%
Nursing							
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 15,053	N/A	\$ 16,179	7.5%	\$ 17,416	7.6%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 12,437	\$ 13,548	8.9%	\$ 14,607	7.8%	\$ 15,756	7.9%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 13,448	\$ 14,725	9.5%	\$ 16,128	9.5%	\$ 17,668	9.5%
Optometry							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 20,221	\$ 22,175	9.7%	\$ 24,219	9.2%	\$ 26,458	9.2%
Theater, Film, & TV							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 15,510	\$ 16,733	7.9%	\$ 18,060	7.9%	\$ 18,823	4.2%
Public Health							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 14,755	\$ 16,026	8.6%	\$ 17,309	8.0%	\$ 18,702	8.0%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 16,350	\$ 17,549	7.3%	\$ 18,699	6.6%	\$ 19,931	6.6%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 16,869	N/A	\$ 18,031	6.9%	\$ 19,296	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 14,211	\$ 15,395	8.3%	\$ 16,682	8.4%	\$ 18,082	8.4%
Public Policy							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 14,755	\$ 16,162	9.5%	\$ 17,605	8.9%	\$ 19,183	9.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 18,030	N/A	\$ 19,295	7.0%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 14,211	\$ 15,395	8.3%	\$ 16,682	8.4%	\$ 18,082	8.4%
International Relations & Pacific Studies							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 14,660	\$ 15,899	8.5%	\$ 17,253	8.5%	\$ 18,731	8.6%
Physical Therapy							
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 10,866	\$ 11,866	9.2%	\$ 24,017	102.4%	\$ 26,052	8.5%
Dental Hygiene							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	\$ 20,674	N/A	\$ 22,372	8.2%	\$ 24,215	8.2%

Total fees include Educational Fee, Registration Fee, Campus-based Fees, and health insurance.

DISPLAY 1-D: Total Fees for Professional Degree Students – Nonresidents

	2008-09 (actual)	2009-10 (proposed)	% Incr.	2010-11 (proposed)	% Incr.	2011-12 (proposed)	% Incr.
Law							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 43,189	\$ 48,091	11.4%	\$ 52,905	10.0%	\$ 56,773	7.3%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 40,760	\$ 44,951	10.3%	\$ 48,834	8.6%	\$ 53,950	10.5%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 46,424	N/A	\$ 50,959	9.8%	\$ 54,412	6.8%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 41,624	\$ 45,914	10.3%	\$ 50,642	10.3%	\$ 54,302	7.2%
Business							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 40,606	\$ 45,032	10.9%	\$ 50,015	11.1%	\$ 53,611	7.2%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 38,749	\$ 41,309	6.6%	\$ 43,980	6.5%	\$ 46,913	6.7%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 38,949	\$ 40,749	4.6%	\$ 42,694	4.8%	\$ 44,795	4.9%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 39,040	\$ 44,051	12.8%	\$ 49,040	11.3%	\$ 53,125	8.3%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 38,035	\$ 40,683	7.0%	\$ 43,369	6.6%	\$ 46,235	6.6%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 37,443	\$ 38,270	2.2%	\$ 39,179	2.4%	\$ 40,179	2.6%
Dentistry							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 38,438	\$ 40,745	6.0%	\$ 42,795	5.0%	\$ 45,010	5.2%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 40,170	\$ 42,894	6.8%	\$ 46,884	9.3%	\$ 51,419	9.7%
Medicine							
<u>Berkeley (Jt. MD/PhD)</u>	\$ 36,962	\$ 37,824	2.3%	\$ 38,665	2.2%	\$ 39,583	2.4%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 37,122	\$ 39,080	5.3%	\$ 40,992	4.9%	\$ 43,054	5.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 38,040	\$ 39,745	4.5%	\$ 41,588	4.6%	\$ 43,579	4.8%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 36,418	\$ 38,147	4.7%	\$ 40,016	4.9%	\$ 42,034	5.0%
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 37,234	\$ 39,146	5.1%	\$ 41,209	5.3%	\$ 43,435	5.4%
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 36,824	\$ 38,700	5.1%	\$ 40,731	5.2%	\$ 42,932	5.4%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 37,447	\$ 39,410	5.2%	\$ 41,537	5.4%	\$ 43,840	5.5%
Pharmacy							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 35,188	\$ 37,775	7.4%	\$ 40,444	7.1%	\$ 42,645	5.4%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 35,666	\$ 38,335	7.5%	\$ 41,093	7.2%	\$ 43,388	5.6%
Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 36,508	\$ 38,783	6.2%	\$ 41,091	6.0%	\$ 43,620	6.2%
Preventative Veterinary Medicine							
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 27,299	\$ 29,727	8.9%	\$ 30,961	4.2%	\$ 32,301	4.3%
Nursing							
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 27,298	N/A	\$ 28,424	4.1%	\$ 29,661	4.4%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 24,682	\$ 25,793	4.5%	\$ 26,852	4.1%	\$ 28,001	4.3%
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 25,693	\$ 26,970	5.0%	\$ 28,373	5.2%	\$ 29,913	5.4%
Optometry							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 32,466	\$ 34,420	6.0%	\$ 36,464	5.9%	\$ 38,703	6.1%
Theater, Film, & TV							
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 27,755	\$ 28,978	4.4%	\$ 30,305	4.6%	\$ 31,069	2.5%
Public Health							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 27,312	\$ 28,614	4.8%	\$ 29,932	4.6%	\$ 31,362	4.8%
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 28,907	\$ 30,128	4.2%	\$ 31,302	3.9%	\$ 32,558	4.0%
<u>Irvine</u>	N/A	\$ 29,458	N/A	\$ 30,653	4.1%	\$ 31,956	4.3%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 26,768	\$ 27,983	4.5%	\$ 29,305	4.7%	\$ 30,742	4.9%
Public Policy							
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 27,312	\$ 28,751	5.3%	\$ 30,227	5.1%	\$ 31,843	5.3%
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 27,312	\$ 28,751	5.3%	\$ 30,227	5.1%	\$ 31,843	5.3%
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 26,768	\$ 28,106	5.0%	\$ 29,511	5.0%	\$ 30,987	5.0%
International Relations & Pacific Studies							
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 27,131	\$ 28,306	4.3%	\$ 29,586	4.5%	\$ 30,983	4.7%
Physical Therapy							
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 25,672	\$ 37,531	46.2%	\$ 39,229	4.5%	\$ 41,058	4.7%
Dental Hygiene							
<u>San Francisco</u>	N/A	\$ 32,919	N/A	\$ 34,617	5.2%	\$ 36,460	5.3%

Total fees include Educational Fee, Registration Fee, Campus-based Fees, health insurance, and Nonresident Tuition.

DISPLAY 2: 2009-10 Proposed Professional Degree Fees for Programs Fully Compliant with the Regents' 9/20/07 Approval

	Residents	Nonresidents (a)
Law (b)		
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 25,283	\$ 25,283
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 23,049	\$ 21,750
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 24,408	\$ 22,803
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 24,408	\$ 22,803
Business		
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 25,675	\$ 22,630
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 18,484	\$ 18,484
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 18,678	\$ 17,489
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 25,161	\$ 21,157
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 18,306	\$ 18,306
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 19,392	\$ 16,040
Medicine (b)		
Berkeley (Jt. MD/PhD)	\$ 14,984	\$ 14,984
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
<u>Riverside</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 16,033	\$ 16,033
Pharmacy		
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 15,395	\$ 15,395
Nursing		
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 4,054	\$ 4,054
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,055	\$ 4,055
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 4,054	\$ 4,054
Public Health		
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,859	\$ 4,859
Public Policy		
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 4,859	\$ 4,859
International Relations & Pacific Studies		
<u>San Diego</u>	\$ 4,905	\$ 4,723

(a) Some schools have opted to set professional degree fee levels for *nonresident* students lower than those for *resident* students in the same program in acknowledgment of the \$12,245 in Nonresident Tuition that nonresident students must pay in addition to mandatory fees and professional degree fees. Total charges for nonresident students continue to be significantly above those for resident students.

(b) Fee amounts do not include the \$376 Special Fee for Law and Medical Students approved in 1990.

DISPLAY 3: 2009-10 Proposed Professional Degree Fees for Programs with Proposed Total In-State Fees Higher than the Average of Public Comparison Programs

	Residents	Nonresidents (a)
Dentistry		
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 19,353	\$ 16,925
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 19,896	\$ 19,896
Pharmacy		
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 15,395	\$ 15,395
Veterinary Medicine		
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 13,705	\$ 13,705
Preventative Veterinary Medicine		
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
Optometry		
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 12,018	\$ 12,018
Theater, Film, & Television		
<u>Los Angeles</u>	\$ 7,231	\$ 7,231
Public Health		
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,859	\$ 4,859
<u>Davis</u>	\$ 4,859	\$ 4,859
<u>Irvine</u>	\$ 4,859	\$ 4,859
Public Policy		
<u>Berkeley</u>	\$ 4,995	\$ 4,995
Dental Hygiene		
<u>San Francisco</u>	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000

(a) Some schools have opted to set professional degree fee levels for *nonresident* students lower than those for *resident* students in the same program in acknowledgment of the \$12,245 in Nonresident Tuition that nonresident students must pay in addition to mandatory fees and professional degree fees. Total charges for nonresident students continue to be significantly above those for resident students.

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Interim Provost Pitts introduced the item, which requests fee increases for professional school programs for the coming year and presents proposed fee increases for the following years, with a three-year moving window. There are three parts to the recommendation. The first part reflects the fact that there are five new professional schools: the Schools of Law at UC Irvine, Preventative Veterinary Medicine at UC Davis, and Dental Hygiene at UC San Francisco will begin charging fees in 2009-10; the Schools of Public Policy at UC Irvine and Physical Therapy at UCSF in 2010-11. The second part of the recommendation is a request for approval of professional school fees for 24 schools which are compliant with the *Three-Year Plan for Professional Degree Program Fees and Proposed Professional Degree Fee Increases for 2008-09*, as approved in September 2007. The third part is a request for approval of fee increases for 12 programs which are exceptions to policy relative to the September 2007 *Three-Year Plan* in that the proposed fees exceed the fees at comparable public professional school

programs. Among these 12 programs, the proposed fees in a number of cases are close to those at comparison institutions, so that the differences are relatively small; in three cases the fees are substantially higher than at comparison institutions. Dr. Pitts observed that there is no other school of preventative veterinary medicine in the country, which makes comparison in that case difficult.

Dean Koda-Kimble of the UCSF School of Pharmacy noted that there are only two public pharmacy graduate programs in California, at the San Francisco and San Diego campuses. There is a shortage of pharmacists in the state; in fact, California ranks 48th in the U.S. in the supply of pharmacists. There are 1,600 applicants to each UC school for 122 available places at UCSF and 60 places at UCSD. Most applicants to public and private pharmacy school programs in California are from California. The fees at UC are 30 percent lower than at private pharmacy school programs.

The UC Schools of Pharmacy operate programs with about one-third of the funding of UC medical school programs. Ms. Koda-Kimble reported that the two UC programs are at risk of losing accreditation, having been cited for insufficient funding. They have been asked to provide specific plans to increase resources, and have been attempting to raise funds from other sources, but there is currently no other option than to increase student fees. She noted that the UCSF program is able to operate partly due to teaching provided by about 700 volunteer faculty, mostly alumni. Graduates from UC's four-year pharmacy programs earn between \$98,000 and \$143,000, with an average debt upon graduation of about \$87,000. Ms. Koda-Kimble estimated that graduates, if they paid 15 percent of their salary annually, could pay off their debt in seven years. She expressed regret at having to raise student fees, but emphasized that this action was being taken to offset State cuts, not to obtain more revenue.

Dean Lyons of the UC Berkeley Haas School of Business discussed the requested fee increases in the context of access, teaching, and program excellence. Students entering the full-time M.B.A. program this year were generally individuals who had been working, with an average annual compensation of \$90,000. Not all have a significant need for financial aid, but many do. With the fee increase, the School would return at least 33 percent to aid. In the area of teaching, Mr. Lyons observed that the School's faculty size in 1990 was larger than it is now, while there are now roughly twice as many students. In a review by external deans the previous year, the major recommendation was to reduce the student-faculty ratio. He anticipated that the School would resolve this with self-funded, not publicly funded, faculty positions. Of five expected faculty hires this year, four positions would be self-funded and one publicly funded; professional degree fees were important in order to accomplish this. Regarding program excellence, Mr. Lyons stressed the importance of examining strategic priorities. The School has a strategic plan with many new initiatives to benefit students, the program, and the School's reputation. Additional funds are needed to implement these strategic initiatives. Mr. Lyons expressed enthusiasm about one such program, "The Berkeley Difference," a program to introduce innovation in larger organizations in a systematic, disciplined way.

Chairman Blum praised Dean Lyons for his leadership at the Haas School. He asked how the student-faculty ratio at the School now compared with the ratio in 1990, and how it compared with comparable programs at the University of Michigan, the University of Virginia, Stanford, and Harvard. He also asked how fees at the School compared with the School's competitors. With regard to student fees, Mr. Lyons responded that UC fees for the M.B.A. program were 25 percent below those at the Universities of Virginia and Michigan, and 33 percent below fees at the top private school programs. For nonresident students, fees would be 15 to 20 percent below those at other institutions. The student-faculty ratio was above 20 to 1. Mr. Lyons compared this situation to the program at Stanford University, which has over 100 full-time faculty and fewer than half the number of students the Haas School has. The Haas School has 75 full-time faculty.

Regent Johnson asked about the use of professional fees to support the proposed non-credit "Leadership Development Series." Mr. Lyons explained that this, like "The Berkeley Difference," was a new strategic initiative. One area of competition among business schools is the provision of non-credit services or opportunities to students. These services would include applied workshops on topics such as the development of interviewing skills, effective coaching and feedback, or self-assessment in leadership styles. Based on the academic standards of graduate business programs, these topics are not considered to belong appropriately in the for-credit curriculum, but the programs with which the Haas School competes typically provide these services. The proposed "Leadership Development Series" would offer not-for-credit leadership development opportunities like those offered at other schools. It would require an increase in resources, for example, for consulting with executive coaches.

Regent Johnson asked how the increase in professional fees was related to for-credit programs in the School. Mr. Lyons responded that "The Berkeley Difference" initiative would be part of the core curriculum. There are about ten such strategic initiatives, most of which would be part of the for-credit curriculum. These initiatives are part of a reframing of the M.B.A. program, which is changing in areas such as access to entrepreneurship and management of technology.

Committee on Finance Chair Gould observed that the proposed fee increases were essential to maintaining access and excellence in the professional degree programs.

Regent Scorza expressed support for the proposal, noting that it addressed the issues of access, affordability, diversity, and public service. He suggested that other proposals for fee increases should address these same topics.

Regent-designate Bernal recalled that the recommendation included exceptions to policy, and that annual reporting to the Regents includes information on demographics and enrollment trends. He noted that the item did not contain this kind of information and asked if it would be provided later.

Dr. Pitts responded that, as part of the University's accountability efforts, there would be a report in September examining diversity at UC at all levels, including the professional

schools. He stated that this was a long-time concern of his and expressed his view that diversity in UC's business and law schools could be improved, especially regarding underrepresented minorities. This topic would be a focus in the coming months and information would be presented in September.

Regent Island noted that one paragraph in the background information to the item addressed related diversity efforts, but he expressed disappointment that more data on diversity at the professional schools were not included. He asked if these data had been withheld or not prepared in time for the meeting. Dr. Pitts responded that there had been no intention to withhold information. Data gathered in the last few weeks were shared with the professional school deans. He acknowledged that there was not much detail in the plans to address diversity and access submitted for this item by the different professional programs. He cited remarks by UC Berkeley School of Law Dean Edley about minority recruitment, which suggested that when the School lost potential students, this was due not to fee levels but to ranking of programs. Dean Edley has emphasized the importance of maintaining an academic program with high standards. Dr. Pitts reiterated that there would be a full presentation of this information in September.

Regent-designate Stovitz expressed concern that rising professional fee levels in UC's law programs might become a disincentive and motivate students to consider private university programs rather than UC. In the past, a graduate of a UC law program might have expected to begin his or her career in an associate position with a salary of \$160,000, but these positions are now becoming scarcer as established law firms consider reorganization. He contrasted this circumstance with the field of pharmacy, where there is a serious demand. UC law school fees may not be a realistic reflection of the starting salaries of legal professionals.

President Yudof reported that Dean Edley has a major proposal to increase loan forgiveness and financial aid. Mr. Edley is sensitive to the fact that the job market has changed and that law students are graduating with large debt.

Dr. Pitts reported that Dean Edley asked that the Committees be informed that 23 percent of the students enrolled in the law program at UC Berkeley were Pell Grant recipients as undergraduates. This was a far higher percentage than at any of the major law schools with which UC Berkeley competes and demonstrated that the financial aid structure in place reaches into a population of students from a lower socioeconomic level. Dr. Pitts stated that three of the four UC law programs have loan forgiveness programs for graduates entering the legal profession below a certain salary level. Various deans' offices are adding funds to the return-to-aid pool. Serious attempts are being made to address this issue.

Referring to this recommendation and to the proposed undergraduate fee increase presented that day to the Committee on Finance, Regent Garamendi said that he believed that the University has lost its way by increasingly relying on students to fund its programs, when not so long ago it relied on the State. The result was that UC was becoming a privatized institution. He expressed dismay at this development, especially at

the professional schools. The University's promise had once been that the best students could all attend its programs. On the current course leading to ever higher fees, California will have lost an important economic development tool – a free higher education system of the highest quality. Regent Garamendi stated that the University had abandoned that philosophy and was heading in a different direction, rather than standing and fighting for its extraordinary tradition. He questioned Dean Lyons' figure of \$90,000 as an average annual income of students at the Haas School and suggested that the figure of 23 percent for former Pell Grant recipients in the UC Berkeley law program was closer to an accurate description of the student population. He observed that the University will never know how many qualified lower-income students have never even applied to these programs.

Committee on Finance Chair Gould stated that the University would appreciate Regent Garamendi's involvement in developing a long-term funding strategy.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee on Finance approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Blum, Gould, Lozano, Scorza, Varner, Wachter, and Yudof (7) voting "aye," and Regents Garamendi and Island (2) voting "no."¹

3. **RECOMMENDATION TO DEVELOP REVISIONS TO THE POLICY GOVERNING THE REGISTRATION FEE**

The President recommended that the University of California develop a new Registration Fee policy to be submitted for approval by the Board by January 2010.

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Lenz recalled that issues surrounding the expenditure of Registration Fee revenues had come to the Regents' attention the previous summer. The Office of the President worked with the campuses to examine Registration Fee expenditures. This work confirmed that Registration Fee revenues were being used appropriately. The report on the use of the Registration Fee, released in October 2008, included a number of recommendations. A subsequent Registration Fee working group including Regent Scorza and other students also examined these issues, and its work was also considered in preparing the present item.

Mr. Lenz enumerated some recommendations on which he anticipated progress could be made. It would be possible to produce an annual report on the use of the Registration Fee, with clear categorizations describing the fund, the function, and the programs where fees are being expended. It may be prudent to revise the Regental fee policy due to certain existing ambiguities. The Office of the President would examine the policy with student

¹ Roll call vote required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act [Government Code §11123(b)(1)(D)] for all meetings held by teleconference.

and campus representatives and present a recommendation to the Regents as early as January 2010, but no later than May. The annual report could be posted on a website. The Office of the President would work with the campuses, some of which already have websites on this topic, to improve the information available to students about the Registration Fee and its use. It would be possible to publish individual fees on the students' financial billings. Mr. Lenz anticipated that there was a need for greater consultation within the University and that a working group would have to be in place to address certain issues.

Interim Provost Pitts recalled that Regent Scorza began last year to investigate whether the Registration Fee was being spent to benefit students and student life. The result of this investigation was satisfactory, but the effort required to obtain the information was quite substantial. There should be ongoing discussion with students on campuses, and for this purpose, data must be available. The item seeks to provide the necessary transparency and data for discussions on how to manage funding for student support services.

Dr. Pitts explained that the present item was a request for the Regents to approve a process. In January 2010, a revised fee policy would be presented, although it is possible that not all issues will be resolved by then; subsequent discussions would likely be necessary. He recognized Regent Scorza's substantial efforts on this issue.

President Yudof thanked Regent Scorza for his work on this item. While there were still some areas that needed further study, this effort resulted in a good outcome that would make the Registration Fee more transparent to students.

Regent Scorza expressed gratitude to Associate Vice President Obley, Executive Vice President Lapp, President Yudof, and several student organizations for their assistance with this work. He urged the University to continue to show clearly to the State and to students how UC fees are spent.

Committee on Finance Chair Gould observed that improved transparency is good for students and the University. Regent Scorza thanked Chair Gould for his leadership.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee on Finance approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Blum, Garamendi, Gould, Island, Lozano, Scorza, Varner, Wachter, and Yudof (9) voting "aye."

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff