

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 13, 2019

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Butler, Elliott, Estolano, Graves, Lansing, Morimoto, Ortiz Oakley, Pérez, and Zettel; Ex officio members Kieffer and Napolitano; Advisory members May, and Weddle; Chancellors Block, Christ, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Klimow

In attendance: Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Executive Vice President Stobo, Senior Vice President Gulbranson, Vice President Brown, Interim Vice President Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 10:15 p.m. with Committee Chair Pérez presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2019 were approved.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MULTI-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION

The President of the University recommended that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommend that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition for 42 graduate professional degree programs, with fee levels as shown in Attachment 1.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Pérez introduced the item, noting that Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) had been held flat at the law schools for seven years. The Committee had previously asked that any tuition increase over five percent be pulled for discussion, and the law schools have proposed PDST increases of 7.5 percent. Committee Chair Pérez also noted that in-state PDST is higher than out-of-state PDST in some programs due to previous Committee and Board actions and recommended discussion. He explained that PDST supports programs that have had limited revenue and flat funding by helping them attract high-caliber faculty, provide financial support to students, and give other support.

With the exception of the Leadership for Education Equity Program at UC Berkeley, which was first presented at the January 2019 Regents meeting, all other PDSTs were reviewed by one of three working groups, each with two Regents and a chancellor. No chancellor considered a PDST from the same campus. Committee Chair Pérez asked Regents to indicate which programs they wished to pull for discussion; he had asked the law schools to present their PDSTs as a group.

Regent Estolano remarked that her working group recommended that several programs reduce their five-year PDST program approval period to a two-year approval period in order to ensure performance, accountability, a good representation of California residents, and effective outreach to underrepresented minorities. Many of the programs have approximately two-thirds nonresident students, most of whom are international students. Regent Estolano was concerned about the lack of a clear program to enhance diversity and increase the number of California residents, women, underrepresented minorities, and first-generation students into these programs.

Regent-designate Weddle noted that student consultation varied among the different proposals and hoped that the Committee would develop clearer standards on high-quality student consultation for the future. Committee Chair Pérez responded that he shared the concerns of Regent Estolano and Regent-designate Weddle and that PDSTs were being considered in the way he had described in response to concerns like theirs.

Committee Chair Pérez explained that Provost Brown would review all programs with PDST proposals by campus, and then the Committee would consider programs that had been pulled for separate discussion, such as the law schools and business schools. He then named the following programs that had been pulled from the list for discussion: UC Berkeley Leadership for Educational Equity Program (LEEP), UC Berkeley Law, UC Berkeley Statistics, UC Irvine Nursing, UC Irvine Law, UCSF Physical Therapy, UCLA Law, UCLA Theater, Film, and Television, UCLA Social Welfare, and UCLA Medicine. General Counsel Robinson recommended removing any amended proposals from the main PDST list.

Provost Brown stated that UC Berkeley Translational Medicine and UC Berkeley Product Development should be removed from the main PDST list, because both have been modified to a two-year plan from a five-year plan. UC Irvine Business and UCSD Business have also been removed from the main list. Provost Brown then named the following programs with no recommended changes to their PDST proposals: UC Berkeley Environmental Design, UC Berkeley Public Health, UC Berkeley Public Policy, UC Irvine Medicine, UCLA Environmental Science and Engineering, UCLA Nursing, UCLA Public Policy, UCSF Dentistry, UC Berkeley Social Welfare, UC Davis Nursing, UC Davis Preventive Veterinary Medicine, UC Davis Public Health, UCLA Urban Planning, UC Riverside Business, UCSD Public Policy, UCSF Medicine, UCSF Nursing, UC Davis Business, UC Davis Health Informatics, UC Davis Medicine, UC Irvine Biomedical and Translational Science, UC Irvine Genetic Counseling, UC Irvine Public Policy, UCLA Architecture, UCSD International Affairs, and UCSD Medicine.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved these PDST proposals as presented and voted to present them to the Board.

Director Cain Diaz listed the proposed amendments from the working group to the following programs: UC Berkeley Medicine with a three-year plan instead of a five-year plan, UC Berkeley Product Development with a two-year plan instead of a five-year plan, and UC Berkeley Translational Medicine with a two-year plan instead of a five-year plan.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved these PDST proposals as amended and voted to present them to the Board.

Provost Brown noted that the campuses and the Office of the President (UCOP) had been working together as well and that his notes and concerns had been passed along to the campuses. Chancellor Christ introduced the UC Berkeley Statistics PDST program and Deborah Nolan, chair of the UC Berkeley Department of Statistics. Ms. Nolan was part of a team that designed a new data science major, and 1,000 students declared this major in its first semester. UC Berkeley's Department of Statistics is one of the top two in the country. This program is a one-year master's program, and those who earn the degree find careers as data analysts, product analysts, financial analysts, actuaries, and data scientists. The starting salary is \$100,000 per year and up, and demand for these careers is growing. The program is growing from three to five students per year to 40 students per year. PDST can help the program provide more student services and more financial aid in order to improve the diversity of the students.

Ms. Nolan stated that the program aims to train students to tackle data-driven, real-world problems. The Department of Statistics took two actions to address student diversity challenges. First, it added a question in its application two years ago to better identify students of diverse backgrounds, enabling targeted return-to-aid and the recruitment of two underrepresented minority (URM) students. This year, the department has created two named fellowships, the Elizabeth Scott Excellence Award and an opportunity award. Ms. Nolan reported that the department sent admissions to 80 applicants and anticipated a 50 percent yield for an incoming class of 40 students. The program will admit 25 percent California residents, more than the rate admitted in the past, and aims to double the number of California residents entering the program in fall 2019. With 800 applicants for 40 spaces, the program is in very high demand, but Ms. Nolan acknowledged the need to better advertise for a more diverse applicant pool, attract admitted students of all backgrounds at a higher rate, and better prepare students to succeed.

The Department of Statistics took feedback from the Regents' working group and devised a plan that addresses outreach, recruitment, and preparation. With regard to outreach, program representatives would attend two statistics and science conferences targeted at URM students and target outreach at California State University (CSU) campuses with strong mathematics programs and strong representation of URM students. With regard to recruitment, the department would hold a Visit Day and bring admitted students to campus to introduce them to student life at Berkeley. With regard to preparation, the department proposes a Summer Bridge program with refresher mathematics courses and social outings.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked how this program will learn from the past and from other programs lacking URM representation and how it wanted to be held accountable. Ms. Nolan responded that the department is attracting a much more diverse undergraduate population to the data science major through teaching real world problem-solving. In a few years, these data science majors will graduate and diversify their field. Similarly, the UC Berkeley Statistics master's program hopes to attract diverse students with data-centric problem-solving for societal good. Chancellor Christ added that UC Berkeley has shared its data science curriculum with California Community Colleges such as San Jose Community College in order to create a pathway for students to transfer into UC Berkeley's data science program. She believed the transfer population would be more diverse as well. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked what CSUs with strong mathematics programs meant. Ms. Nolan explained that some CSU campuses are well known for their science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and strong mathematics preparation. Regent Ortiz Oakley challenged the department to look for talented math students at more diverse CSU campuses. Chancellor Christ added that the department was considering bridge programs as well.

Regent Graves asked about the diversity of the faculty. Ms. Nolan replied that all of the ladder rank faculty in the department are potentially part of the program. The Department of Statistics has 20 full-time equivalents (FTEs), six of whom are women and one of whom is Latino(a). Regent Graves asked what will be done to recruit more faculty of color to help recruit more students of color. Chancellor Christ replied that statistics and data science have both been targeted for faculty growth and that she recently published a plan for faculty diversity. Regent Graves expressed how difficult it was to make this decision in seeing the diversity numbers and was concerned that, by not supporting this program, he could potentially close the opportunity for change.

Regent Zettel asked whether UC Berkeley was tracking where the international students, who make up 78 percent of the program, go for employment. Ms. Nolan stated that nearly all alumni stay in the U.S. and almost all stay in California. Students are finding employment at technology companies, social media, banking, and finance, and they are fueling the California economy.

Regent Morimoto noted the lower cost of this program compared with comparable programs at other institutions, and he asked whether there was an opportunity to capture more value given the quality of employment of alumni. Ms. Nolan replied that the program was asked to consider a differential PDST for nonresident students. She would welcome the opportunity to do so, using one-third of the increase to nonresident students for return-to-aid and two-thirds for funding summer bridge programs and visit days.

Committee Chair Pérez asked Ms. Nolan whether she would like to seek an amendment to the proposal, and she responded in the affirmative. Ms. Nolan requested a one-time increase of 20 percent for nonresident students for an additional \$100,000. \$30,000 from future increases would go to return-to-aid and fund the summer bridge programs and visit days. Committee Chair Pérez asked Provost Brown for comment, and Provost Brown stated

that the program was currently a bargain for nonresident students and raising nonresident PDST by 20 percent would be consistent with comparable programs.

Regent Estolano asked Ms. Nolan to provide the proposed PDST increases for the record. Ms. Nolan stated that a 20 percent PDST increase for nonresident students would mean an additional \$3,600 per student. Taking into account the originally requested five percent increase, the differential 15 percent would be dedicated to return-to-aid and outreach, preparation, and recruitment programs. Committee Chair Pérez confirmed that, for nonresident students, there would be a PDST increase of 20 percent in the first year and an increase of five percent in subsequent years.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the amendment, a PDST increase of 20 percent in the first year and an increase of five percent in subsequent years, to the PDST proposal from the UC Berkeley Department of Statistics. Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the PDST proposal from the Department of Statistics as amended and voted to present it to the Board, with Regent Graves voting “no.”

Chancellor Christ introduced Prudence Carter, Dean of the UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education and the LEEP program, which is a pioneering program providing a model for educational leadership and is recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching. The program had experienced some problems with time-to-degree, which was one of the principal reasons it was suspended. The proposed PDST would provide more financial aid to those working professionals in the programs and support services ensuring program effectiveness and better time-to-degree.

Ms. Carter stated that LEEP is a three-year doctoral program for working professionals who are the highest level executives in higher education. Twelve California State Superintendents are graduates of the program as are local principals. The program began 13 years ago, and 50 students have since graduated. Ms. Carter had asked to put LEEP on hiatus because of a backlog of students who were not graduating in a normative time, which is often the case for working professionals, and the backlog has since been corrected. The leading challenge for the program was academic support, such as writing coaches and academic coordinators. Students were taking courses on evenings and weekends and needed help finishing dissertations. In the last year, four new faculty were hired, three of whom can provide student support. Historically, nearly all students are California residents and at least 50 percent come from diverse backgrounds. Fifty-nine percent from last year's cohort came from underrepresented backgrounds. Many of the leaders who graduate from this program are committed to social justice and social change. Ms. Carter stated that the program can maintain its diversity because of the pipeline of diverse students currently attending the UC Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute. Eighteen of 22 students interviewed would accept PDST if it meets their career goals. Ms. Carter addressed the income-to-debt ratio. Students who stayed 12 to 13 semesters and borrowed money every semester drove up the debt average. PDST would build resources that help students graduate in normative time. With new faculty and programs, Ms. Carter was confident that students would be able to complete the program in the normative three years.

Regent Estolano asked Provost Brown whether there was a reporting process for these programs. Provost Brown responded in the affirmative. Committee Chair Pérez responded that the reporting process does not generally carry consequences. Instead, the Regents have shortened the time of approval and reporting that allows for extensions. Status reports on programs did not track expectations and did not have actions attached to them. Chancellor Christ added that there are multiple accountability mechanisms at the campus level. Outside peer reviewers review programs every eight years, the Graduate School of Education conducts an accreditation review, and time-to-degree is constantly monitored at administrative level, because poor time-to-degree hurts students and wastes resources. Regent Estolano recommended that all PDST programs report to the Regents every two to three years. Committee Chair Pérez suggested bringing this recommendation back as a discussion item. Regent Estolano stated that she was speaking about all PDSTs in general, and Committee Chair Pérez recommended revisiting the topic at the end of the action item.

Regent Butler, expressing her concern about the number of semesters students were borrowing money in order to continue, asked Ms. Carter how much time the new faculty would need with the students before this improves. Regent Butler wished to see a metric of how many years would be needed for progress; she stated that this applied to all the PDST programs. Regent Butler also asked what the time period for success measured against the most optimal goals would be. Ms. Carter replied that the LEEP was resetting; it had one more student in the program and would be welcoming an entirely new cohort for 2020. The program would need a full cycle of three years and possibly two cycles. Ms. Carter has also restructured the advisory role for more faculty oversight in the leadership programs. With those resources in place, the hiring of new faculty, more mentoring, and academic support, LEEP can meet the normative time-to-degree.

Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that he was trying to reconcile a program focused on equity with increasing the burden on individuals leading the most difficult school districts in the State with the least resources. Equity means putting the best and brightest people in most difficult regions. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked why UC Berkeley did not consider investing directly in the program before putting a burden on students. Ms. Carter noted the stress of determining how to support a program and maintain its high-quality nature. There is in-kind and direct support from the school, but LEEP is not the only program in the Graduate School of Education that needs funding. One-third of the PDST will go to return-to-aid, and Ms. Carter is fundraising for students working in education systems. Much of the faculty support and administrative support comes from the limited budget of the Graduate School of Education. Ms. Carter stated that she is trying to distribute resources across many programs with need. Regent Ortiz Oakley recommended finding additional resources and additional commitments. He hoped that LEEP's pedagogy is attractive to foundations heavily invested in educational equity and the training of principals. Regent Ortiz Oakley suggested the possibility of employer support, stating that many employers will offset costs because this training helps employers recruit and retain the best leadership. The University should not burden these students and their families with increased debt to better serve underserved populations. Regent Ortiz Oakley acknowledged the need to hire faculty to ensure that success, but key indicators of that success are increased philanthropic funds,

securing employer support, and loan repayment programs. Ms. Carter replied that she agreed and was working to get more foundation funding. Some students are part of the State's loan forgiveness programs based on their work in high-needs areas. The average assistant principal in the Bay Area is earning about \$100,000 and superintendents are earning about \$150,000 to \$200,000. It would be ideal to fundraise more so that students do not have to pay more, but that is not the situation at the moment. Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed his appreciation and stated that he would be asking these questions again.

Regent-designate Weddle asked Ms. Carter to elaborate on how PDST revenue will improve financial aid for underrepresented students. Ms. Carter stated that financial aid would be modeled after that of the Principal Leadership Institute, which has an application process in place. The program will be able to give small, need-based grants of \$4,000 to \$7,000. One-third would go back to return-to-aid, coupled with philanthropic support, but most of the PDST funds would go to program support, mentoring, and training.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UC Berkeley LEEP PDST proposal and voted to present it to the Board.

Student observer Jazz Kiang introduced himself as a Ph.D. student in higher education at UCLA and chair of both the UCLA Student Fee Advisory Committee and the systemwide Council on Student Fees. He expressed his concern that students are not able to participate in discussions about PDST changes despite student consultation processes that are in place. Students may be unaware of the goals of proposed PDST changes, and programs may not be adequately soliciting student feedback prior to their application for changes. Mr. Kiang encouraged the Regents to consider the financial challenge that graduate and professional students experience and to improve student consultation. He cited Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. Graduate students have less access to financial aid, and professional students have fewer opportunities to be teaching assistants and graduate student researchers. As a result, these students have jobs without fee remission benefits and which are not responsive to increases in cost of attendance. Many graduate and professional students are parents, which presents unique challenges. Mr. Kiang stated his hope to see continued and proactive discussion on these students' experiences. He continued to look forward to listening, learning, and collaborating on behalf of the over 270,000 students systemwide.

Provost Brown introduced the UC Irvine Nursing program. Adeline Nyamathi, founding Dean of the UCI Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing, introduced herself and Leanne Burke, the school's pre-licensure program director. She addressed the program's lack of faculty diversity and low enrollment of African American students. The UCI School of Nursing was established in January 2017. The Master's Entry Program in Nursing, a pre-licensure program, started enrolling students in summer 2017, so the first class of students have not graduated yet. Regulatory issues and the high student-to-faculty ratios affect the cost of the program. The Master's Entry Program will help develop new workforce; students in the program have bachelor's degrees in other areas and can get a master's degree in nursing in two years. The program, which admits 20 students per year, has a community focus; nurses who graduate from the program work in underserved populations.

The majority of students come from within a 50-mile area. The UCI School of Nursing has a large number of practicing faculty, which influences new faculty hiring. In addition, UCI School of Nursing faculty have seen 10,000 underserved patients in a two-year span. The School of Nursing expressed its gratitude to Cathryn Nation, Associate Vice President of UC Health for bringing the UC nursing school deans together and helping them close budget gaps. As a new school, the focus has been on building school and programs, as well as recruiting more faculty. The UCI School of Nursing has tried to recruit diverse faculty not only with regard to race and ethnicity, but also gender and sexual orientation. The nursing profession is 85 percent female, so the School of Nursing has tried to recruit more men. Other areas of focus include spoken language and a desire to work with diverse populations. The School of Nursing grew from six senate faculty to 12 in two years, and grew the male student population from zero percent to 25 percent. There is one Latina student, and more work needs to be done. A systemwide UC Health task force shares best practices in increasing student and faculty diversity. The UCI School of Nursing has convened an excellence and diversity committee to recruit diverse faculty from California and out-of-state. The school is interested in building a presence in organizations like the National Black Nurses Association in order to attract faculty, and the school is reaching out to historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). Growing the pipeline is critical; the School of Nursing also wishes to recruit nurses who want higher-level degrees. The school is pursuing postdoctoral fellowships, as well as summer bridge programs as well. The school is currently recruiting a Native American faculty member and African American researcher. With regard to the low enrollment of African American students, 45 percent of students in the program come from underrepresented backgrounds and are predominantly Hispanic or Latina because of the location of the school. African American students doubled from three students to six students. The school's next steps include reaching out to HBCUs, summer programs and bridge programs, holistic admission, developing an algorithm to increase the African American student population, pipelines, and visits for students from underrepresented schools that focus on healthcare and nursing professions.

Committee Chair Pérez stated that he had difficulty aligning the presentation with the submitted proposal. He asked what aspects of the diversity recruitment plan were developed prior to submitting the PDST proposal and what was developed afterward. Ms. Nyamathi stated that holistic admissions and outreach to HBCUs are new, while inviting students for summer visits is an existing approach. The school had already been attending diversity fairs and reaching out to organizations but planned to triple the amount of time spent in those areas. Committee Chair Pérez stated his disappointment with the application submitted. He was particularly disappointed with the numbers of African American students and frustrated with the tone of the discussion of faculty diversity. Committee Chair Pérez stated his high level of skepticism about the difference between the proposal and the presentation, as well as future progress. He acknowledged the efforts and hoped that these were not all the efforts. HBCU's are not the only places with African American students, and there is a population of African American students in Orange County. Committee Chair Pérez did not want to regret supporting the proposal.

Regent Butler asked what holistic admissions meant and who was responsible for its execution. Ms. Burke replied that, historically, nursing schools have considered grade point average and the ability to graduate. Holistic admissions considers prior academic success in undergraduate and master's programs, personal statements, essays, volunteerism, and whether the applicant is a first-generation student. The School of Nursing has had a large number of first-generation college and master's degree students. The goal is to improve numbers in nursing education, nursing at the bedside, and in academia. Undergraduate admissions work is well supported, but graduate admissions work is all done in-house. This year, Ms. Burke, two student affairs staff, and a team of seven to 12 faculty reviewed 454 applications for 20 spots. Life experience, different degree types, and backgrounds of the applicants are considered as well. Regent Butler stated that it was unclear who had responsibility for outcome and that the program would not get the desired outcome if there is no consistently responsible person who is checking progress. Regent Butler asked Ms. Nyamathi to elaborate on the algorithm. Ms. Nyamathi responded that the algorithm comes from undergraduate admissions; filters on the algorithm might enhance the recruitment of more African American students. The school is still in the investigatory stage with regard to using an algorithm. Regent Butler asked about the data to which the algorithm applies. Ms. Burke responded that the undergraduate admissions office provides a breakdown of applicants, and the program admits percentages of students that are similar to the percentages of populations that applied; this has been a challenge at the graduate level.

Committee Chair Pérez asked General Counsel Robinson to confirm that no undergraduate admissions offices in the University consider race when developing admissions criteria. Mr. Robinson confirmed this.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked Provost Brown whom the Committee should hold responsible and accountable for improving diversity. He noted that every presentation states its commitment to diversity and stated that the Provost has a certain amount of responsibility. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked the question in light of the recent admissions scandals in the news. Graduate standardized tests such as the GRE, LSAT, and MCAT were barriers to students of color. Provost Brown acknowledged that he is one of those who should be held responsible in supporting the President to carry out aims of the Regents and that the University is very complex. It was part of the Provost's job to determine how to carry out these responsibilities and how to demonstrate the commitment he has and the Regents have to diversity. Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that an accountability measure was needed and recognized that the answer would not come in one day. Ms. Nyamathi stated that she was hopeful that the task force that Dr. Nation convened will consider the best strategies within the UC schools.

Committee Chair Pérez asked the presenters why he should not ask them to return another time. Ms. Nyamathi cited the two URM faculty they were trying to recruit, the increase of African American students, and the ambition and intention to achieve the program's goals. The program was previously limited by having very few faculty, but the program has more support and assistance to achieve its goals as it recruits and grows.

Regent Elliott shared many of Regent Ortiz Oakley's concerns and was concerned about the proposal's changes between submission and presentation. Regent Elliott's work group reduced the approval periods of some of the programs it reviewed to ensure feedback. He cited one program that had promised better numbers during its last approval but still reported poor numbers. He emphasized that these programs cannot keep failing students.

Mr. Robinson stated that he was also accountable alongside the Provost in trying to achieve these diversity objectives in a lawful way and that the Office of the General Counsel would be working with the Provost and others in the University.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCI School of Nursing PDST proposal and voted to present it to the Board, with Regents Butler, Elliot, Graves, Ortiz Oakley, and Pérez voting "no."

Kimberly Topp, former chair of the UCSF Department of Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science and co-director of the graduate program in physical therapy, introduced herself and Amber Fitzsimmons, who is the current chair of the department. Ms. Topp asserted UCSF's commitment to excellence, access, inclusion, and affordability in its physical therapy program, which has been at UCSF for 75 years. The PDST is for a three-year doctoral physical therapy program that enrolls 50 students per year. The program is ranked 20th in the country by *U.S. News and World Report*, second in California, and the number one ranked public program California. It is the only physical therapy program in the UC system. The Regents were concerned about the diversity of student body and faculty, affordability and student indebtedness, and the consultation process with faculty and students. The program has struggled with the recruitment of students who self-identify as Hispanic or Latino(a), African American, and Native American or Alaskan. Many students self-identify as two or more ethnicities and were categorized in the admissions application as "other" or "unknown." The Regents brought this to UCSF's attention, which prompted the campus to further examine this data category. The program had been using a holistic admissions approach for three years, and Ms. Topp compared 2016 data with 2019 data to demonstrate improvement. In 2016, there were no African American students, no Native American students, eight percent Hispanic or Latino(a) students, and 14 percent Pacific Islander, Hawaiian, Filipino, and Vietnamese students in the program. After establishing a holistic admissions process, in 2019, the program has eight percent African American students, still no Native American students, 14 percent Hispanic or Latino(a) students, and 16 percent Pacific Islander students. Ms. Topp acknowledged that diversity was improving but not enough.

Committee Chair Pérez asked whether UCSF had attempted to pinpoint the racial identities of students who had self-reported as multiracial or other, and Ms. Topp responded in the affirmative. Committee Chair Pérez stated that he had a problem with this approach.

Regent Lansing stated that multiracial people should be identified as multiracial and that it should be counted as diversity. She understood what UCSF was doing but felt that it was not right. Committee Chair Pérez stated that readjusting numbers raises concerns. Regent Elliott added that this is a much more complicated issue and cautioned against this

approach because it risks double or triple counting, which would skew numbers. Regent Lansing requested a separate meeting item on this topic.

Committee Chair Pérez stated that he would flag this topic for a future conversation. He added that UCSF's clarification may be more confusing than clarifying compared with how this question is evaluated in the other 41 programs. Regent Estolano appreciated the breakdown because she did not know what "other" meant and agreed with Regent Lansing's points. She asked how UCSF categorizes those students. Ms. Topp responded that the program used something similar to Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines and made sure they were in line with UCOP guidelines. The program assigned multiracial students to the least represented group in the population first. She understood that this is problematic, but the program did not know how to target recruitment without the breakdown.

Ms. Topp continued her presentation and stated that the department consulted with the School of Medicine to implement a holistic admissions process. The program has since increased faculty diversity, addressed unconscious bias, and increased outreach. The program has a good recruitment pipeline through an outreach program called Inside UCSF. The program is also creating webinars for UC and California State University (CSU) student outreach and creating materials to be distributed at Society for the Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science and Annual Biomedical Research Conference for Minority Students meetings. The program's diversity committee is now a student success committee. An African American faculty member will implement a tiered mentorship program that pairs students from middle school to undergraduate with current students of the program and providers.

Ms. Topp addressed faculty diversity and stated that faculty were four percent African American, which is better than the national average of three percent for this field. The program has no Native American faculty; there are only ten Native American faculty members in the nation. The program has 13 percent Hispanic, Chicano(a), or Latino(a) faculty. More than 80 percent of providers and 85 percent of faculty are Caucasian. With regard to affordability and student indebtedness, the PDST for this program is used for return-to-aid and teaching faculty salary and benefits. State funds support less than ten percent of the cost of the program, so it is very much dependent on PDST for support of outstanding faculty and staff and providing for students with limited means. The department was very concerned when student debt reached \$100,000, but it decreased by 20 percent in the last year. The default rate on loans for this program is one percent. The median salary of the program is comparable to the national average but not as high as the California median salary. The median salary following completion of the program is \$85,000 nationwide and \$95,000 in California. There is a public service student loan forgiveness program, and UCSF provides financial guidance and financial literacy training so that students only borrow what they need. Housing for students is kept below market rate, and UCSF is building graduate student housing that will be available in summer 2019. In 2016, the program began providing a cost of living supplement of \$2,400, and 59 percent of students are taking advantage of it. Need-based scholarships are also available. Through the holistic admissions process, the program improved its first-generation student

recruitment from six percent in 2015 to 22 percent in 2019. The student success committee has really focused on helping these students complete the program and find employment.

Ms. Fitzsimmons stated that PDST has been held flat since 2016, and the program opted to not increase fees until 2020. The leadership team met to review the costs of the program and the costs of their top priorities, which are: the recruitment of two diverse faculty positions; implementation of a local, tiered mentoring program that would create a local pipeline; and applicant support for first-generation and diverse students. Faculty met and discussed two options: 1) an overarching five percent increase through an initial two percent increase followed by a three percent increase, as was done in the past, or 2) an annual three percent increase. Faculty voted for the second option but decided to keep fees level for the existing cohort. One group of students would be completing the program when those fee increases start, and one-time money has been set aside to offset these additional costs. The department invited students to a town hall meeting to discuss the second option and field questions, the class presidents collected student feedback, and an anonymous survey was distributed for further feedback. Student feedback had been provided to the Committee for review. The students are most concerned that the high cost of education and the lure of the technology industry may diminish UCSF's ability to attract people to the health professions and physical therapy in particular due to its lower salaries. Students were also concerned that UCSF lacks the endowments and scholarships to support the program. There is currently a campaign to raise money for educational scholarships. Students offered unique strategies, such as crowdsourcing and crowd funding with alumni. Cost of living supplements would continue. At the next faculty retreat, leaders will consider the length of the curriculum. Another consideration is keeping students in more local clinical placements while keeping in mind that there are 15 physical therapy programs across the state that are all vying for clinical placements as well. One solution is engaging other UC medical centers without a physical therapy component, helping students stay in UC system and creating a pipeline for future physical therapists within UC. Students were grateful for the high-quality, unique program despite fee increases. In this program, students work alongside physicians, pharmacists, dentists, and nursing students. UCSF hopes to continue these quality indicators as they do separate UCSF from its comparators.

Committee Chair Pérez thanked the presenters and acknowledged the high quality of the program, the student input process, and the consideration for the existing student cohort. He noted that the proposed PDST increase was modest and appropriate to what was needed for program improvements. Committee Chair Pérez asked whether students had success with the loan forgiveness program. Ms. Fitzsimmons replied that she could follow up with information. Committee Chair Pérez remarked that the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau had changed how it evaluates the Public Loan Forgiveness programs and that loan forgiveness should not be the answer to solve student indebtedness. He asked what else was being done about indebtedness. Ms. Topp replied that the program is trying to help students minimize the loan amounts. Committee Chair Pérez stated that managing debt load is good but does not address indebtedness. He asked whether the methodology for obtaining student diversity numbers were used for obtaining faculty diversity numbers. Ms. Topp replied that faculty self-identified as one ethnic group. Committee Chair Pérez underscored his discomfort with the methodology used to categorize multiracial students,

stating that, for instance, many Latinos are multiracial and will identify that way. Ms. Topp responded in the affirmative and asked for guidance from programs such as the UCSF School of Medicine. Committee Chair Pérez stated that his discomfort stems from the change in methodology. While this is not enough not to support the program, it will affect how the program will be held accountable in the future.

Chancellor Hawgood echoed that the methodology was modeled after that of the EEOC and not arbitrary. He acknowledged Regent Elliott's concerns about how far the methodology can be taken. UCSF has raised \$380 million dollars to address student indebtedness, and there was a 20 percent reduction in indebtedness after one of the endowments became available.

Regent Elliott stated that he was troubled by the African American and Latino(a) student percentages of one percent and five percent, respectively. He noted that increasing diversity was in the last PDST proposal and that this was not a success. Regent Elliott added that, rather than providing efforts different from than the ones that have failed, the explanations seemed to redefine students already in the program. He asked what was different now compared with four years ago. Ms. Topp responded that there will be four new African American students entering the program and cited the success of holistic admissions. Ms. Topp provided examples of the holistic admissions process, such as interviewing more students to build a better cohort, taking life experiences into account, helping with the application process, and having diverse faculty in the admissions committee. Chancellor Hawgood added that, in the incoming class, eight percent self-identify as African American. Ms. Fitzsimmons noted that there is faculty development in the admissions process, especially regarding diversity. Through UCSF's Differences Matter campaign, all new faculty are required to take an eight-hour training session on diversity, equity and inclusion, and existing faculty have volunteered to participate. What is new is a focused, tiered pipeline for physical therapy dedicated to recruiting from African American and Hispanic populations at the middle and high school levels. Faculty involved in this pipeline need release time from teaching.

Committee Chair Pérez recommended recruiting in Oakland instead of San Francisco, because its African American and Hispanic populations have been very much diminished. Regent Estolano thanked Committee Chair Pérez for noting that and added that the work group was really concerned by UCSF's decision to recruit in San Francisco because it exemplified lack of understanding of the trends the Bay Area.

Regent Elliott stated that he appreciated that the incoming class has greater diversity numbers but noted that they were still low overall. He was also concerned with the development and consultation of the plan, noting an initial reduction in PDST for out-of-state students, of which there are very few. Regent Elliott asked why the proposed PDST was increased upon discussion with faculty, but students were not consulted until after this increase was decided. Ms. Fitzsimmons responded that she did not want to increase PDST any more than what was necessary but acknowledged that the strategies the program wanted to implement would require more money. After analyzing both options, it was found that the second option, which was a three percent increase every year, would boost

return-to-aid and allow the aggressive pursuit of strategies to improve diversity. Ms. Fitzsimmons stated that this was why faculty were presented with this option. Ms. Fitzsimmons stated that there is a transparent policy with faculty to discuss strategic initiatives and priorities because faculty do much of the work to make it happen. Ultimately, Ms. Fitzsimmons and the program directors would have the final say. Leadership felt that a three percent input was as modest an increase as possible for reaching priorities.

Chair Committee Pérez stated that, based on the discussion, this item might have difficulty getting approved. He asked the work group whether it had any amendments to the proposed PDST increase before the vote.

Regent Estolano stated that the work group wished to amend the program to two years.

Regent-designated Weddle stated that student consultation seemed secondary and would have preferred if students had been given the opportunity to consider all options. She also reiterated that this Committee should have future conversations about multiracial categorizing given concerns about the methodology that was discussed.

Regent Zettel asked how many URM students are deciding not to pursue the physical therapy doctorate because they would be earning less than nurses. Ms. Fitzsimmons responded that this is a doctoring profession because physical therapists receive direct access and have autonomy to see a patient as a first point of contact in the health profession. UCSF would consider whether it could decrease program time within the constraints of its accreditation standard.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCSF Physical Therapy PDST proposal, amended to approve the program for two years, and voted to present it to the Board, with Regent Graves voting “no.”

Teri Schwartz, Dean of the UCLA School of Theater, Film and Television, stated that it is the only film school in the UC system and had no other public comparators. Private comparators were New York University and University of Southern California (USC).

Committee Chair Pérez stated that his work group was unimpressed by the level of diversity. In contrast, the Los Angeles theater scene has vibrant diversity. Committee Chair Pérez asked how the School planned to achieve greater levels of diversity in both film and theater. Ms. Schwartz shared Committee Chair Pérez’s concern and acknowledged that diversity numbers were not as good as they should be. She added that there have been five faculty searches since 2014. From these searches, the School recruited four faculty members of color and four women faculty, three of whom are women of color. This was a success story in changing diversity across film and theater. With regard to student diversity, the percentage of Hispanic students increased from eight to nine percent in 2018. These strategies were undertaken to improve student diversity: 1) a new Director of Enrollment Management Strategies was hired to reach out to the California Community Colleges and California State University; 2) department chairs were

charged with developing strategic plans with a diversity enrollment component; 3) Ms. Schwartz created a dean's leadership team; and 4) a daylong equity, diversity, and inclusion workshop for faculty was launched. Ms. Schwartz stated her belief that new stories and storytellers will come from this diversity. The School planned to use its alumni of color more effectively to do outreach across Los Angeles and around the world. The School distributed \$3 million in scholarships last year, 40 percent of which went to students most in need. Ms. Schwartz also secured an eight-figure gift that will be used for need-based scholarships. Through various donations, there are full scholarships for women of color. A ripple effect has inspired other donors as well. Another goal is to create free workshops that explain the application process to underserved populations. Finding Your Voice, Telling Your Story is a program that introduces 20 high School students to the School and future careers. The first cohort was 48 percent African American, and the remaining percentage was Hispanic. The School had begun recruiting for the program's second year. The School also received a gift from Hearst Foundation for new, diverse voices in playwriting.

Regent Morimoto noted that this program was far less expensive than private comparators. He asked whether the School wished to increase PDST to fund other initiatives that would further improve diversity and other aspirations. Ms. Schwartz responded in the affirmative and stated the need to improve communicating about funding to URM populations. Sources of funding include PDST, donors, and industry partnerships.

Committee Chair Pérez stated that he sensed that the Committee was prepared to support approval with a commitment from UCLA to work with the Committee on metrics.

Regent Estolano stated her concern about the debt level and the low level of diversity in a highly diverse region, so she was only comfortable approving a two-year program. Ms. Schwartz provided an example of student productions. A graduate student makes three films while in the program, which cost a total of \$55,000. The average four-year thesis film costs about \$32,000. UCLA put a cap on film costs in order to fight debt. Each graduate student is provided with about \$60,000 of support and over \$150,000 per student in value added. Each student has a portfolio of work upon completion of the program.

Regent Lansing suggested keeping the proposal at the original number of years. She added that this is a particularly good time to look for entertainment industry scholarships. The industry knows it has a diversity problem, and organizations are reaching out, so there is opportunity for funding.

Committee Chair Pérez asked whether there was a motion to amend and there was none.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCLA School of Theater, Film and Television PDST proposal and voted to present it to the Board, with Regent Estolano voting "no."

Provost Brown stated that, with regard to UCLA Social Welfare, the work group was concerned about how money would be used and affordability.

Gary Segura, Dean of the Luskin School of Public Affairs at UCLA, stated that the program was in its 72nd year and is distinguished for the diversity of its faculty and student body. Classes have been added for licensure. Students in the program gain significant field experience. For instance, Luskin social workers interviewed asylum seekers to establish credible fear, and nine of 15 infants under the age of one were released because of this work. The School is proposing PDST because more classes are driving up costs, class size must be maintained to ensure the high quality of the program, and field faculty of licensed social workers are needed. Mr. Segura addressed indebtedness and diversity. This program's primary competitors are UC Berkeley and USC. Debt from the UCB program is 4.4 percent higher than that of UCLA, and principal competitor USC charges \$53,472 per year. The average loan has not changed in the last several years due to holding PDST relatively flat; here has only been a 2.8 percent increase since 2010. Students receive an average financial aid package of \$7,749, and 35 students from each cohort attend for free and have a guaranteed job upon graduation. Mr. Segura reported that 60.3 percent of Master of Social Welfare students are Pell Grant recipients, 48.5 percent are URM, and 65.2 percent are non-white. Faculty are 62.5 percent women, 37.5 percent URM, and 56.25 percent non-white. The program made three offers of employment, one to a white male and two to women of color.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCLA Social Welfare PDST proposal and voted to present it to the Board.

With regard to UCLA Medicine, Committee Chair Pérez recommended that presenters share their best practices at another meeting in the interest of time.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCLA Medicine PDST proposal and voted to present it to the Board.

Committee Chair Pérez explained that the law schools had to present their proposals before the Committee because the PDST increases were 7.5 percent. The previously approved PDSTs of both the law schools and business schools were \$10,000 to \$11,000 more for in-state students than out-of-state students. Committee Chair Pérez spoke to the Deans about leveling resident and nonresident PDSTs so that the differential comes from tuition. Law school PDSTs were kept flat for seven years, which is why the proposed increase is 7.5 percent. Provost Brown provided a chart demonstrating that this proposed increase is less than an annual five percent increase for the last seven years. In return for approval of the proposals as presented, the law school deans have promised to return to the Committee in two years with a proposal to level in-state and out-of-state tuition.

Regent Estolano asked whether is it possible to begin leveling in-state and out-of-state tuition in the first two years. Committee Chair Pérez responded that this could either result in a smaller net revenue or a significantly higher PDST percentage increase for out-of-state students. The issue is that students were not consulted on that model; students were presented with and approved the 7.5 percent proposal. This would give the law schools a chance to obtain buy-in from the students for further modifications.

Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean of Berkeley Law, reported that he held a forum for students in fall 2018 and presented the possibility of a 7.5 percent tuition increase for in-state and out-of-state students. Of the 300 students who attended the forum, no one objected; the students recognized the need for a tuition increase for the law school to be competitive. The students were concerned about equity among those served by the increase. Faculty unanimously approved the proposal, and the alumni wrote a support letter to the Regents. He stated that this proposal allowed the law school to plan for the future and create an even better proposal for the coming years.

Regent Estolano noted that the Regents did propose that another program set a higher PDST increase for nonresident students because of the competitive nature of the program. She suggested that even an eight percent increase for nonresident students would keep Berkeley Law competitive with comparators. Jennifer Mnookin, Dean of the UCLA School of Law responded that tuition at UC law schools is well below many comparators and stated that she shared Mr. Chemerinsky's discomfort with doing something different from what was proposed to students and faculty. A higher PDST increase that only applied to incoming, first-year nonresident students, if that was possible, would be more acceptable. If that is what the Regents want, the Deans will do it, but Ms. Mnookin reiterated her discomfort. Regent Estolano responded that she understood and suggested applying a higher increase to next year's first-year nonresident students.

Chancellor Christ stated that the program that raised its PDST increase is UC Berkeley Statistics, which is a one-year program, so everyone could opine, while law is a three-year program.

Committee Chair Pérez proposed approving the PDST increase for two years and requesting the law schools to return in one year with a new proposal for PDST after those two years, and he asked whether this would work. Mr. Chemerinsky responded in the affirmative. Committee Chair Pérez entertained a motion to amend the proposal to approve the plan for two years with an expectation to return in one year with a proposal for the following three years.

Provost Brown asked whether this applied to the business schools as well, and Committee Chair Pérez responded that this applied to the law schools only.

Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that he wished to have a future discussion about UC law schools returning to being public law programs where students are trained to practice law for those least able to afford high quality representation. He was concerned in the same way he was concerned about the medical schools. Regent Estolano responded that, to her knowledge, the law schools at UCLA and UC Berkeley have good loan repayment programs. Song Richardson, Dean of the UC Irvine School of Law, stated that one of the law school's founding principles was commitment to public service. *U.S. News and World Report* ranked UC Irvine Law School's clinical program seventh in the country, and the School consistently ranks at the top with pro bono work, community service, and the number of students who enter public interest and social justice careers. Mr. Chemerinsky added that 20 to 25 percent of Berkeley Law graduates enter public

interest and government work, and 50 percent of the PDST will go toward financial aid. The School is constantly looking for ways to improve its loan repayment assistance program, which has 300 graduate participants every year. Ms. Mnookin added that UCLA also has a very strong public interest program, and roughly the same percentage of UCLA students as at Berkeley pursue public interest and government careers. UCLA School of Law has been able to take advantage of the President's Public Service Law Fellowships, which help students get their dream public interest job, and it also has a loan repayment program. Regent Estolano stated that she would prefer that the law schools raise fees for nonresident students to better support public interest work for resident students.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UC law schools' PDST proposals as two-year plans and voted to present them to the Board.

Provost Brown stated that no representatives were present from the two business schools with PDST proposals. Committee Chair Pérez asked whether the two proposals went to two different work groups, and Provost Brown responded in the affirmative. Committee Chair Pérez asked whether the proposals were well received in the work groups. Mr. Diaz replied that the work group for UC Irvine's business program took issue with the fee differential between resident and nonresident students, and UC Irvine changed its proposal to close that gap. There was also a discussion about a possible two-year approval. Regent Elliott clarified that his work group's only question was about the differential. Provost Brown stated that he brought the UC Irvine and UC San Diego business programs together because he wanted them to be treated similarly. Committee Chair Pérez asked Regent Elliott whether he would accept affording the same two-year approval period to both business schools as was done for the law schools. Regent Elliott stated that UC Irvine proposed closing the differential gap in five years, but the work group wanted the gap closed much sooner to minimize the impact on existing students.

Committee Chair Pérez stated that he would entertain a motion to approve the plans as presented for two years and invite both business schools to return to the Committee in one year to propose a more expedited resolution to the differential issue.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the UCI Business and UC San Diego Business PDST proposals as amended and voted to present them to the Board.

3. **UPDATE ON STEM PREPARATION THROUGH COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS: LAUNCH ACADEMY SUMMER STEM PROGRAM**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

This item was not discussed.

4. **EVIDENCE OF THE PUBLIC VALUE OF A UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DEGREE**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

This item was not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Attachment 1: Proposed PDST Levels* for 2019-20 through 2023-24

Campus	Program	Years in Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for California Residents					Percent Change				
			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Berkeley	Leadership for Educational Equity	5	N/A	\$8,000	\$8,240	\$8,488	\$8,742	\$9,004	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Environmental Design	5	\$6,946	\$7,190	\$7,442	\$7,702	\$7,972	\$8,252	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%
	Law	5	\$35,164	\$37,800	\$40,636	\$43,684	\$46,960	\$50,482	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
	Medicine	5	\$22,407	\$23,079	\$23,772	\$24,486	\$25,221	\$25,977	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Product Development	5	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	\$35,746	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Public Health	3	\$8,790	\$9,230	\$9,692	\$10,176	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$9,750	\$10,236	\$10,748	\$11,286	\$11,850	\$12,442	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Social Welfare	5	\$4,848	\$5,090	\$5,344	\$5,612	\$5,892	\$6,186	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Statistics	5	\$18,232	\$19,144	\$20,100	\$21,104	\$22,160	\$23,268	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Translational Medicine	5	\$33,456	\$34,464	\$35,496	\$36,564	\$37,656	\$38,790	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Davis	Business	5	\$25,998	\$27,036	\$28,116	\$29,241	\$30,411	\$31,626	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	Health Informatics	5	\$7,224	\$7,440	\$7,662	\$7,890	\$8,127	\$8,370	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Law	5	\$34,182	\$35,890	\$36,966	\$38,072	\$39,214	\$40,390	5.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,410	\$23,084	\$23,776	\$24,488	\$25,224	\$25,980	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Prev Veterinary Medicine	2	\$6,060	\$6,060	\$6,060	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Health	5	\$8,100	\$8,343	\$8,592	\$8,850	\$9,117	\$9,390	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Irvine	Biomedical & Translational Science	5	\$11,568	\$12,147	\$12,753	\$13,392	\$14,061	\$14,763	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Business	5	\$27,807	\$28,362	\$28,929	\$29,508	\$30,099	\$30,702	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	Genetic Counseling	5	\$10,941	\$11,487	\$12,060	\$12,663	\$13,296	\$13,962	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Law	5	\$31,755	\$34,136	\$36,696	\$39,448	\$42,406	\$45,586	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
	Medicine	5	\$22,413	\$23,085	\$23,778	\$24,492	\$25,227	\$25,986	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$7,233	\$7,596	\$7,977	\$8,376	\$8,793	\$9,234	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Los Angeles	Architecture	5	\$9,261	\$9,492	\$9,729	\$9,972	\$10,221	\$10,476	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	Environmental Science & Engineering	5	\$7,998	\$7,998	\$8,079	\$8,160	\$8,322	\$8,490	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	Law	3	\$31,755	\$34,136	\$36,696	\$38,532	N/A	N/A	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
	Medicine	5	\$23,745	\$24,932	\$26,178	\$27,488	\$28,862	\$30,304	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	\$0	\$0	\$0	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$8,859	\$9,303	\$9,768	\$10,257	\$10,770	\$11,307	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Social Welfare	5	\$6,505	\$6,831	\$7,170	\$7,524	\$7,893	\$8,286	5.0%	5.0%	4.9%	4.9%	5.0%
	Theater, Film, & Television	5	\$11,589	\$12,168	\$12,774	\$13,413	\$14,085	\$14,790	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Urban Planning	5	\$7,233	\$7,521	\$7,821	\$8,133	\$8,457	\$8,793	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%

* The amounts in the display reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated in the display requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program's approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final year. Assessing PDST levels greater than the amounts in the display requires Regental approval of a new multi-year plan.

Attachment 1: Proposed PDST Levels* for 2019-20 through 2023-23 (continued)

Campus	Program	Years in Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for California Residents					Percent Change				
			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Riverside	Business	3	\$27,771	\$29,158	\$30,616	\$32,148	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
San Diego	Business	5	\$32,961	\$33,948	\$34,965	\$36,012	\$37,092	\$38,202	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	International Affairs	5	\$9,234	\$9,510	\$9,795	\$10,089	\$10,392	\$10,704	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,413	\$23,535	\$24,714	\$25,953	\$27,252	\$28,617	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Public Policy	5	\$9,234	\$9,510	\$9,795	\$10,089	\$10,392	\$10,704	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
San Francisco	Dentistry	5	\$31,035	\$31,968	\$32,928	\$33,915	\$34,935	\$35,985	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,407	\$23,079	\$23,772	\$24,486	\$25,221	\$25,977	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Physical Therapy	5	\$12,975	\$12,975	\$13,362	\$13,764	\$14,178	\$14,604	0.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

Campus	Program	Years in Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for Nonresident Students**					Percent Change				
			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Berkeley	Leadership for Educational Equity	5	N/A	\$8,000	\$8,240	\$8,488	\$8,742	\$9,004	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Environmental Design	5	\$6,946	\$7,190	\$7,442	\$7,702	\$7,972	\$8,252	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%
	Law	5	\$26,870	\$28,884	\$31,050	\$33,380	\$35,884	\$38,574	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
	Medicine	5	\$22,407	\$23,079	\$23,772	\$24,486	\$25,221	\$25,977	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Product Development	5	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	\$35,746	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Public Health	3	\$8,790	\$9,230	\$9,692	\$10,176	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$10,538	\$11,062	\$11,616	\$12,194	\$12,804	\$13,444	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Social Welfare	5	\$4,848	\$5,090	\$5,344	\$5,612	\$5,892	\$6,186	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Statistics	5	\$18,232	\$19,144	\$20,100	\$21,104	\$22,160	\$23,268	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Davis	Translational Medicine	5	\$33,456	\$34,464	\$35,496	\$36,564	\$37,656	\$38,790	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Business	5	\$25,998	\$27,036	\$28,116	\$29,241	\$30,411	\$31,626	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	Health Informatics	5	\$7,224	\$7,440	\$7,662	\$7,890	\$8,127	\$8,370	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Law	5	\$31,188	\$32,748	\$33,730	\$34,740	\$35,782	\$36,856	5.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,410	\$23,084	\$23,776	\$24,488	\$25,224	\$25,980	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Prev Veterinary Medicine	2	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$6,540	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Health	5	\$8,616	\$8,343	\$8,592	\$8,850	\$9,117	\$9,390	-3.2%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%

* The amounts in the display reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated in the display requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program's approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final year. Assessing PDST levels greater than the amounts in the display requires Regental approval of a new multi-year plan.

** Nonresident students are also assessed nonresident supplemental tuition, which is expected to be \$12,245 in 2019-20.

Attachment 1: Proposed PDST Levels* for 2019-20 through 2023-23 (continued)

Campus	Program	Years in Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for Nonresident Students**					Percent Change				
			2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Irvine	Biomedical & Translational Science	5	\$11,568	\$12,147	\$12,753	\$13,392	\$14,061	\$14,763	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Business	5	\$22,983	\$24,132	\$25,338	\$26,604	\$27,933	\$29,331	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Genetic Counseling	5	\$10,941	\$11,487	\$12,060	\$12,663	\$13,296	\$13,962	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Law	5	\$26,004	\$27,954	\$30,050	\$32,302	\$34,724	\$37,328	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
	Medicine	5	\$22,413	\$23,085	\$23,778	\$24,492	\$25,227	\$25,986	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$7,233	\$7,596	\$7,977	\$8,376	\$8,793	\$9,234	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Los Angeles	Architecture	5	\$9,261	\$9,492	\$9,729	\$9,972	\$10,221	\$10,476	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%
	Environmental Science & Engineering	5	\$7,998	\$7,998	\$8,079	\$8,160	\$8,322	\$8,490	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	Law	3	\$26,004	\$27,954	\$30,050	\$31,552	N/A	N/A	7.5%	7.5%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
	Medicine	5	\$23,745	\$24,932	\$26,178	\$27,488	\$28,862	\$30,304	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	5	\$9,450	\$9,924	\$10,419	\$10,941	\$11,487	\$12,060	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Social Welfare	5	\$6,984	\$7,332	\$7,698	\$8,082	\$8,484	\$8,910	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Theater, Film, & Television	5	\$11,589	\$12,168	\$12,774	\$13,413	\$14,086	\$14,790	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Urban Planning	5	\$7,767	\$8,076	\$8,397	\$8,733	\$9,081	\$9,444	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Riverside	Business	3	\$27,771	\$29,158	\$30,616	\$32,148	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
San Diego	Business	5	\$24,018	\$25,218	\$26,478	\$27,801	\$29,190	\$30,648	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	International Affairs	5	\$9,234	\$9,510	\$9,795	\$10,089	\$10,392	\$10,704	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,413	\$23,535	\$24,714	\$25,953	\$27,252	\$28,617	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Public Policy	5	\$9,234	\$9,510	\$9,795	\$10,089	\$10,392	\$10,704	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
San Francisco	Dentistry	5	\$31,035	\$31,968	\$32,928	\$33,915	\$34,935	\$35,985	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Medicine	5	\$22,407	\$23,079	\$23,772	\$24,486	\$25,221	\$25,977	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Nursing	2	\$11,607	\$12,186	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Physical Therapy	5	\$13,341	\$12,975	\$13,362	\$13,764	\$14,178	\$14,604	-2.7%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Total: 42													

* The amounts in the display reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated in the display requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program's approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final year. Assessing PDST levels greater than the amounts in the display requires Regental approval of a new multi-year plan.

** Nonresident students are also assessed nonresident supplemental tuition, which is expected to be \$12,245 in 2019-20.