

## Attachment 2: Summaries of Proposed Multi-year Plans and Multi-year Proposals for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition

### Table of Contents

1. Berkeley Master of Development Practice.....	2
2. Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute (Educational Leadership M.A.) .....	7
3. Berkeley Engineering M.Eng .....	11
4. Berkeley Journalism .....	16
5. Berkeley Optometry .....	20
6. Berkeley Product Development.....	24
7. Berkeley Teacher Education .....	28
8. Davis Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL).....	32
9. Davis Master of Preventive Veterinary Medicine .....	37
10. Davis Doctor of Veterinary Medicine .....	42
11. Irvine Biotechnology Management M.S. ....	47
12. Irvine Engineering Management M.S. ....	52
13. Irvine Master of Public Health .....	57
14. UCLA Art M.F.A. ....	63
15. UCLA Dentistry D.D.S. ....	68
16. UCLA Master of Public Health.....	73
17. Riverside Medicine M.D. ....	78
18. Riverside Public Policy.....	83
19. San Diego Pharmacy .....	88
20. San Francisco Pharmacy. ....	93
21. Santa Barbara Master of Technology Management .....	99
22. Santa Cruz Applied Economics and Finance M.S.....	105
23. Santa Cruz Games and Playable Media M.S.....	110
24. Santa Cruz Serious Games M.S. ....	115

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program:** UC Berkeley Master of Development Practice

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23						
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$				
Resident:	\$18,600	\$19,344	\$19,924	\$20,522	\$21,138	\$21,772	4%	\$744	3%	\$580	3%	\$598	3%	\$616	3%	\$634
Nonresident:	\$18,600	\$19,344	\$19,924	\$20,522	\$21,138	\$21,772	4%	\$744	3%	\$580	3%	\$598	3%	\$616	3%	\$634

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of the multi-year proposal is to modestly increase PDST each year to maintain and enhance the quality of instruction and student services while ensuring affordability for our students and financial sustainability in light of increased costs. The increase will also underwrite additional recruitment and external development efforts to attract a higher proportion of students from underrepresented populations by increasing financial and other support.

**Brief Description of Program**

The UC Berkeley Master of Development Practice (MDP) is a two-year professional program designed to prepare a new generation of leaders in business, the social sector, government, and international organizations to confront the challenges and opportunities of sustainable development at community, national, regional, and global scales. Compared to the approximately 30 professional graduate programs that are members of the Global MDP Association, our program is known for its quantitative rigor, infusing into its curriculum market-based approaches, innovation, entrepreneurship, and finance to position our graduates for both domestic and international sustainable development positions.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The purpose of our first multi-year plan for AY 2012-13 through AY 2014-15 was to establish the MDP program and generate PDST funds to pay for the following expenses:

- 1. Course development, faculty, and other instructional costs for the program’s “core” courses:** The program’s ten “core” courses were developed with faculty recruited from eight of the university’s fourteen colleges/schools.
- 2. Establishment of student services (admissions, academic, and career counseling):** The student services functions were developed and staffed. Indicators of achievement include: increasing application processing capacity from 94 applications in 2012 to 165 in 2017; effective advising led to all but 3 of the 90 students who entered the program to graduate on time; after poor job placement rates for our first cohort, our career assistance efforts resulted in 88% of the respondents in our 2016 survey indicating that they were employed full-time, with over 81% reporting employment consistent with their aspirations within six months of graduation. The median salary was \$77,500.
- 3. Administrative and operational costs not covered by the University:** Program staff were recruited, classroom and office space furnished.
- 4. Student aid to maximize accessibility:** Average student support rose to over \$7,000 (37% of PDST) in 2016-17.
- 5. Speaker events and panel discussions to benefit the university community:** Two annual major public speaking events were held each year. Speakers included economist Prahbu Pingali, geographer Jared Diamond, Raj Shah, former Director of USAID, philosopher Martha Nussbaum, and gender specialist Judith D’Souza.
- 6. Fundraising to enhance program quality and provide additional student support:** Over \$200,000 raised from external sources for summer Practicums and \$60,000 for tuition support.
- 7. Diversity and retention services:** A mix in nationalities is seen as essential to providing the critical diversity of global perspectives for a program of this nature. We currently have students from sixteen countries. Our staff have worked to connect admitted students from URM communities and different countries to fellowship resources in order to ensure retention and timely graduation.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our goal is to ensure the MDP program’s financial viability while enhancing educational quality and student services and increasing the percentage of underrepresented domestic students in the program. To cover costs, our strategy is to increase the number of students while seeking only modest annual increases in PDST (3-4%). One use of increased revenue will be for the additional marketing and recruitment activities needed to meet our ambitious enrollment goal (from 49 in 2017-18 to 62-64 students in the period covering our multi-year plan). Funds from external sources will continue to be used to supplement aid to students. The goal is to reach 35% of PDST going to aid students by the end of this plan. An indicator of success will be when the percentage of accepted students (domestic and international) whose self-reported reasons for deciding not to attend due to financial challenges drops below 25%. If the PDST increase are not approved, much of the above would be in jeopardy. Resources would need to be diverted from instruction, student services, or fundraising to meet the 33% student aid target. The option of increasing class sizes even more has been considered but rejected due to the impact on the quality of instruction and direct student services.

**Market Comparison:**

▣ Total Annual Charges    □ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$32,770	\$33,870	\$34,851	\$35,857	\$36,889	\$37,592
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$19,615	\$20,204	\$20,810	\$21,434	\$22,077	\$22,739
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,111	\$53,674	\$55,284	\$56,943	\$58,651	\$60,411
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$45,015	\$46,115	\$47,096	\$48,102	\$49,134	\$50,197
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$37,350	\$38,470	\$39,624	\$40,813	\$42,037	\$43,299
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,111	\$53,674	\$55,284	\$56,943	\$58,651	\$60,411

**Comparison publics:** University of Florida Master of Development Practice, University of Washington Master of Public Administration, University of Minnesota Master of Development Practice, University of Texas Austin Master of Global Policy Studies

**Comparison privates:** Columbia University MPA-DP, Harvard University MPA/International Development, Georgetown University Master of Global Human Development, University of Denver Master of International Development, MIT Political Science, Brandeis Social Policy and Management

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** Of the forty-six accepted students who declined admission in 2017, 87.5% of those responding to the question accepted admission at private universities. Given that the more accurate peer group would therefore be those private institutions, the MDP's costs are quite favorable for California residents and roughly equivalent for non-residents. For residents, UC Berkeley MDP's costs are lower than its private peers, which are our more accurate peer group. For comparison purposes, our costs are above the average for selected MDP-related programs at public institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$340,145	\$8,806	\$12,103	\$7,763	\$9,761	\$10,096	\$388,674
Benefits Cost	\$158,397	\$9,867	\$10,604	\$11,400	\$12,262	\$13,193	\$215,723
Providing Student Services	\$106,290	\$3,189	\$3,284	\$3,383	\$3,484	\$3,589	\$123,219
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$81,255	\$2,438	\$2,511	\$2,586	\$2,664	\$2,744	\$94,198
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$5,000	\$109	\$92	(\$2,534)	\$5,351	(\$5,509)	\$2,509
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$139,880	\$259,896	\$18,635	\$12,552	\$19,975	\$13,528	\$464,466
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$80,433	\$3,623	\$8,655	\$2,524	\$6,449	\$2,935	\$104,619
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$911,400</b>	<b>\$287,928</b>	<b>\$55,884</b>	<b>\$37,674</b>	<b>\$59,946</b>	<b>\$40,576</b>	<b>\$1,393,408</b>

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	48%	\$64,972	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$77,500
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	12%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
					<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i>	Afr-American	2%	4%	2%	N/A	N/A
	Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	2%	2%	4%		
	American Indian	2%	2%	0%		
	<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>6%</b>		
	Other Domestic	66%	58%	53%		
	International	28%	35%	41%		
	Total	100%	100%	100%		
<i>Socioeconomic:</i>	% Pell recipients	30%	36%	31%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i>	% Male	36%	35%	39%	N/A	N/A
	% Female	64%	65%	61%	N/A	N/A
	Total Enrollment	51	53	48		

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

The data doesn't yet reflect our commitment to diversity other than in gender and the mix of nationalities (currently we have students from 16 countries) – this mix of nationalities is essential to providing the diversity of global perspectives for a program of this nature. Enrollment percentages to increase racial and ethnic diversity will be achieved through tailored marketing efforts and by working through MDP alumni from those groups. Student aid funds will continue to be used to enhance affordability and diversity. Early outreach in the admissions process regarding Graduate Student Instructor positions and other funding opportunities will increase confidence and avoid unreasonable debt. Fundraising efforts will be intensified to support students from economically less advantageous situations for both tuition and travel support for the required summer practicum experiences.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

Due to the focus and desirability of diversity in global perspectives among the students, international students will continue to represent a high proportion of total students (40%) and the proportion of women is expected to continue to be 60-65%. Where change will be sought is within the cohort of students from the US and particularly among the residents of California. The target is to increase the number of non-international students coming from underrepresented minorities by 50%, and with 40% of non-international students having benefited from Pell Grants.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	4.7%	4.2%	4.3%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	9.9%	10.2%	9.1%
	International			
White	Domestic	79.5%	83.1%	84.1%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	4.7%	2.5%	1.9%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	34.5%	32.5%	32.3%
	Male	65.5%	67.5%	67.7%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	14.2%	14.3%	12.5%
	International			
White	Domestic	80.0%	80.7%	82.5%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	31.7%	30.3%	30.8%
	Male	68.3%	69.7%	69.2%

**Note:**

The Master of Development Practice is a Graduate Group without faculty of its own. For its courses, the MDP draws faculty and instructors on a semester-by-semester basis from multiple departments and eight of the university's fourteen schools and colleges. Instructors change from year to year.

The data presented in the tables are those from MDP's home college, College of Natural Resources with the understanding that they may not be of much relevance. The program is not involved in the recruitment and retention of instructional faculty in any of the departments that provide the MDP with instructors.

That said, our goal to maintain a diverse body of students is matched by our efforts to increase diversity among our pool of instructors. We also continue our efforts to enhance this by valuing diversity of perspective and background when selecting

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* In 2017-18, approximately \$160,000 in committed external funding will be used to supplement PDST funds to reach the 33% target in Return-to-Aid. In 2018-19, increased PDST revenue coming from the 4% increase in PDST and the addition of thirteen students will make up for the drop in external funding used for financial aid that is caused by the end of a USAID cooperative agreement. It allows us to continue to maintain the minimum target - and if successful, aggressive fundraising activities are expected to increase that percentage to 35% by the end of the plan period.

*Goals/Strategies:* The modest PDST increases requested and the projected growth in the number of students will allow the program to meet the goal of 33% of total PDST returned in the form of student aid throughout the plan period. In addition, the program will raise funds for tuition support and for Practicum Grants. The beginnings of an alumni base, and their "success stories," can be leveraged to solicit more significant gifts from donors. An endowed chair and/or a collection of focused "term" endowments can be used to free up additional student aid. Through these supplemental fundraising strategies, the program intends to raise student aid to at least 35% of total PDST. In addition, the program will work with students earlier in the admissions process to build awareness of fellowship opportunities, identify and share graduate instructor opportunities, and ensure that fellowship offers made are of the size and timeliness to make a difference.

### ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

Thirteen students (48% of the class that would be affected by the proposed increase) attended a “town hall” meeting to discuss the PDST. The discussion was lively, and students expressed understanding of the logic behind the proposed increases. Their response was the formation of a student-led initiative to help with fundraising efforts. In addition, a survey was sent out to all current MDP students. Twenty-six (53%) responded. Half of the students expressed concerns with the level of fees, the largest number mentioning the burden on international students and the potential impact on the profile of students that the program will attract. Several pointed out the high cost of living in the Bay Area and the fact that student resources were fixed while tuition and living costs were increasing. Six students suggested that more funding go to student support; one suggested that faculty and staff salaries be frozen or reduced and one suggested less funding go to supplies/equipment. Echoing the town hall, several students suggested more aggressive fundraising to support Fellowships. Two called for more transparency, including specific mention of pending fee increases on the program webpage and sharing more detailed cost information with students. One student opposed the proposed increase in student numbers while another mentioned their support for it. Eighty-three percent of the students responding to the survey felt that they understood how PDST is being spent. Two said they did not understand and three others indicated that they would appreciate a more detailed breakdown of expenses than that which had been provided.

The plan was shared with the MDP Faculty Executive Committee via email. Four of the six members also serve as faculty for MDP courses. Four of the six responded with an email stating “I agree” or “I approve.” The chair of the Executive Committee commented on the delicate balance between covering costs and keeping the program affordable. He opined that the lack of permanent faculty was one reason for the high costs of instruction relative to other PDST-supported programs on campus and expressed the hope that the program would be allocated FTEs in the future – or that a portion of the regular graduate tuition/non-resident tuition be shared with the program to help keep the level of PDST down.

The program leadership considered the feedback, most of which corresponding to their own sentiments that the increases were regrettable but unavoidable due to increased costs. The consultation strengthened the program’s intention to aggressively pursue the plan’s recruitment goals and enhanced diversity and fundraising programs.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute (Educational Leadership Program)**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0
Nonresident:	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

Although costs continue to rise, the program proposes to continue to assess PDST at its current level of \$6,000 for the 5-year period covering this multi-year plan. PDST revenue will continue to fund program enhancements and scholarships, and ensure that underrepresented minority and low income students are able to pursue a graduate professional degree in educational leadership.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Principal Leadership Institute (PLI) was established at UC Berkeley’s Graduate School of Education in 2000 to prepare leaders to serve in Bay Area schools with historically vulnerable and underserved populations. Students completing the 14-month PLI program receive an M.A. in Education and a recommendation towards an Administrative Services Credential - Preliminary (Tier 1) from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. PLI’s leadership preparation program is grounded in principles of equity and social justice at the intersection of research and practice. PLI graduates educational leaders who are well prepared for leadership positions in high-needs schools and districts.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

In the 2015-16 through 2017-18 multi-year plan, two primary goals for instituting a PDST were outlined: 1) financial support to low-income and underrepresented minority students, and 2) program enhancements.

First, we used PDST funds for student financial support particularly to low-income and underrepresented minority students, and to minimize any debt students must incur to complete a leadership preparation program. Half of all PDST revenue has been returned to students in the form of scholarships, and financial aid and has been critical in our recruitment of highly qualified, low income, and underrepresented minority students who aspire to a career in educational leadership but who lack the means to attend UC Berkeley. PDST-funded financial aid has also been supplemented with other needs-based and diversity scholarships from funding sources secured from private donors and foundations.

Second, we implemented program enhancements that would ensure our programs are of the highest quality with respect to both campus-based and field-based clinical preparation. Half of all PDST revenue was used to hire new Field Supervisors/Coaches and pay for instructional materials and services. Specifically, PLI hired four additional Field Supervisors/Coaches (for a total of 18) over the past three academic years. Increasing the number of Field Supervisors on staff and investing in their initial and ongoing training, through a partnership with the National Equity Project, ensured that PLI students are provided with career entry (induction) support in their first leadership positions. PDST funds also paid for course materials on behalf of students in order to minimize some of the financial burden associated with the program. The program used PDST funds to invest in digital tools and instructional materials for use in classrooms, schools, and school systems. For example, Chalk & Wire software licenses for all PLI students gave our students a platform to create and store digital portfolios demonstrating leadership competencies acquired while in the PLI program. These enhancements, also provided at our peer institutions, ensured that the PLI and the Graduate School of Education maintain its high-quality program.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

PLI is not requesting an increase in PDST revenue but anticipates receiving additional PDST revenue as result of enrolling a few more students. Similar to our first multi-year plan, approximately 50% of PDST revenue will be allocated to financial aid for the incoming PLI cohort. This percentage could vary, depending on PLI's ability to secure grants and donations from private foundations. Remaining revenues will be used to: a) expand and provide professional development for field coaches; b) enhance technology, including online resources; and c) develop career entry supports.

We also anticipate using PDST funds for costs related to the implementation of the California Administrator Performance Assessment (Cal APA), which all credential students will be required to pass beginning in 2019-20. The Cal APA is projected to cost a minimum of \$500 per student per testing administration, totaling at least \$14,000 of additional annual programmatic expense for PLI.

**Market Comparison:**       **Total Annual Charges**       **Total Charges to Degree**

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$23,361	\$23,717	\$24,118	\$24,526	\$24,942	\$25,371
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$16,536	\$17,032	\$17,543	\$18,069	\$18,611	\$19,170
	<i>Privates</i>	\$35,722	\$36,793	\$37,897	\$39,043	\$40,205	\$41,411
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$35,606	\$35,962	\$36,363	\$36,771	\$37,187	\$37,616
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$26,040	\$26,821	\$27,626	\$28,455	\$29,308	\$30,187
	<i>Privates</i>	\$35,722	\$36,793	\$37,897	\$39,034	\$40,205	\$41,411

Comparison publics: Cal State East Bay  
 Comparison privates: Mills College, University of Sothern California, Loyola Marymount University

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** Tuition costs for Berkeley's school leadership program (PLI) is slightly above those for our public comparator, though the hybrid model of Cal State East Bay compared to PLI's in-person model accounts for the cost discrepancy. Compared to private institutions offering in-person delivery models, PLI tuition is very affordable.

**NOTE:** While the Principal Leadership Institute collected out-of-state tuition for the leadership preparation program and its comparators, it is designed to enroll students who are currently employed in the San Francisco Bay Area and, therefore, are California residents. In California, if students are employed in a public school (which our PLI students must be), they are eligible for residency. This, we felt, made out-of-state comparisons generally not applicable to our proposal, though numbers have been provided for reference.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$43,200	\$7,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,400
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$72,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$84,000
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$28,800	\$4,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,600
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$144,000	\$24,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$168,000

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	69%	\$29,166	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$120,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	3%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** This is not information that we ask of our students, either at graduation or post-graduation. There is a questionnaire that goes out to our students that talks about the students and how they are doing, but it does not ask about the salary. It is something that we will seek to ask in the future, because we understand the importance of that data, especially when trying to quantify the impact on our students' lives. We have used the median principal salary for Oakland (from salary.com) as a proxy for this information.



<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American		21%	4%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		10%	22%		
American Indian		3%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>		<b>34%</b>	<b>26%</b>		
Other Domestic		66%	74%		
International		0%	0%		
Total		100%	100%		
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients		52%	14%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male		45%	30%	N/A	N/A
% Female		55%	70%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment		29	23		

Note: In general in the field of education, Asians are considered underrepresented and we consider them as such for the purposes of our program. In 2015 Asians represented 21% of our enrollment and in 2016 they represented 9%.

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

PLI endeavors to first and foremost maintain its existing above-average enrollment of diverse students as well as continue to actively recruit and support students from underrepresented populations in order to serve partner school districts in the local Bay Area. Providing adequate financial support and a continued focus on social justice and equity are two strategies to ensure a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in the PLI program.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

Aligned with our mission to continually diversify the school leadership population, PLI will continue to actively recruit, mentor, and support students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and those from underrepresented minority and gender backgrounds. Our commitment to equity and social justice necessitates an intentional effort to nurture the development of future leaders who represent the diverse student population of our surrounding urban districts. Consequently, we will continue to strive to maintain higher than average levels of enrollment of African American, Latino/Hispanic, and lower income students

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic		16.7%	20.3%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic		10.8%	10.9%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic		0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic		5.0%	3.1%
	International			
White	Domestic		65.0%	59.4%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic		2.5%	6.3%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female			45.2%	45.2%
Male			54.8%	54.8%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic		20.0%	22.6%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic		12.9%	12.9%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic		0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic		6.5%	3.2%
	International			
White	Domestic		58.1%	58.1%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic		3.2%	3.2%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female			45.2%	45.2%
Male			54.8%	54.8%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund* Approximately 50% of PDST revenue will be allocated toward student aid in the form of scholarships for low income and underrepresented minority students in PLI. This percentage could vary, depending on PLI's ability to secure grants and donations from private foundations.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our goal is to configure financial aid packages (including fellowships, stipends, fee waivers, etc.) so that students in greatest economic need will not find fees to be an insurmountable barrier to applying and so that students need not incur substantial debt to complete their degree. We propose to measure our success primarily by tracking the indebtedness, composition of the applicant pool, student enrollment, and graduating cohorts.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

The Principal Leadership Institute is not proposing an increase to PDST levels. Therefore, we solicited minimal feedback in the form of an online survey to current students and faculty.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Berkeley Master in Engineering**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
Current							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$		
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23											
Resident:	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0		
Nonresident:	\$24,700	\$25,900	\$27,100	\$28,400	\$29,700	\$31,100	4.9%	\$1,200	4.6%	\$1,200	4.8%	\$1,300	4.6%	\$1,300	4.7%	\$1,400

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

While maintaining a high quality program and addressing annual inflationary increases to program costs, the aim of our five-year proposal is to increase the enrollment of California residents in the Master of Engineering (M.Eng.) program at a compound annual growth rate of 10%, which is more than double that of our domestic and international nonresident students. To do so, the College is proposing to not increase the PDST level for California residents for the next five years, and increase the nonresident PDST level anywhere between 4.58% and 4.80% each year for the next five years. By keeping fees constant for residents—and allocating additional aid to resident students—the proposed PDST fee levels for the next five years will help balance the student body for California residents and nonresidents, and likely improve diversity.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Berkeley Master of Engineering Program (M.Eng.) is aimed at developing engineering leaders. With twenty-three concentrations located across seven engineering departments, the one-year M.Eng. curriculum integrates engineering coursework with classes in leadership and core management concepts. Students tackle actual industry challenges through case studies and a capstone project. They gain the management skills necessary to lead a complete spectrum of technology ventures. As a cross-disciplinary community of peers, students ultimately form a broad network of professional colleagues. These networks are reinforced through career advising and placement, access to alumni and industry connections, and other services.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

For the period covering the last multi-year plan and the following two years, from AY 2011-12 to 2015-16, PDST funds were used to maintain the quality of the program, provide student financial aid, and fund outreach efforts to increase diversity.

**To maintain program quality**, especially in light of significant program growth in the last three years, PDST funds were used to hire additional lecturers to teach more and smaller sections of the leadership curriculum; add more staff to help with student services, career services, and capstone program administration (2 FTE plus seasonal and student help); and secure and renovate classrooms and study space for students (\$800-\$900K annually in off-campus building rental plus rental of classrooms from other schools and colleges). For this period, several of our engineering departments continue to be among the top-tier engineering programs in the nation. We also employed feedback from student surveys, administered three times during the program in order to implement solutions to fixable issues raised from the surveys. Student feedback has generally been positive to changes in the program, including changes based on student feedback, such as offering smaller, more intimate sections for three of our engineering leadership courses and providing additional GSIs for two courses. Based on end-of-year student satisfaction survey results, on average students viewed the program:

STUDENT SERVICES SUCCESS METRICS (5 pt scale)	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
"The program was intellectually challenging and stimulating"	3.87	3.84	3.99
"This program had a large impact on my career direction"	3.93	3.91	4.06
"I would recommend this program to prospective students"	4.05	3.84	3.94
"I would enroll in this program again"	3.92	3.78	3.86

**For affordability**, 1/3rd of PDST revenue was returned to financial aid via the M.Eng. Fellowship Award and Opportunity Grant every year.

- Fung Fellows Award - All applications are automatically considered for the Fung Fellows Award. This merit award is given to a subset of candidates with noteworthy academic or professional accomplishments, as determined by department faculty nominations. The award covers approximately 40% of the tuition and fees and is awarded to approximately 30% of admitted applicants.
- M.Eng. Opportunity Grant - Students who are awarded grants must demonstrate financial need. Special consideration is given to applicants whose background and life experiences contribute significantly to an educationally beneficial mix of students and enhance educational diversity. This may include applicants who have had limited access to educational resources, who represent geographic diversity, who have persevered over economic disadvantage, who have shown exceptional fortitude by working many hours to support themselves during their education, or whose experiences have brought about a perspective not widely represented within the program. The award covers approximately 30% of the tuition and fees and is awarded to approximately 15% of admitted applicants.

**For diversity**, the PDST had funded several strategic initiatives. Most notably, the PDST was used to bolster recruitment efforts for underrepresented minorities and women, including sponsorship of events, advertising, and marketing opportunities with affiliated organizations working with these populations. Enrollment of underrepresented minorities grew from 0% in 2012-13 to 4% in 2016-17. Also, enrollment of women in the M.Eng. program has ranged from 21% to 33% over the last 5 years. The program has experienced growth in the diversity of its international populations, growing from 26 countries at the beginning of our last multiyear plan to 31 countries represented, from Australia to Zimbabwe, in 2017-18.

## ***Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal***

---

The College of Engineering plans to increase enrollment from 366 to 467 students during the five-year period of the plan. Our goal is to **significantly increase enrollment of California residents** in the Master of Engineering program by keeping the resident PDST level flat for the next five years, and increasing the nonresident PDST level anywhere between 4.58% and 4.80% each year for the next five years. If the proposed PDST levels are not approved, the program risks losing California residents due to affordability challenges. The proposed PDST fee levels for the next five years will help balance the student body for California residents and nonresidents, and likely improve diversity. The financial model will be stable in future years, and there will be a significant total cost differential between residents and nonresidents.

Also, the additional PDST revenue from enrollment growth and increases to nonresident PDST will be used to **maintain a high quality program** for students, especially as enrollment growth continues. Future program investments include hiring more ladder-track faculty to support the leadership curriculum (which relies heavily on lecturers), adding more staff to ensure quality of student and career services, and securing more classroom and student space. These investments require substantial financial resources above and beyond what linear enrollment growth can provide. It is also important to mention that all program costs are going through annual inflationary increases that should be accounted for. PDST funds will also be used to **fund our industry partnership initiative** and **expand our diversity recruitment efforts** with by, for example, extending our outreach efforts to the other UC campuses, increase the size and number of M.Eng. Opportunity Grant awards, market to national diversity recruitment lists, leveraging corporate sponsored events that focus on connecting with women in technology and leadership, and establish pipeline relationships with both Cal and national student organizations.

**Market Comp:**     **Total Annual Charges**     **Total Charges to Degree**

**Comparator Figures Below are Projections**

		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$47,870	\$48,226	\$48,627	\$49,035	\$49,451	\$49,880
	<i>Other Publics</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,363	\$53,934	\$55,552	\$57,219	\$58,935	\$60,703
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$51,115	\$52,671	\$54,272	\$55,980	\$57,696	\$59,525
	<i>Other Publics</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,363	\$53,934	\$55,552	\$57,219	\$58,935	\$60,703

Comparison publics: Not applicable  
 Comparison privates: MIT, Stanford, Cornell, Carnegie Mellon

The M.Eng. comparators are from top-tiered engineering programs at private institutions. They are MIT, Stanford, Cornell, and Carnegie Mellon. We do not directly compete with any other public institutions, as they are not top-ranked engineering schools, and we do not compete for the same students and faculty.

Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges: Based on the data in the table, the total cost for California residents in the M.Eng. program is consistently lower than the total costs for state residents of the comparison institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$1,148,868	\$197,940	\$160,000	\$320,000	\$480,000	\$480,000	\$2,786,808
Benefits Cost	\$582,900	\$40,000	\$80,000	\$160,000	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$1,342,900
Providing Student Services	\$450,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$550,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$300,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$500,000
Instructional Support Staff	\$1,537,651	\$107,636	\$115,170	\$166,632	\$24,186	\$107,420	\$2,058,695
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$300,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$350,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$3,100,000	\$349,350	\$318,188	\$351,568	\$374,958	\$412,610	\$4,906,673
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$778,100	\$33,860	\$102,950	\$54,837	\$3,558	\$4,752	\$978,057
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$856,681	\$15,064	\$78,255	\$1,667	\$2,172	\$43,048	\$996,887
Other	\$250,000	\$100,000	(\$50,000)	(\$100,000)	(\$50,000)	(\$50,000)	\$100,000
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$9,304,200	\$893,850	\$954,563	\$1,054,703	\$1,124,875	\$1,237,830	\$14,570,020

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	11%	\$40,916	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$92,500
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	6%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity</i> Afr-American	1%	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
<i>(Domestic):</i> Chicano(a)/Latino	3%	2%	3%		
American Indian	0%	0%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>		
Other Domestic	40%	28%	29%		
International	57%	69%	67%		
Total	100%	100%	100%		
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	23%	17%	36%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	79%	73%	67%	N/A	71%
% Female	21%	27%	33%	N/A	29%
Total Enrollment	177	176	239		

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Focused primarily on prospective applicants living in the US, the College of Engineering is taking the following comprehensive approach that targets multiple groups at the same time including URM, low SES, and women in engineering:

- **Strategic Outreach** aimed at increasing the pipeline of applicants from underrepresented and other groups through frequent middle school and high school visits and engagement programs, community college outreach, and other various pipeline programs.
- **Admit Yield-Improvement Outreach** that is based on connecting current students with admitted students to encourage them to attend UC Berkeley. Admitted students are invited to attend our M.Eng. Visit Day event held each year in April. Applicants receiving the M.Eng. Opportunity Grants are offered visit day travel grants.
- **Enhanced Mentoring and Student Services** at the College in order to broaden the participation of women and underrepresented minorities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We are strengthening the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students and ensuring that our services and programs address issues specific to underrepresented groups, including LGBT, re-entry, and disabled students as well as multicultural and women students.
- **External Fellowship Opportunities** by encouraging application to two external scholarships that increase affordability for underrepresented groups: the GEM Fellowship and the Gates Millennium Fellowship. The mission of The National GEM Consortium is to enhance the value of the nation's human capital by increasing the participation of underrepresented groups (African Americans, American Indians, and Hispanic Americans) at the master's and doctoral levels in engineering and science. The Gates Millennium Scholars Program promotes academic excellence and provides an opportunity for outstanding minority students with significant financial need to reach their highest potential.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect that the enrollment composition of the Berkeley M.Eng. in respect to these groups will continue to match or exceed the enrollment composition we've seen for ourselves as well as for our comparator schools (from anecdotal evidence) based on our increased and more comprehensive efforts to address diversity.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/ Afr-American	Domestic	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%
	International			
Chicano(a)/ Latino(a)	Domestic	5.5%	5.8%	5.5%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
	International			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	22.4%	21.3%	21.8%
	International			
White	Domestic	70.1%	69.8%	69.7%
	International			
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	1.1%	1.7%	1.8%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		16.3%	16.6%	16.9%
Male		83.7%	83.4%	83.1%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/ Afr-American	Domestic	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%
	International			
Chicano(a)/ Latino(a)	Domestic	5.5%	5.8%	5.5%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
	International			
Asian/ Pac Is	Domestic	22.4%	21.3%	21.8%
	International			
White	Domestic	70.1%	69.8%	69.7%
	International			
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	1.1%	1.7%	1.8%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		16.3%	16.6%	16.9%
Male		83.7%	83.4%	83.1%

**Note:** All faculty in the M.Eng. program are ladder rank, so the two tables are identical.

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* One third of PDST is returned back for financial aid .

*Goals/Strategies:* It is essential that a Berkeley Engineering education at the graduate and undergraduate levels remain accessible to students of all socioeconomic backgrounds. To this end, we use one-third of our M.Eng. PDST revenue for student aid and support in accordance with Regental policy. This allocation of resources will help maintain the accessibility of a Berkeley Engineering M.Eng. education. In addition, a percentage of nonresident fees are going to subsidize resident tuition through financial aid packages. Opportunity grants consider CA residency as a qualification towards educational diversity. Residents are also awarded a number of merit based fellowships.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

Feedback on the plan was provided by **engineering faculty** via a survey. Six respondents indicated that half the faculty feel that the program is average in cost, with the other half feeling that the program is expensive, but that they all feel the program is somewhat affordable compared to other similar MA programs.

There were **two student consultations** regarding the proposed increase to PDST levels: 1) a focus group of the class of 2018 student leadership (class representatives); and 2) an on-line MEng student representative and alumni survey was sent to over 900 people with 7% response rate (61). Generally, students in the focus group indicated that tuition is costly but increases would not have changed their decision to come to the program. They also indicated that the return to financial aid and the program quality and services compared to other programs help justify the increases.

The following results are based on feedback provided by M.Eng. alumni who, using a scale from 1-5, provided their opinions on the planned increases:

- Over 80% thought the overall cost of the program is expensive. (39% 4; 43% 5 = Extremely expensive )
- In comparison to other similar master's programs, almost 70% thought the M.Eng. program was unaffordable. (49% 4; 20% 5 = Relatively unaffordable)
- Over 70% thought financial support (any relevant scholarships, loans, etc.) was important in making their decision to attend this program. (20% 4; 54% 5 = Extremely Important)
- If the PDST had been 4% greater when you were accepted to the M.Eng. program, 19% of the respondents indicated that they would not have attended the program, 32% indicated they would have attended the program, and the remaining 49% indicated maybe they would have attended the program.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Berkeley Journalism**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$8,270	0%	\$0	5%	\$376	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	5%	\$394
Nonresident:	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$8,270	0%	\$0	5%	\$376	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	5%	\$394

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

With increases proposed in years 2 and 5 of this multi-year plan, the purpose of this proposal is to both increase resources to reduce the financial burden to students with greatest need, as well as to maintain student/lecturer ratios in journalism courses, offsetting costs to open new sections of courses when demand is high.

**Brief Description of Program**

Widely regarded as among the country's best journalism programs, Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism offers one of the only remaining two-year Master of Journalism degrees in the U.S. and is the only graduate-level journalism program in the UC system. The School expects to be the top provider of communicative expertise for its own campus and its surrounding community, and should position itself in that role by developing operations that, at the same time, create the net revenues that both sustain the School and strengthen its core commitment to turning out the world's best journalists.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The last multi-year plan established the PDST and was for the period of AY 2015-16 through AY 2017-18. In addition to providing students with world-class professional training, the main purpose for which the School established a PDST was budgetary – the School's budget reflects a legacy deficit of approximately \$2.36 million, and, until the PDST was implemented, it was still growing. Budget controls, aggressive development, sustained advancement efforts, and proactive career services were four dependent variables that were of great concern to J-School faculty, staff, and students.

Accordingly, PDST funds were used for the following goals:

- **Implement a PDST without unduly burdening our students with long-term debt.** The PDST increase allowed for two-year financial aid packages to be offered to students, increasing transparency and security. Students with the least socio-economic resources have received need-based assistance to minimize the impact of the PDST on their access to professional education. In addition, increased fundraising revenue has allowed for fellowships to further reduce costs for students.
- **Expand the size of our development operation to bolster fundraising.** Development operations have doubled in size and philanthropy yields have increased 345% from FY15 to over \$3 million by the end of FY17.
- **Invest in strengthening the national and international standing of the School through expanded marketing and social media efforts.** PDST proceeds invested in advancement, specifically marketing and social media campaigns, benefited students by ensuring that their degrees remain appreciating assets, gaining in value apace with the prominence and respect the School continues to command.
- **Expand career services at the School to ensure students experience a smooth transition into (or return to) the industry at an appropriate level.** The hiring of 1.0 FTE for career services has increased the number of personalized communications between the School and employers from a handful each semester to approximately 50 per week. The number of career-focused events has increased from 25 events in AY 2014-15 to 40 events in AY 2016-17.
- **Invest in new lecturers and curricular innovations, without leaving the School with the unpalatable choice of either a deepening deficit or cutting courses, access, or instructional range.** Courses were implemented to train students in basic photography and audio storytelling, as well as the history, business, and ethics of journalism.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

As 23% of the School's revenue picture, the PDST is an important ingredient in the Journalism School's sustainability and ability to balance its budget. The revenue from a 5% increase in our PDST in FY2019-20 would go towards financial aid to reduce the financial burden on students, and to maintaining student/lecturer ratios in journalism courses to offset costs to open new sections of courses when demand is high. Without the additional revenue, the School could face raising the student/faculty ratio beyond optimal sizes.



**Market Comparison:**

☑ **Total Annual Charges**      ☐ **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$21,918	\$22,274	\$23,051	\$23,459	\$23,875	\$24,697
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$18,330	\$18,880	\$19,446	\$20,030	\$20,631	\$21,249
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,947	\$55,188	\$57,525	\$59,961	\$62,502	\$65,151
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$34,163	\$34,519	\$35,296	\$35,704	\$36,120	\$36,942
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$32,030	\$32,991	\$33,981	\$35,000	\$36,050	\$37,132
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,947	\$55,188	\$57,525	\$59,961	\$62,502	\$65,151

Comparison publics: CUNY

Comparison privates: Stanford, NYU, Columbia, Northwestern

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** The annual program cost of Berkeley Journalism compares well against its primary competitors for both California residents and nonresidents (who are required to pay Non-Resident Tuition their first year). Its main competitor, Columbia University, charges 161% higher annual tuition and fees, and even in light of Columbia's shorter program duration of 10 months vs. Berkeley Journalism's 22 months, still costs the student more in the longer run. Berkeley Journalism is 30% more expensive than the one public institution we've included in our comparables (CUNY), but students vote with their applications and continue to show us that CUNY's brand is regional and does not hold up next to Berkeley's national standing overall. Berkeley Journalism is attractive to nonresident students due to its national quality ranking, lower cost, and Berkeley's appeal as a place to live.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$130,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,405	\$141,405
Providing Student Services	\$160,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$170,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$165,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000	\$195,000
Instructional Support Staff	\$95,003	\$0	\$2,526	\$0	\$0	\$2,471	\$100,000
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$297,497	\$0	\$14,962	\$0	\$0	\$15,646	\$328,105
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$847,500</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$42,488</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$44,522</b>	<b>\$934,510</b>

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	49%	\$41,415	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$60,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	10%

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	10%	8%	9%	N/A	5%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	14%	11%	10%		8%
American Indian	2%	3%	4%		0%
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>23%</b>		<b>13%</b>
Other Domestic	56%	59%	64%		39%
International	18%	19%	14%		48%
Total	100%	100%	100%		100%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	38%	32%	34%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	36%	34%	33%	N/A	23%
% Female	64%	66%	67%	N/A	77%
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>102</b>		

NOTE: The J-School has maintained a diverse population of students over the past five years and is characterized as a minority-majority program. This is true even when considering the “unknown/other” category which are overwhelmingly mixed race-identified students in the Journalism program.

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

***1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?***

Overall strategy for student recruitment remains focused on reaching the greatest concentration of qualified applicants through conventions, events, and university visits. Berkeley Journalism’s annual outreach for recruitment sends our Admissions Director to affinity group conferences around the country, such as the National Association of Hispanic Journalists (NAHJ) and the National Association of Black Journalists (NABJ). At these conferences, racially diverse applicants are encouraged to apply for a dozen scholarships we offer to visit the School during our annual Fall Open House and Spring Welcome Visit. A climate of inclusion is especially important to our program. In response to student input in 2015, the School made equity and inclusion part of its curricular and co-curricular efforts. For example, the School incorporated diversity-related content in required courses, in the first-year students’ orientation week, and in co-curricular meetings and encounter sessions throughout the year.

***2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?***

We remain hopeful that additional investments in fundraising will offer new financial aid funding to reduce the burden caused by the fee increases we are proposing. Applicants to our program are very sensitive to the financial aid packages they are offered at the time of acceptance--strong packages encourage acceptance. Our goals and approach will remain the same going forward: to strike a balance between merit-based and need-based support so that we preserve access to the program for a diverse student body.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	5.7%	8.1%	5.9%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	17.1%	13.5%	14.7%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	2.9%	2.7%	2.9%
	International			
White	Domestic	71.4%	70.3%	70.6%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	2.9%	5.4%	5.9%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	28.6%	32.4%	26.5%
	Male	71.4%	67.6%	73.5%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	7.7%	9.1%	10.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	15.4%	18.2%	20.0%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
White	Domestic	76.9%	72.7%	70.0%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	23.1%	18.2%	20.0%
	Male	76.9%	81.8%	80.0%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* 33% of PDST goes to financial aid; in addition, PDST used to increase philanthropy and fundraising revenue has allowed us to create fellowships and scholarships further reducing the impact of the PDST on our students.

*Goals/Strategies:* Berkeley Journalism's financial aid/affordability goal is to strike a balance between merit-based and need-based support so that we preserve access to the program for meritorious candidates regardless of their ability to pay, while enrolling students who we believe have unusually strong potential as journalism practitioners and leaders. We continue to review our application and enrollment numbers and gather input from current students to ensure our program remains affordable. Financial aid packages are focused on those with the highest need. In order to provide better information up front to students for whom financial aid is a significant factor in their decision to attend, two-year financial packages were initiated in 2015-16 and were offered during the acceptance process.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

A preliminary introduction to the proposal was delivered to the School's Student Leadership Committee and their guidance was sought on how best to seek feedback from the student community. This was followed by a presentation to the Senate Faculty, again to seek their feedback on the proposal. The faculty offered their support.

A School-wide PowerPoint presentation providing the details of the proposal followed by a Q&A took place on September 20, 2017 and students, faculty, staff, and lecturers were in attendance.

An email went out to students, faculty, and lecturers on September 21st, describing the PDST multi-year plan soliciting their feedback. A reminder went out for comments. One comment was submitted. No changes to the proposal were made as a result of the one comment submitted.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Berkeley Optometry**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$17,258	\$18,120	\$19,026	\$19,976	\$20,974	\$22,022	5%	\$862	5%	\$906	5%	\$950	5%	\$998	5%	\$1,048
Nonresident:	\$16,436	\$17,258	\$18,120	\$19,026	\$19,976	\$20,974	5%	\$822	5%	\$862	5%	\$906	5%	\$950	5%	\$998

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The UC Berkeley School of Optometry proposes annual 5% increases in PDST for AY 2018-2019 through AY 2022-23 to ensure UC Berkeley not only remains the #1 rated Optometry school in the country but also the most cost-effective program within the public institutions. PDST is the main source of funding for operations of the school given that the campus does not provide support for clinical faculty, staff for the school or clinic, or operating funds. PDST rates have increased once since AY 2012-13, while the costs for faculty and staff continue to rise due to merits and promotions, mandated salary and benefit increases, as well as increased contributions to pension plans. As a result, our increased costs for essential personnel were unfunded and have already outpaced future proposed increases. In addition, teaching, student services, and clinical operations have also increased in costs. The proposed PDST increases alone will not stabilize the school's budget. If the increases are not approved, the school will re-incur an operational deficit that will be compounded by increased costs. Approval of the multi-year 5% increase will provide an educational benefit to the students by helping maintain a stable student-to-faculty ratio, which is essential for a health science program like ours, not just for the education of the students but for the safety of the general public who are treated by our students during the last two years of their curriculum.

**Brief Description of Program**

Berkeley Optometry is the only in-state public option for CA residents and is the world's top-ranked program in optometric education and training, and vision research. Berkeley Optometry provides an outstanding education in our three distinct programs: the Doctor of Optometry degree, Optometric Doctor residency training, and the Ph.D. in Vision Science. Building on our students' strong didactic knowledge base, we offer extensive clinical experience to our interns and residents. The exposure to patient care, the breadth of clinical cases, and the opportunity to train with top clinical faculty, in one of the country's largest optometry clinics, all provide an exceptional learning environment. We are committed to excellence in optometric education, vision research and clinical community outreach and public access to primary care services. Our Mission Statement is: Advance optometric education, clinical practice, and vision research for the benefit of society.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

Our last multi-year plan was for AY 2011-12 through 2013-14, and PDST levels have increased once since AY 2012-13. Per our last plan that was approved in 2010, PDST revenue was used for the following goals:

- (a) To support and maintain a stable faculty-student ratio** – PDST funds were used to hire clinical faculty and support the increased use of graduate student instructors;
- (b) To maintain program quality through equipment and facilities improvements** – teaching labs were renovated and exam rooms were updated with new equipment providing a better instructional experience for our students; and,
- (c) To maintain affordability through provision of generous financial aid packages** – from a variety of fund sources, the program awards nearly \$2 million per year in scholarships and tuition reduction; 94% of our students receive scholarships with an average award of \$8,314 per student. Not only is this more than any of our competitors, it is more than the other 8 state schools and colleges of optometry combined. The high level of financial aid results in a lower cumulative cost of the 4-year program (3rd lowest of 21 schools and colleges of optometry).

While we have used PDST funds for the above stated purposes, PDST revenue has not kept up with operational costs, making it difficult to continue to achieve our stated mission. Between 2012-13 and 2016-17 the total usable PDST revenue to the School was increased by \$133,415. One third of this amount was returned to aid as student support, leaving \$89,388 to support cost increases for clinic faculty in only one of the last six years. This was not sufficient to maintain several existing programs and services at the School. Despite this, the program remains the world's top-ranked optometry program.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

While the proposed PDST increases alone will not stabilize the school's budget, the revenue from the multi-year 5% increases will be returned to students as financial aid and help offset the annual projected increases in faculty salaries, which will help maintain a stable faculty-to-student ratio. We plan to continue to provide generous financial aid packages to our students, with a third of new the PDST revenue used for student financial aid. We also anticipate paying \$6.7M in 2018–19 for clinical faculty salaries and benefits. Less the amount returned to students as financial aid, the increase in usable revenue of PDST is estimated to be \$151,828 for AY 2018-19 while the increase in faculty costs for salary increases is estimated at 3%; merit increases at 1.78%; and cost of living increases of 1.5%, totaling more than \$398,000. Thus, the additional revenue will neither fully cover the increased costs of clinic faculty nor the increased costs in staff, equipment, materials and supplies we are anticipating related to changes to the required National Board Examinations in Optometry (NBEO) examination for licensure. Heavy investment in technology and additional teaching laboratory modules will be essential in the next five years placing additional strain on limited operating funds.

**Market Comparison:**

☑ **Total Annual Charges**

☐ **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$31,428	\$32,646	\$33,953	\$35,311	\$36,725	\$38,202
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$28,371	\$29,790	\$31,279	\$32,843	\$34,485	\$36,209
	<i>Privates</i>	\$41,737	\$43,824	\$46,015	\$48,315	\$50,731	\$53,268
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$42,851	\$44,029	\$45,292	\$46,606	\$47,972	\$49,399
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$47,092	\$49,447	\$51,919	\$54,515	\$57,241	\$60,103
	<i>Privates</i>	\$41,737	\$43,824	\$46,015	\$48,315	\$50,731	\$53,268

**Comparison publics:** Ohio State College of Optometry, Indiana University School of Optometry, SUNY College of Optometry  
**Comparison privates:** New England College of Optometry, Southern California College of Optometry, Pacific University of Optometry

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** The program's in-state total charges is slightly higher than its public peer comparison institution and substantially lower than its private peer comparison institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$1,174,920	\$98,590	\$103,600	\$108,656	\$114,126	\$119,848	\$1,719,740
Benefits Cost	\$634,457	\$53,238	\$55,945	\$58,673	\$61,628	\$64,719	\$928,660
Providing Student Services	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$1,497,007	\$74,781	\$78,582	\$82,416	\$86,566	\$90,906	\$1,910,256
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$4,536,384</b>	<b>\$226,609</b>	<b>\$238,127</b>	<b>\$249,745</b>	<b>\$262,320</b>	<b>\$275,473</b>	<b>\$5,788,656</b>

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	73%	\$150,208	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$117,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	18%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**

The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates. \*The downward shift in the % of students with debt and the increase in average debt per borrower are part of a larger national pattern for graduate students overall due to changes made to the Federal loan program. The 2015-16 graduating class would be the first graduating cohort which had no access to Federal Subsidized loans. These changes are expected to impact peer public and private comparator schools as well.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
Chicano(a)/					
Latino(a)	6%	7%	6%	3%	4%
American Indian	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Other Domestic	88%	87%	86%	91%	92%
International	3%	4%	5%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	96%	96%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	32%	33%	49%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	21%	19%	19%	32%	30%
% Female	79%	82%	81%	68%	70%
Total Enrollment	253	254	265		

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Our strategies have been aimed at exposing underrepresented students to the profession and to the Berkeley Optometry program through the following efforts:

**Opto-Camp:** Berkeley Optometry's three-day "in residence" summer program is designed to introduce underrepresented pre-health science majors to optometry as a career and the optometry application process. Preferential consideration is given to applicants who were the first in their family to pursue post-high school education, for those candidates who are economically disadvantaged, or are underrepresented minorities in optometry. These students are also eligible for full scholarships to attend. In the 11-year period since the program began, 608 undergraduates have attended: 50% were first generation college students, and 20% were underrepresented minorities. The program is very successful; approximately 85% of the attendees have graduated from optometry school, are currently in optometry school, or are planning to apply. 15% have graduated or are currently attending Berkeley Optometry.

**Health Science Outreach:** Student Affairs organizes visits to campuses across the country, with an emphasis on Californian institutions. This includes visiting Opto-Clubs and health science career fairs. We also attend the Pre-Health Conference at UC Davis every October, participating on panels and sessions throughout the conference, which hosts approximately 4,500 pre-health science students with an emphasis on first generation and underrepresented students.

**National Optometric Association:** We have partnered with the National Optometric Association (NOA), a principally African American association. Through our work with the NOA, we have been successful in our proposal to hire a National Director for Diversity Success within the Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, which will provide a national resource to help coordinate initiatives to promote the profession of optometry to underrepresented populations.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

By the final year of our multi-year plan we expect a small but significant increase in underrepresented minorities, and a corresponding increase in Pell students due to our continued outreach efforts. We predict that gender balance will remain unchanged.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	37.0%	37.0%	37.0%
	International			
White	Domestic	61.0%	61.0%	61.0%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic			
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		53.0%	53.0%	53.0%
Male		47.0%	47.0%	47.0%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic			
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic			
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	22.0%	22.0%	22.0%
	International			
White	Domestic	78.0%	78.0%	78.0%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic			
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		33.0%	33.0%	33.0%
Male		67.0%	67.0%	67.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.  
 \*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:** We will continue to return 33% of PDST to students as financial aid per year over the course of this multi-year proposal. The school supplements PDST return-to-aid from additional fund sources, which include Block Grants and Diversity Scholarships (Graduate Division), Professional Student Support Funds (PSSF), as well as external student support opportunities based on academic achievement and financial need.

**Goals/Strategies:** The goal of financial aid is to keep the total cost of attending Berkeley Optometry competitive, and thereby improve access to all students. Berkeley Optometry seeks to recruit top-performing students to its program, and is committed to mitigating economic barriers faced by talented students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Our strategy includes awarding departmental awards to every student in our program, and offering scholarships (academic achievement, leadership, public service, and need-based awards) to eligible 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year students. Competitive graduate teaching and instructional support positions provide additional financial opportunities for students.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

In fall 2017, Dean Flanagan met with both the Faculty and student leadership regarding the PDST proposal. The student leadership comprised of approximately 40 students who represent each of the 4 years of the OD program, which consists of approximately 260 students. He explained to both the Faculty and students that there had not been a cost of living increase in PDST for several years (PDST levels have increased once in the past five years) and that the School has applied for a 5% increase as an essential rise to combat cost of living and enforced increases in salary and benefits of staff and faculty. There was a frank discussion at the meetings where it was understood that no one likes the idea of tuition increases, but that PDST is the only way open to the School to cover increased costs. It was also confirmed that the School receives none of the tuition, only the PDST. It was agreed that continued freezing of PDST would soon impact the quality of education within the School and clinic. Student leadership was asked to inform the rest of the student community about the proposal and that the Dean was available to answer questions at any time. The School also arranged to hold an all student town hall meeting should the increase be approved.

Student and faculty consultations were also done in the past two years for similar proposals to increase PDST levels by 5%. In 2015 Dean Flanagan sent an e-mail to the entire Optometry student population outlining the proposal to increase PDST by 5% and solicited feedback from all students for review and consideration. The common two themes from student feedback were more transparency and understanding of how the PDST will be spent and how it will be reinvested into the program. In response, Dean Flanagan sent two additional e-mails to the student population. One addressed the overall financial situation of the State and University overall by reiterating the issues that were addressed this past summer between the Governor and President. As well as the budget process here at Berkeley and how the School of Optometry is funded by the Campus. The second e-mail addressed specific concerns regarding the plan for upgrading equipment, classroom upgrades, and scholarships. Two student town halls were held to allow students the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. In 2015 the same e-mails shared with the program's student population were shared with ladder-rank and clinical faculty members and instructors. No feedback was received from faculty.

In 2016 Dean Flanagan conducted town hall meetings with the 1st, 2nd and 3rd year classes. He explained that PDST had again been frozen and that he might require their assistance in lobbying for an increase should PDST continue to be frozen, as the financial situation had become serious enough to be threatening their education and the integrity of the program.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Berkeley - Product Development Program**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		
2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	
Resident:	\$25,466	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	10%	\$2,534	5%	\$1,400	5%	\$1,470	5%	\$1,544	5%	\$1,630	
Nonresident:	\$18,522	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	51%	\$9,478	5%	\$1,400	5%	\$1,470	5%	\$1,544	5%	\$1,630	

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of this proposal is to provide the Product Development Program (PDP) with the resources needed to evolve into a larger, more established program by making substantial investments in program excellence, affordability, diversity, and equity, while continuing to assess total charges below the average total charges at comparable public and private institutions. For the benefit of our program's students this means recruiting additional top notch faculty, enhancing the program's career development services, and creating the seed funding for new state-of-the art instructional facilities.

**Brief Description of Program**

The central objective of the PDP program is to fulfill the unmet need for professionals with backgrounds in the chemical sciences (e.g. chemical engineering, chemistry, chemical biology) who have knowledge and field experience in the complex process of transforming innovations into commercially successful products. Students in the 9-month program receive an M.S. in Chemical Engineering and gain exposure to real-world product development practices in a range of chemical process-intensive industries including biotechnology, microelectronics, nanoscience, alternative energy, manufactured products, and consumer products. Students are ultimately positioned for jobs in globally-scaled networked R&D enterprises in the industrial sector.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

Our last multi-year proposal was for AY 2015-16 through 2017-18, and PDST funds were used to:

- (1) Establish a low cost operating model as a platform for "threshold" program delivery (spent \$942,480 over three years)** – The program has a disciplined and cost-efficient approach to every step of the PDP business process model by having important tasks carried out by limited staff resources – one full-time faculty member (non-tenure track), a part-time (40%) senior lecturer, and a part-time (50%) administrative assistant – from applicant processing to career services and alumni networking. PDP annual charges were approximately \$9,000-\$14,000 lower than charges at comparable Master's degree programs at public and private institutions.
- (2) Develop a comprehensive "map" of the relevant elective courses at UC Berkeley appropriate for our students (spent \$80,000)** – The fast pace of our program requires our students, who have a wide variety of career objectives, to have the latest information and advice on the best set of elective courses from multiple colleges and programs across the Berkeley campus. Based on a 2017 survey of graduating students, 89.6% said that PDP elective courses "exceeded" or "far exceeded" their expectations for course quality and relevance.
- (3) Meet all University expectations for student financial aid (spent \$666,447)** – Per policy, an amount equivalent to 33% of new PDST revenue was returned to PDP students as PDST stipends. 100% of all PDP students over the past three years have received financial aid from the program and each year 25-30% of our students act as GSI or Reader for one or more undergraduate classes.
- (4) Create career development services supplemental and complimentary to those already offered on campus (spent \$150,000)** – Funds were used for staff to provide specialized career services, with 90% of PDP students accepting a career opportunity within 6 months of graduation from the program.
- (5) Build market awareness with industry of the value of our PDP Master's degree (spent \$70,000)** – PDST funds were used to proactively engage industry with the program and our students as a way of increasing hiring managers' awareness of our program and the potential fit our graduates might have with professional positions that require the unique skill-set our graduates offer. Our student teams have completed 25 field projects with industry clients, and we have hosted 22 industry speakers in our classes.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

With its current delivery model akin more to a pilot program, the PDP plans to step up to the next level as new product development and technology commercialization in the 21st century requires a robust new set of interdisciplinary skills from its practitioners. Leadership of globally-scaled networked R&D enterprises in the industrial sector will require new competencies and career preparation not now readily available in the marketplace. The PDP will accomplish this by creating the basis for excellence by allocating the incremental PDST fees to achieve the following goals:

- (1) Recruit and assemble a world-class faculty team from academia and industry** to develop teaching and research initiatives that will define this relatively new area of product development in the chemical sciences.



**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal (continuation)**

- (2) Provide financial aid to ensure the program remains accessible and affordable.** In addition to the third of new PDST revenue set aside for financial aid purposes, we expect to develop the resources needed to ensure student access and affordability for the program. The program will initiate a new PDP Alumni Fund in part to provide additional financial assistance, particularly to California residents who would like to attend the program but cannot due to cost. We will also seek to leverage our current robust relationship with industry into fellowships for students and sponsorships of several key PDP initiatives.
- (3) Provide enhanced career development services for our students and alumni.** A full-time placement professional will be hired to work with students, market the program to local industry, and work with other academic units to initiate a yearly job fair.
- (4) Develop a formal structure to organize and enhance the enthusiasm of all 189 of our program’s alumni who want to help the program move to the next level in its evolution.** A PDP Alumni Fund will be established and PDST funds likely will be used to support a part-time PDP alumni relations manager at some point during the planning period. The PDP Alumni Fund will support new initiatives such as a public service incentive program, the aforementioned California resident scholarship, and additional capital improvements (see Goal 6).
- (5) Create a new initiative to give our students the opportunity to explore the possibility of new venture creation to support creative business ideas they have developed during the school year.** PDP graduates have had success in forming companies and in raising venture capital. We propose to establish the “Venture Breakthrough Workshop” as a special 10-week summer program in which one or more PDP faculty members will coach venture teams as they prepare to seek venture funding and/or apply for acceptance into a venture incubator or accelerator.
- (6) Set aside and accrue funds each year to help secure a permanent location for the PDP that accommodates the program’s growth objectives.** Our current program facilities are business office spaces whose size, configuration, and style are inconsistent with our student and faculty recruitment objectives. The PDP has identified a potential permanent space in Hildebrand Hall, and will need an architectural study (estimated cost: up to \$250,000) with plans for an extensive renovation of the space (estimated cost: \$1.5-2.0 million). The PDP plans to augment these funds with gifts from corporate donors and the PDP Alumni.

**Market Comparison:**      ☐ Total Annual Charges      ☐ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$39,636	\$42,526	\$44,327	\$46,205	\$48,165	\$50,224
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$59,200	\$60,976	\$62,805	\$64,689	\$66,630	\$68,629
	<i>Privates</i>	\$57,866	\$59,602	\$61,490	\$63,232	\$65,129	\$67,083
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$44,937	\$54,771	\$56,572	\$58,450	\$60,410	\$62,469
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$59,200	\$60,976	\$62,805	\$64,689	\$66,630	\$68,629
	<i>Privates</i>	\$57,866	\$59,602	\$61,490	\$63,232	\$65,129	\$67,083

Comparison publics: MS Management of Technology/Univ. of Minnesota; Master’s Science and Technology Commercialization/Univ. of Texas; Master of Engineering in Particle Technology/Univ. of Delaware  
 Comparison privates: MS Product Design and Development Management/Northwestern Univ.; MS Product Development and Engineering/Univ. of Southern California; MS Product Development/Rochester Institute of Technology

*Brief Description of Program’s In-State Total Charges:* For the course of this plan the program’s annual charges will be substantially below the average for both the public and private comparison institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$8,370	\$14,370	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,740
Benefits Cost	\$127,859	\$9,477	\$16,560	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$153,896
Providing Student Services	\$5,000	\$27,478	\$16,330	\$20,000	\$25,919	\$28,790	\$123,517
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$279,013	\$49,877	\$36,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$364,890
Instructional Support Staff	\$15,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$25,530	\$0	\$0	\$65,530
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$2,756	\$0	\$15,090	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$42,846
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$238,514	\$142,286	\$69,020	\$74,970	\$26,281	\$27,710	\$578,781
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$25,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$300,000
Other		\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,000
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$701,512</b>	<b>\$418,488</b>	<b>\$203,000</b>	<b>\$220,500</b>	<b>\$77,200</b>	<b>\$81,500</b>	<b>\$1,702,200</b>

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	22%	\$43,954	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$75,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	8%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

Median Salary at Graduation derived from exit surveys of program graduates.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	3%	2%	3%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/	5%	5%	4%		
Latino(a)					
American Indian	0%	0%	1%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8%</b>		
Other Domestic	68%	71%	65%		
International	24%	22%	27%		
Total	100%	100%	100%		
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	14%	22%	24%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	57%	69%	65%	N/A	N/A
% Female	43%	31%	35%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	30	36	40		

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Our trends for inclusion of Hispanic and African American students in the program have been steady over the last three years, but lower than the levels we aspire to achieve. Even so, our three-year average for program participation by Hispanics (4.5%) and African Americans (2.6%) compares favorably with other science and business-related professional Master's degree programs on the Berkeley campus. To improve our performance in recruiting these students we will need to develop and implement an active and targeted information/marketing campaign with the help of organizations like Hispanic Engineering Students Association, National Organization of Black Chemists and Chemical Engineers (NOBCCHE), the National Black MBA Association, and the National Hispanic MBA Association.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

Our revised financial aid strategy, which includes consideration of applicant/student financial resources in addition to academic merit, should help increase the diversity of the student body compared to our current levels. With respect to Hispanic and African American students we would hope to double the current levels of enrollment to around 5% for each category. Because of the relatively high numbers of applicants who are non-U.S. citizens, Pell recipient participation may be a bit harder to improve from the current 3-year average of 19.8%, even so we think a goal of 25% is a good stretch target. Our goal with respect to gender is to maintain the nearly 50% level we are currently operating at.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	3.3%	3.1%	3.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	6.7%	6.3%	12.1%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	13.3%	15.6%	18.2%
	International			
White	Domestic	80.0%	81.3%	78.8%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic			
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	23.3%	21.9%	24.2%
	Male	76.7%	78.1%	75.8%

<b>Ladder Rank &amp; Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	11.1%	10.0%	14.3%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	16.7%	20.0%	23.8%
	International			
White	Domestic	77.8%	75.0%	66.7%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic			
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	27.8%	25.0%	23.8%
	Male	72.2%	75.0%	76.2%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

**Please note the following:**

- (1) PDP has only 1 full-time faculty member - data is for entire department.
- (2) Diversity will be a consideration in recruitment and retention of program instructional faculty.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund* For the course of this multi-year proposal, return-to-aid is 33% per Regents policy. We also hope to initiate an "Alumni Fund" with the aim of supporting underrepresented  
*Sources:* student diversity as well as a public service incentive program.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our ultimate goal is to make affordability of our program a non-issue for most potential applicants. We are committed to continued compliance with the Regents policy of ensuring that 33% of all PDST revenues are used for student financial aid. We make our students who are U.S. citizens aware of the types of financial support options that are available to finance their participation in the program. We also actively make sure that all students are aware of the numerous openings for Graduate Student Instructors each semester. Finally, we intend to begin collecting data on why applicants to the program choose not to attend. We intend to measure the success of our affordability goals by not losing students who want to attend the program but cannot due to cost constraints. This will be especially important given the targeted outreach programs to underrepresented minority students and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

We held an extensive town hall meeting with the entire current PDP class in early October 2017. We made a slideshow presentation covering current fees, how they are allocated, and a comparison of current annual charges with those charged at 3 public and 3 private universities for comparable master's degrees. We also showed the students the relative PDST fee levels between the PDP and 3 other similar master's programs being offered in the U.C. ten campus system (Master's of Engineering/UC Berkeley, Master of Technology Management/UC Santa Barbara, and Master of Translational Medicine/UC Berkeley). After highlighting several needs for investments to improve the program (e.g. faculty, career services, facilities, etc.), we showed the students the proposed five-year plan for PDST fee levels for the PDP. We answered questions and then encouraged all students to take an online survey around several questions suggested by the University. In response to the question, "Do you have any concerns regarding the proposed PDST increase?", 56% of the 18 students responded "No" while 44% said "Yes". In response to the question, "Do you understand how the program currently spends PDST revenue?", 78% of the students responded "Yes" with 22% responding "No". We also sent an email survey about the details of the proposed PDST increase to all department faculty. We got three responses from the faculty all supporting the PDST proposal.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program:** UC Berkeley Teacher Education Program

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current						Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0
Nonresident:	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our proposal keeps our PDST level flat at \$6,000 for the next five years, with additional PDST revenue resulting from enrollment growth, to support ongoing program goals, additional services, and instructional materials.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Graduate School of Education offers a terminal Master’s degree and a Preliminary Teaching Credential in three credential areas: Elementary Education, Secondary English, Secondary Math and Science. With a curriculum equally balanced between theory and practice, these two-year masters/credential programs enroll approximately 60 students in any academic year. Informed of leading theory on learning and pedagogy, our graduates accept jobs with our district partners; remain in teaching for the long term; and develop into effective educational leaders – often returning to the GSE to earn their administrative credential.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

We had two primary goals for the use of PDST funds in our first multi-year plan that covered AY 2015-16 through 2017-18:

- **Ensure affordability and accessibility** of the program by enhancing financial support to low-income and under-represented ethnic minority teacher education students through fellowship awards with the goal of building a more diverse teacher workforce that more closely reflects the diversity of California; and
- **Ensure our programs are of the highest quality** by restoring and expanding our strength in clinical guidance and mentoring, as well as extending support of our students into the induction phase of teaching.

We accomplished our goals. PDST funding helped ensure our program **remained affordable and accessible** with 50% of all PDST revenue returned to students as merit and need-based scholarships, which were essential for recruiting URM students and low SES students. A portion of PDST revenue also was used to reimburse students for testing and test preparation costs – the fees of required tests and disciplinary content are often barriers for low-income, underrepresented minority individuals. The remaining PDST revenue paid for expenses to **maintain the quality of our program**. The PDST revenue allowed us to improve the ratio of supervisors to student teachers to 1:3, up from the former ratio of 1:5; increase induction support through a fellows program for math and science alumni; offer an advanced practicum course for English alumni; offer guided curriculum planning and coaching for elementary education alumni; offer a site-based methods course; and offer professional development opportunities for alumni. Additionally, we have implemented a test preparation course, as well as developed coaching, mentoring, and instructional guidance workshops.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our goal is to build a more diverse teacher workforce that more closely reflects the diversity of California. We plan to keep the PDST level flat for the next five years and to continue using our PDST income for the same purposes as our last multi-year plan, namely to maintain program quality, affordability, and accessibility. We plan to enroll a few more students during the period covered in this multi-year plan. PDST revenue, including that generated by enrollment growth, will be used for student financial aid, credentialing support student services, additional instructional support staff, and other costs that benefit students (e.g., Chalk & Wire educational assessment technology program, testing reimbursement, and other technical supplies).

**Market Comparison:**

**Total Annual Charges**     **Total Charges to Degree**

	<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident: <i>This program</i>	\$20,170	\$20,526	\$20,927	\$21,335	\$21,751	\$22,180
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$28,028	\$28,869	\$29,735	\$30,627	\$31,546	\$32,492
<i>Privates</i>	\$49,584	\$51,072	\$52,604	\$54,182	\$55,807	\$57,481
Nonresident: <i>This program</i>	\$32,415	\$32,771	\$33,172	\$33,580	\$33,996	\$34,425
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$52,871	\$54,457	\$56,091	\$57,774	\$59,507	\$61,292
<i>Privates</i>	\$49,584	\$51,072	\$52,604	\$54,182	\$55,807	\$57,481

Comparison publics: University of Washington and University of Michigan  
 Comparison privates: Stanford University, Columbia University - Teachers College , and University of Pennsylvania

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** For the course of this plan, the program's in-state total charges will be significantly lower than the average for its comparison public institutions; and these charges will also remain significantly below the average for the program's comparison private institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>						<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Services	\$0	\$34,800	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$36,000	(\$36,000)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$93,000	\$11,400	\$3,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$108,000
Instructional Equipment Purchases							\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$165,000	\$9,000	\$6,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$180,000
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$36,000	(\$1,200)	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,000
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$330,000</b>	<b>\$18,000</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$360,000</b>

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	63%	\$28,315	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$48,678
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	8%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**

This is not information that we ask of our students, either at graduation or post-graduation. There is a questionnaire that goes out to our students that talks about the students and how they are doing, but it does not ask about the salary. It is something that we will seek to ask in the future, because we understand the importance of that data, especially when trying to quantify the impact on our students' lives. Instead we have used the California Department of Education's average beginning teacher annual salary for large public school districts statistic as a proxy for the salary of a teacher in our program.

Enrollment*	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American		2%	2%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		13%	11%		
American Indian		0%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>		<b>14%</b>	<b>13%</b>		
Other Domestic		84%	86%		
International		2%	2%		
Total		100%	100%		
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients		49%	34%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male		24%	18%	N/A	N/A
% Female		76%	82%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment		67	57		

\* The program first assessed PDST in AY 2015-16 and, accordingly, data provided reflects enrollment trends for the program as a PDST program.

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

- Expanding recruitment efforts
- Increasing financial aid to students who might not otherwise be able to enroll due to their financial constraints

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

- Aligned with our mission to continually diversify the school teacher workforce population, Teacher Ed will continue to actively recruit, mentor, and support students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, and those from underrepresented minority and gender backgrounds. Our commitment to equity and social justice necessitates an intentional effort to nurture the development of future teachers who represent the diverse student population of our surrounding urban districts. Consequently, we anticipate that our student population of African American, Latino/Hispanic, and lower income students will continue to increase.
- To increase the number of male students within the programs, the faculty has engaged in one-on-one meetings with potential male candidates, initiated a collaboration with a district's male achievement program—which is 100% staffed by men and men of color, and expanded our recruitment strategy to include community events such as neighborhood gatherings and city-wide festivals.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic		16.7%	20.3%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic		10.8%	10.9%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic		0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic		5.0%	3.1%
	International			
White	Domestic		65.0%	59.4%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic		2.5%	6.3%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female		55.4%	51.6%
	Male		44.6%	48.4%

<b>Ladder Rank &amp; Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic		20.0%	22.6%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic		12.9%	12.9%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic		0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic		6.5%	3.2%
	International			
White	Domestic		58.1%	58.1%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic		3.2%	3.2%
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female		45.2%	45.2%
	Male		54.8%	54.8%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund* 50% of PDST revenue is returned to student aid. Additional funding sources for support are President's Educator Fellowships, and other gifts and donations meant to support students in the Teacher Ed program.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our goal is to configure financial aid packages (including fellowships, stipends, fee waivers, etc.) so that students with the greatest economic need will not find tuition to be an insurmountable barrier; and so that students need not incur substantial debt to complete their degree. We propose to measure our success primarily by tracking the composition of the applicant pool, student enrollment, and graduating cohorts.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

Teacher Education solicited feedback in the form of an online survey to current students and faculty. Feedback from student and faculty indicated support for the priorities and goals for the use of PDST. The various allocations of the revenue generated through PDST meets faculty and students' needs and expectations for a quality program; therefore, we are not increasing the PDST level.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC Davis Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>2021-22</b>		<b>2022-23</b>	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0%	\$0	3%	\$132	3%	\$138	3%	\$138	3%	\$144
Nonresident:	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0%	\$0	3%	\$132	3%	\$138	3%	\$138	3%	\$144

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL) program is proposing that a 3% PDST increase take effect in 2019-20, followed by consistent 3% increases through 2022-23. The program seeks to hold PDST flat in 2018-19 to allow students the ability to plan for an increase in 2019-20. We are also hopeful that this approach will help motivate our current students to stay on track to finish the program in three years, so they do not have to pay the fee increase. The program's PDST fee will have remained flat for over three years by 2019-20, during which time the program has absorbed fixed cost increases. The primary reason for the program's proposed 3% PDST increases is to address fixed cost increases that are outside the control of the program, such as salary, benefits, and other campus assessments. Once fixed costs are covered, the remaining new PDST revenue will go toward the continued refinement of the program's structured third year, which is essential to supporting our students in their advancement to qualifying exams.

**Brief Description of Program**

The three-year Ed.D. in Educational Leadership program is designed for working professionals in education, such as teachers in leadership positions, superintendents, and school principals, many of whom are already in mid-level leadership roles in an educational setting. Graduates of this program are prepared to lead for change in educational environments that promote learning, equity, and achievement for all students.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The CANDEL program's previous multi-year plan, which spanned from academic year (AY) 2012 to AY 2014, proposed to assess PDST to accomplish the following goals:

- 1) Maintain the quality of the program
- 2) Meet the expectations of our students in terms of support and services
- 3) Continue to attract excellent part-time lecturers to supplement course offerings and full-time faculty
- 4) Create a community of leaders in Education with a strong alumni association that will advance the alumni's ability to lead for change and influence policy

The PDST collected allowed the program to achieve the following:

- The program provided a unique structured 3rd year of the program to support students during the writing of their dissertations.
- The program provided support to students in their quantitative and qualitative research design and analysis process.
- The program enhanced outreach recruitment within targeted communities, especially seeking candidates of color who serve the lowest income students in educational settings in the Northern California area. The percentage of administrators of color who serve communities of color and poverty in Northern California is low. We continued to increase our recruitment efforts throughout the Northern California area so that these prospective students would know about our program, would be encouraged to apply, and would be provided financial support when necessary to encourage them to matriculate after applying and being accepted.
- The program hired a third year lecturer. The lecturer worked closely with the students' dissertation advisors to quickly resolve issues that arose in the writing of the proposal, data collection, or in the design of the research. The lecturer held cohort and small group editing sessions and served to keep the students' momentum as they completed preparation for the Qualifying Exam.

The PDST has allowed for the CANDEL program to achieve the four goals listed above, and the new structured 3rd year that is possible primarily due to the revenue from the PDST has increased the number of students we see advancing to their qualifying exam. The Structured Third Year program was piloted in 2015-16 with the intention of better supporting students towards their qualifying exam and improving time to degree. During the pilot, we saw significant gains. Previous to the pilot, the average third year Qualifying Exam completion was 45% for a cohort; in the pilot year, the cohort completion rate for the Qualifying Exam was improved to 73%. PDST funding largely supported the staffing and administration of this program.



**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

The Ed.D. CANDEL program's primary goals are to cover fixed costs and maintain program offerings while supplementing support provided to students during their third year of the program. While PDST fees have been frozen, the program has absorbed fixed cost increases associated with salary, benefits and other campus assessments. The primary reason for the proposed 3% PDST increase, therefore, is to address fixed cost increases that are outside the control of the program. Once fixed costs are covered, additional revenue remaining from the fee increase will support the refinement of the program's relatively new structured third year, which is important to support our students in their advancement to qualifying exams.

The consequences to the program if the proposed PDST levels are not approved to cover fixed costs will be that the program will have to sacrifice program quality to cover fixed costs by cutting areas within our instructional budget.

**Market Comparison:**

☐ Total Annual Charges      ☐ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$18,017	\$18,367	\$18,867	\$19,380	\$19,913	\$20,474
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$19,343	\$19,923	\$20,520	\$21,136	\$21,770	\$22,423
	<i>Privates</i>	\$36,930	\$38,038	\$39,179	\$40,354	\$41,565	\$42,812
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$30,262	\$30,612	\$31,112	\$31,625	\$32,158	\$32,719
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$27,659	\$28,488	\$29,343	\$30,223	\$31,130	\$32,064
	<i>Privates</i>	\$36,930	\$38,038	\$39,179	\$40,354	\$41,565	\$42,812

Comparison publics: University of Oregon, Sacramento State University  
 Comparison privates: University of the Pacific, Mills College, University of Southern California

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:* Even with the Professional fee, our fees remain below those of our public and private comparators offering an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$40,000		\$6,382	\$6,643	\$6,657	\$6,947	\$66,629
Benefits Cost	\$55,000						\$55,000
Providing Student Services	\$80,000						\$80,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio							\$0
Instructional Support Staff							\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases							\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$104,782		\$3,143	\$3,272	\$3,279	\$3,421	\$117,897
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases							\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal							\$0
Other	\$37,738						\$37,738
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$317,520</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,525</b>	<b>\$9,915</b>	<b>\$9,936</b>	<b>\$10,368</b>	<b>\$357,264</b>

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	75%	\$64,984	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$150,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	6%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	15%	16%	16%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	21%	27%	28%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	3%	3%	4%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	61%	54%	52%	N/A	N/A
International	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	46%	39%	63%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	39%	41%	46%	N/A	N/A
% Female	61%	59%	54%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	68	62	67	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Nearly half of our students are from underrepresented groups, however we are still committed to increasing the diversity of our student population. The trend reflected in the table shows our continued growth in underrepresented students by ethnicity. Within our recruiting efforts for each student cohort, we focus on recruiting a larger community of under-represented students, with particular attention being paid to recruitment in our Latino/Chicano communities that are underserved in our region and interested in the important educational benefits of the CANDEL program. We participate in recruitment opportunities at professional conferences representing specific ethnic professionals, such as Asian Americans, Pilipino-Americans, African American, and Latino/Chicano organizations.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

The CANDEL program expects the composition to be similar to the current state since it already encompasses the multiple dimensions of diversity represented in the question above. CANDEL will continue to consider the make-up of each incoming cohort during the admissions process, taking into consideration diversity of the students and their disciplines.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity ***		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American		5.0%	4.0%	5.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		16.0%	16.0%	18.0%
American Indian		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is		5.0%	4.0%	5.0%
White		72.0%	66.0%	66.0%
Other/Unknown		3.0%	10.0%	5.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Female	67.0%	69.0%	71.0%
	Male	33.0%	31.0%	29.0%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American		0.0%	4.0%	7.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		19.0%	18.0%	18.0%
American Indian		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is		7.0%	7.0%	7.0%
White		67.0%	64.0%	61.0%
Other/Unknown		7.0%	7.0%	7.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Female	56.0%	57.0%	64.0%
	Male	44.0%	43.0%	36.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.  
 .. For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**... Please note that the faculty diversity tables for each UC Davis program proposing to assess PDST do not include domestic and international subcategories. These subcategories have been removed to ensure that these tables do not reveal the identity of specific faculty members. UC Davis programs have included one figure for each ethnicity noted in the tables, capturing both domestic and international faculty.**

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* For each year of this multi-year proposal, return-to-aid (RTA) is 33%, which meets the minimum RTA requirement in the policy.

*Goals/Strategies:* One of the goals for CANDEL is to provide a high quality education to our students indicative of a top 40 School of Education in the nation at a price that is similar to the other Ed.D. programs in the region. CANDEL's total tuition, including the PDST increase, will make it the most inexpensive Ed.D. in the region, including the program offered by Sacramento State University less than 50 miles away. CANDEL also provides financial aid to students based on the FAFSA. CANDEL measures success in this area by maintaining quality and affordability in comparison to similar programs in the region.

### ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

In October 2017, students received a letter from Dean Lindstrom and Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Instruction, Cynthia Carter-Ching explaining the rationale and the plan for the use of PDST funds. Students were provided with multiple opportunities to provide input:

1. CANDEL leadership invited students to attend a one hour round table discussion regarding the changes. Students were able to provide their comments and feedback in person or they could call-in and participate remotely. Dean Lindstrom, Assistant Dean Chapman and Co-Director Martorell were available during this time to provide students with information regarding the plan; however no students attended the meeting.
2. The Associate Director of CANDEL contacted each of the instructors for Fall quarter and asked them if students had raised the issue or asked any questions during the courses. All instructors indicated that students had not asked about the PDST plan or proposed increase.

On October 23, 2017, faculty received a letter from Dean Lindstrom and Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Instruction, Cynthia Carter-Ching explaining the rationale and the plan for the use of PDST funds. In addition to a letter detailing the proposed changes, the plan was discussed as an agenda item at the 10/30/17 faculty meeting. In attendance were a quorum of the School of Education Faculty, which includes all faculty who teach in CANDEL (except three who were on sabbatical or traveling).

Faculty were also given the option to weigh in via email or other correspondence with the SOE leadership, but no written concerns were submitted. At the meeting, the proposal was well received, and a productive discussion ensued. Faculty were satisfied with the explanation and use of the monies as they are being administered, and found very convincing the argument that fixed-costs were going up and needed to be covered for CANDEL. In particular, faculty were very supportive of the gradual roll-out model, wherein students will experience only the 2.7% general tuition increase in 2018-19, and then the additional 3% PDST increase will take effect in 2019-20. Several faculty raised the question about whether this increase would negatively impact admissions and the general consensus was that even with this increase, CANDEL tuition is lower than competitors in the region and thus this change would not result in a significant decrease in our applicant pool. Overall, faculty were in support of this change.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program:** Davis - Master of Preventive Veterinary Medicine

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>2021-22</b>		<b>2022-23</b>	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$5,886	\$6,060	\$6,240	\$6,426	\$6,612	\$6,810	3%	\$174	3%	\$180	3%	\$186	3%	\$186	3%	\$198
Nonresident:	\$6,351	\$6,540	\$6,738	\$6,936	\$7,146	\$7,362	3%	\$189	3%	\$198	3%	\$198	3%	\$210	3%	\$216

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

UC Davis's Master of Preventative Veterinary Medicine program proposes to increase the PDST by the regional year-over-year consumer price index (3%) over the five years of this multi-year plan. If we are not able to increase the PDST by the rate of inflation, we will not be able to keep pace with the increasing costs of our graduate coordinator and teaching assistants' salaries and benefits. Students benefit from the graduate coordinator's expertise to navigate the program. Students also benefit from the personalized assistance they receive from their teaching assistants, particularly with the data-intensive assignments and projects of our applied epidemiology program.

**Brief Description of Program**

Using state-of-the-art methods in epidemiology, the one year MPVM program prepares veterinarians to investigate and evaluate disease and production problems in animal populations and to design, evaluate and implement disease control or other veterinary services programs. Our program is an applied epidemiology program targeted to health professionals including practicing veterinarians. Our program is somewhat similar to a Master of Public Health (MPH) program, but has a different target audience (veterinarians or practicing health professionals) and has a very rigorous epidemiological focus to the curriculum.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The primary goal of our prior multi-year plan, which covered the period from 2011-12 through 2013-14, was to fund staff to assist in the teaching of the MPVM programs, particularly in the laboratory classes. Due to budget cuts, the number of faculty available to teach this program had been reduced, and the program that funded veterinary graduate students (who were available to teach in the MPVM program) had been eliminated. If we had not received the requested increase, we would not have been able to continue funding these teaching assistants, the quality of teaching would have been significantly diminished, and the workload on faculty would have been unreasonably high. The requested increase simply covered the inflationary increase associated with funding these positions.

We have achieved our goal of sustaining the program with fewer teaching resources (namely faculty members). Teaching assistants have been integral to the program to assist students with their coursework, particularly with applied epidemiology, applied statistics, and the capstone research project at the conclusion of the program.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

We propose to increase the PDST by the regional year-over-year consumer price index (3%) over the five years of our multi-year plan to keep pace with the increasing costs of our graduate coordinator and teaching assistants' salaries and benefits. We have increased the PDST for this program only once in the last six years and we would like to reserve the option to increase at least at the pace of inflation. Students benefit from the graduate coordinator's expertise to navigate the program. Students also benefit from the academic support of teaching assistants, as they provide insight on in-depth data intensive assignments and projects in our applied epidemiology program.

Market Comparison (select one):  Total Annual Charges  Total Charges to Degree

**Comparator Figures Below are Projections**

		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$21,576	\$22,153	\$22,752	\$23,365	\$23,986	\$24,632
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$31,741	\$32,693	\$33,674	\$34,684	\$35,725	\$36,797
	<i>Privates</i>						
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$34,286	\$34,878	\$35,495	\$36,120	\$36,765	\$37,429
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$57,820	\$59,555	\$61,342	\$63,182	\$65,077	\$67,030
	<i>Privates</i>						

Comparison publics: Colorado State University MPH with focus area in Animals, People, and the Environment; Ohio State University MPH with Veterinary Public Health concentration; University of North Carolina MPH with Veterinary Epidemiology concentration; and Virginia Tech MPH with Infectious Disease concentration  
 Comparison privates: N/A

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** Our program is somewhat unique but is most closely similar to Master of Public Health programs with a focus on veterinary public health, veterinary epidemiology, or infectious disease. The Master of Public Health program can range from 1.5 to 2 years and our program is 1 year plus 1 summer session quarter. Overall our MPVM program is less expensive, but as mentioned above, it differs somewhat from an MPH program.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$8,475	\$3,645	\$5,357	\$3,054	\$1,951	\$4,682	\$27,164
Providing Student Services	\$21,000	\$9,083	\$13,297	\$7,685	\$4,944	\$11,709	\$67,718
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$14,517	\$6,279	\$9,192	\$5,312	\$3,418	\$8,095	\$46,813
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$43,992	\$19,008	\$27,846	\$16,051	\$10,313	\$24,486	\$141,696

**Affordability**

	2014-15 Pct with Debt	2014-15 Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	2014-15 Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income
This Program:	25%	\$18,500	Median Salary at Graduation: \$100,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary: 3%

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	8%	13%	0%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	85%	62%	36%	N/A	N/A
International	8%	25%	64%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	39%	38%	50%	N/A	N/A
% Female	62%	63%	50%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	12	7	13	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Our MPVM is a very small program and has always had a fairly significant number of international students. We are conducting recruitment outreach to attract domestic students including those with diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds. We recruit at other veterinary schools around the US, at State and Federal agencies, in our alumni network, at professional conferences, and through the American Veterinary Medical Association website. It is important to note that our students are drawn from the population of individuals with Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degrees. This population is predominantly white and female in the US. Because our MPVM program also draws students with international backgrounds, we are able to capture diversity in international experience, which has proven valuable. We have over 900 alumni and they have gone on to work in 74 countries around the world.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

Prior to this year, we experienced an upward trend in enrollment with a total of 14 students last year. Our target is to enroll 20 students annually. We hope to increase underrepresented minority students. We have a unique situation regarding gender parity with a largely female student population. Since we recruit from health professionals who have a DVM, we do not have solid data on the socioeconomic backgrounds of our students. We know that affordability is key to attracting students to our program, however.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity***</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American		2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		6.0%	7.0%	7.0%
American Indian		1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Asian/Pac Is		5.0%	5.0%	6.0%
White		83.0%	82.0%	81.0%
Other/Unknown		3.0%	2.0%	3.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	45.0%	46.0%	47.0%
	Male	55.0%	54.0%	53.0%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American		1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		4.0%	6.0%	6.0%
American Indian		1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Asian/Pac Is		4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
White		87.0%	84.0%	85.0%
Other/Unknown		3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	40.0%	39.0%	41.0%
	Male	60.0%	61.0%	59.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

\*\*\* Please note that the faculty diversity tables for each UC Davis program proposing to assess PDST do not include domestic and international subcategories. These subcategories have been removed to ensure that these tables do not reveal the identity of specific faculty members. UC Davis programs have included one figure for each ethnicity noted in the tables, capturing both domestic and international faculty.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* For each year of this multi-year proposal, return-to-aid (RTA) is approximately 33%, which meets the minimum RTA requirement in the policy.

*Goals/Strategies:* We believe our program is affordable and that our students generally have not accumulated a large amount of debt. Looking at the last several years of data and focusing on the 2014-15 debt load, approximately a quarter of our MPVM students have debt, which is quite low. The percentage fluctuates from year to year because the program is small. Those with debt have less than \$50,000 in cumulative debt for the last five years. We draw largely from an international student population and have less ability to track starting salaries than our DVM program. We do allocate 33% of our PDST revenue to Return-to-Aid to all students in our program and 33% of our USAP funds to all of our students. Our low student debt load is a strong indicator of the affordability of our program.



### ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The program scheduled town-hall style meetings on 9/22/17 and 10/2/2017 and described the plan to students in the program via email. The town-hall style meetings included a 20 minute PowerPoint presentation followed by 40 minutes of engaging discussion. The proposal was also posted on the school-wide intranet inviting feedback from faculty and students via email. Students provided the following feedback at the two town hall meetings:

- (1) Students were interested to know the amount of debt and starting salaries of the UC Davis School of Medicine students as a comparison to their own program. The average student debt for SOM students from 2013-14 was \$154,576 and their average starting salary was \$51,250. Most medical school graduates move to residencies or internships after graduation, therefore their starting salaries don't reflect a full professional salary.
- (2) Students had an idea to set the professional fees and tuition as an inverse function of student debt (e.g., if debt is higher than average, tuition is lower than average).
- (3) Students suggested packaging financial aid to attract students based on various characteristics including career interest (e.g., large animal specialties) or socioeconomic background.
- (4) Students wanted to know what percentage of core funds used by the school (state funds, tuition, indirect cost return, and professional fees) were funded by students. We computed that 18% of the school's core funds were funded through professional fees and tuition.
- (5) Students requested that if fees were increasing that other services be offered to them. DVM students requested that their third year surgical packs be paid by the school. The school is evaluating this request currently.
- (6) Students had questions about the computer grants of \$500 offered to DVM students. They asked if the amount could possibly be increased and why new computers were required for first year students. Why couldn't they bring their own that they were currently using? The school is considering offering a higher dollar amount for computer grants. New computers from a select set of models

The program consulted with faculty by including the proposal as an agenda item at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting, scheduling town-hall style meetings of faculty to discuss the plan and solicit feedback, and describing the plan to faculty in the program via email. The faculty members did not provide written feedback. During the town-hall meetings faculty members asked about UC Davis School of Medicine's student debt upon graduation, wanted clarity on fellowships for MPVM students, and requested that the presentation be expanded to include 2008-09. Additionally, two faculty members explicitly stated that fee increases based on the change in the consumer price index appeared fair and reasonable.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: Davis - Doctor of Veterinary Medicine**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$15,594	\$16,062	\$16,542	\$17,034	\$17,544	\$18,066	3%	\$468	3%	\$480	3%	\$492	3%	\$510	3%	\$522
Nonresident:	\$15,594	\$16,062	\$16,542	\$17,034	\$17,544	\$18,066	3%	\$468	3%	\$480	3%	\$492	3%	\$510	3%	\$522

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

Davis’s Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program proposes to increase the DVM PDST by 3% per year to continue to offer innovative programs and fund fixed cost increases. Our fundraising success in recent years has permitted us to keep PDST flat even as fixed cost increases (e.g. fringe benefits increases and faculty salary merit increases) occurred. Now our primary goal for fundraising is to replace our outdated teaching hospital. We launched a public campaign in October 2017 for our Veterinary Medical Center. With this increase in PDST, our program will be able to: (1) continue to fund our exceptional academic programs unit including the SMASH outreach program, which helps us to increase recruitment of the best and most diverse group of students, along with our 1.5 FTE mental health counselors, our diversity officer, and our new Leadership Concentration; (2) further improve our clinical skills laboratory—in the coming years we will need to add several more small group learning rooms to support our new block structure curriculum, which emphasizes small group learning with an interactive, hands-on, team-based approach.

**Brief Description of Program**

Davis’s four-year DVM program has been ranked #1 in the country by US News and World Report and #1 in the world for veterinary science by QS World University rankings. Its professional curriculum provides students with a broad foundation of knowledge and skills in comparative veterinary medicine, allowing students to focus on careers in small animal, large animal, equine, livestock, zoologic, or mixed animal practices, as well as poultry, laboratory animals, or research. The top quality educational experiences provided by the program support our students and colleagues as leaders in veterinary medicine.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The goals we listed in our last multi-year plan for 2011-12 through 2013-14 were to:

- (1) Maintain the quality of the School of Veterinary Medicine’s programs in the face of declining budgets and escalating costs.
- (2) Meet accreditation requirements related to a major change in the curriculum, and the implementation of outcome assessments. This change required more small-group teaching.
- (3) Attract and retain well-qualified faculty.

Goal 1: We were able to use the PDST revenue to maintain the quality of the DVM program despite budget reductions that continued through 2012-13 as a result of the recession. We added an outreach program (our Summer Math and Science Honors program, or SMASH) to enhance the pipeline of diverse and socioeconomically disadvantaged potential students. We offer this college preparation program at UC Davis for thirty 8th grade students from under-represented groups and disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds. Additionally, we employed a half-time diversity officer to work with our admissions office to conduct outreach to under-represented individuals for our DVM program. We also added another half-time mental health counselor for a total of 1.5 FTE devoted to mental well-being. We have created a Professional Concentration in Personal Development and Leadership program for 1st through 3rd year students (60 hours/6 units) and faculty through University Extension to help build leadership acumen. This program is open to 20-30 participants annually.

Goal 2: We used the PDST to compensate faculty members for extraordinary teaching efforts by providing faculty stipends and honoraria for individuals serving as teaching block leaders. We also added the position of Director of Clinical Year Students to ensure students in their clinical year have a faculty advisor and advocate in our teaching hospital. We also created 15 small group learning rooms within our primary teaching facility, Valley Hall, to facilitate learning in groups of 8-10 students.

Goal 3: We have attracted and retained well-qualified faculty members. We use a portion of our PDST annually for faculty start-up packages to ensure faculty members launch and maintain research programs that aligns with their instruction.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our primary goal driven by our strategic plan is to: educate world leaders in academic veterinary medicine, veterinary medical practice, and public and environmental health. Our strategies are: (1) to attract, mentor, and support the best and the brightest students and trainees; (2) to design curriculum and training programs to meet current and future societal needs; and (3) to lead the field of veterinary medicine by sharing educational expertise and best practices locally, nationally, and internationally. To continue to fulfill these aims, we must continue to offer an excellent DVM program and therefore we need to keep up with fixed cost increases. To continue to offer innovative programs and fund the fixed cost increase of our current programs, we propose to increase the DVM PDST by 3% per year. Should this proposal be approved, the following innovations would be funded in part by PDST over the next five years: (1) continued funding of our exceptional academic programs unit, our 1.5 FTE mental health counselors, our diversity officer, and our new Leadership Concentration; (2) further improvement of our clinical skills laboratory, along with the addition of several more small group learning rooms to support our new block structure curriculum, which emphasizes small group learning with an interactive, hands-on, team-based approach.

**Market Comparison (select one):**     **Total Annual Charges**     **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$31,673	\$32,490	\$33,337	\$34,202	\$35,092	\$36,005
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$32,073	\$33,035	\$34,026	\$35,047	\$36,098	\$37,181
	<i>Privates</i>	\$53,532	\$55,137	\$56,792	\$58,495	\$60,250	\$62,058
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$43,918	\$44,735	\$45,582	\$46,447	\$47,337	\$48,250
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$56,397	\$58,088	\$59,831	\$61,626	\$63,475	\$65,379
	<i>Privates</i>	\$55,968	\$57,647	\$59,376	\$61,157	\$62,992	\$64,882

**Comparison publics:** University of Florida, Ohio State University, University of Minnesota, Colorado State University, Cornell University's Vet Med Program  
**Comparison privates:** Tufts University, University of Pennsylvania

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** Our program costs are below the program average for public institutions and below the public and private average. University of Pennsylvania and Cornell University are considered our closest peers. We believe we provide a fair tuition and fees package for the highest quality DVM program.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$323,545	\$12,867	\$8,608	\$9,497	\$9,499	\$9,723	\$373,739
Benefits Cost	\$797,215	\$31,703	\$21,210	\$23,400	\$23,407	\$23,958	\$920,893
Providing Student Services	\$1,652,428	\$65,713	\$43,964	\$48,503	\$48,516	\$49,658	\$1,908,782
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$500,000	\$19,884	\$13,303	\$14,676	\$14,680	\$15,026	\$577,569
Instructional Support Staff	\$1,646,100	\$65,462	\$43,795	\$48,317	\$48,330	\$49,468	\$1,901,473
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$582,000	\$23,145	\$15,484	\$17,083	\$17,088	\$17,490	\$672,290
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$2,090,600	\$127,655	\$85,404	\$94,222	\$94,248	\$96,466	\$2,588,594
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$294,000	\$11,692	\$7,822	\$8,630	\$8,632	\$8,835	\$339,611
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$372,000	\$14,794	\$9,897	\$10,919	\$10,922	\$11,179	\$429,711
Other	\$350,000	\$13,919	\$9,312	\$10,273	\$10,276	\$10,518	\$404,298
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$8,607,888</b>	<b>\$386,832</b>	<b>\$258,800</b>	<b>\$285,520</b>	<b>\$285,599</b>	<b>\$292,321</b>	<b>\$10,116,960</b>

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	69%	\$146,128	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$90,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	23%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	1%	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	7%	7%	9%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	1%	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	90%	89%	87%	N/A	N/A
International	1%	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	21%	28%	27%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	20%	18%	16%	20%	20%
% Female	80%	82%	84%	80%	80%
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>616</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>621</b>		

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Our percentage of under-represented students has increased by a modest amount from 2015-16 to 2016-17. To further increase racial/ethnic diversity, our diversity officer will continue to conduct outreach and recruit qualified applicants from diverse backgrounds. Although we are not comfortable adding these data to the table because the groupings of ethnicities are different, the average underrepresented percentage of DVM students is 21% for our public comparators and 13.7% for our private comparators according to our AAVMC Comparative Data Report (2015-16). UC Davis' School of Veterinary Medicine has an underrepresented percentage of 41% according to this survey for 2015-16. Underrepresented groups, for purposes of this survey, included: African American, Latino, Asian, Pacific Islander, Native American, and Multi-Ethnic. Approximately one-third of UC Davis' respondents identified themselves as multi-ethnic.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect the upward trend in the number of students to continue to increase for underrepresented minorities and Pell Grant recipients, and we expect to remain gender inclusive. Approximately three years ago we hired an admissions and diversity officer to assist in our admissions efforts, and we believe this will continue to impact our pipeline of applicants with diverse backgrounds in a positive way. Simply put, our outreach program has improved with the addition of this staff member.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity***</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American		2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		6.0%	7.0%	7.0%
American Indian		1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Asian/Pac Is		5.0%	5.0%	6.0%
White		83.0%	82.0%	81.0%
Other/Unknown		3.0%	2.0%	3.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	45.0%	46.0%	47.0%
	Male	55.0%	54.0%	53.0%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American		1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		4.0%	6.0%	6.0%
American Indian		1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Asian/Pac Is		4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
White		87.0%	84.0%	85.0%
Other/Unknown		3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	40.0%	39.0%	41.0%
	Male	60.0%	61.0%	59.0%

**Note:**  
"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

\*\* **Please note that the faculty diversity tables for each UC Davis program proposing to assess PDST do not include domestic and international subcategories. These subcategories have been removed to ensure that these tables do not reveal the identity of specific faculty members. UC Davis programs have included one figure for each ethnicity noted in the tables, capturing both domestic and international faculty.**

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* For each year of this multi-year proposal, return-to-aid (RTA) is 33% of the additional PDST, which meets the minimum RTA requirement in the policy.

*Goals/Strategies:* We aim to reduce student debt and increase student starting salaries. Our student debt is below the mean among our veterinary school peers. In 2015-16 our average student debt was \$101,302 and the mean student debt load across all 30 accredited veterinary schools was \$132,901. Our median starting salary for 2015-16 was \$90,000. This is less under our control, but we have a Career, Leadership, and Wellness (CLAW) center that we started in 2014 to provide career development services to our students to assist them in their career search.

### ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The program scheduled town-hall style meetings on 9/22/17 and 10/2/2017 and described the plan to students in the program via email. The town-hall style meetings included a 20 minute PowerPoint presentation and 40 minute block for discussion following the presentation. The proposal was also posted on the school-wide intranet inviting feedback from faculty and students via email. Students were interested to know the amount of debt and starting salaries of the UC Davis School of Medicine (SOM) students as a comparison to their own program. The average student debt for SOM students from 2013-14 was \$154,576 and their average starting salary was \$51,250. Most medical school graduates move to residencies or internships after graduation, therefore their starting salaries don't reflect a full professional salary. Students had an idea to set the professional fees and tuition as an inverse function of student debt (e.g., if debt is higher than average, tuition is lower than average). Students suggested packaging financial aid to attract students based on various characteristics including career interest (e.g., large animal specialties) or socioeconomic background. Students wanted to know what percentage of core funds used by the school were funded by students. Students requested that other services be offered to them if fees were increasing. DVM students requested that their third year surgical packs be paid by the school. The school is evaluating this request currently. Students had questions about the computer grants of \$500 offered to DVM students. They asked if the amount could possibly be increased and why new computers were required for first year students. The school is considering offering a higher dollar amount for computer grants. New computers from a select set of models are required to ensure our IT group can easily maintain them throughout the four years that they are matriculating with us. We have learned that older computers or unique models take more time to maintain. Students are provided with Mac and Windows computer options.

The program consulted with faculty by including the proposal as an agenda item at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting, scheduling town-hall style meetings of faculty to discuss the plan and solicit feedback, and describing the plan to faculty in the program via email. The faculty members did not provide written feedback. During the town-hall meetings, faculty members asked about UC Davis School of Medicine's student debt upon graduation, requested that the presentation be expanded to include 2008-09, and two faculty members explicitly stated that fee increases based on the change in the consumer price index appeared fair and reasonable.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: Irvine/M.S. Biotechnology Management**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$13,230	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,586	\$15,315	\$16,080	0%	\$0	5%	\$660	5%	\$696	5%	\$729	5%	\$765
Nonresident:	\$12,303	\$12,303	\$12,918	\$13,563	\$14,241	\$14,952	0%	\$0	5%	\$615	5%	\$645	5%	\$678	5%	\$711

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

UC Irvine’s MSBTM program is focused on making the program as affordable as possible, while maintaining quality and outstanding student support. These efforts are underscored by our not requesting a PDST fee increase for 2018-19. Holding PDST flat during 2018-19, despite inflationary costs, will be possible only because the initial growth of the MSBTM program was slower than anticipated. Now that the program has an established track record of training and placing high-quality graduates, we are confident that future growth will meet or exceed expectations. As such, our program is requesting consistent 5% increases in PDST for the remaining four years of this plan to maintain both program quality and student services. The professional fee would be used for: 1) continued financial aid; 2) expanded efforts in outreach, marketing, and recruiting especially to under-represented minorities and prospective students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds; 3) expanded career services for a larger number of students; 4) placing more students in the best labs; and 5) expanding instructional support staff to offer new sections of required courses in biological sciences. If the proposed increases requested for years 2019-20 through 2022-23, are not allowed, our view is that we would not be able to continue the program in its present form. Critical features like career services, marketing, outreach, and instructional support, including staff, would have to be cut.

**Brief Description of Program**

Our two-year M.S. Program in Biotechnology Management (MSBTM) is an interdisciplinary program that trains highly qualified students in both science and business/management. Students take graduate level science courses with M.S. and Ph.D. students from graduate programs spanning many disciplines. They take their business courses with MBA students from the Paul Merage full-time MBA and FEMBA programs. They also spend a minimum of 2 quarters doing research in a faculty laboratory of their choosing. The overall goal of the program is to provide graduates with training that will allow them to enter the job market as highly skilled practitioners in science, business, or entrepreneurship, each capable of bridging the gap between the business and scientific sides of the biotechnology industry. None of our comparator schools offer the scope of business courses that we do, the business school competitions in entrepreneurship that we do (Hult Prize, Technology-Entrepreneurship with the School of Law, the annual Entrepreneurship/Business Plan Competition), and most definitively, none offer independent research in a faculty lab.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

In our previous multi-year plan (AY 2012-13 through AY 2015-16), we stated that establishing and maintaining a high-quality program that offered students outstanding training, a fulfilling experience, and, ultimately, a permanent position, were our primary goals. We also identified several cost-cutting areas, which included corporate outreach to develop fellowships and internships, and the use of TA positions, when available, to help students earn money during their second year in the program. Outreach to recruit underrepresented minorities was identified as a priority as was gender diversity. The MSBTM program is now in its fifth year. It is our view that we have reached our initial goals of establishing a unique and high quality program that trains students to be marketable as scientists, managers, or entrepreneurs, and ultimately helps them obtain a position of their choosing. With one exception, PDST revenue was used in each of the areas outlined in our 2012-13 multi-year plan (PDST funds were not used for instructional equipment purchases). Specifically:

- a) Faculty Salary Supplements. In summer, PDST aided faculty recruiting efforts and outreach.
  - b) Expanding Instructional Support. PDST funded MB252L, an 8-unit, highly intensive teaching laboratory course, designed to provide students with the fundamental methods required to enter research labs in their second year. This category also provides funds to the laboratories in which the MSBTM students perform their second-year research.
  - d) Financial Aid. 33% of PDST revenue was returned to the students.
  - e) Non-salary cost increases. This category included the cost of mailings, office supplies, graduation costs, and orientations. All were aimed at enhancing program cohesiveness and culture.
- (Continued on Next Page.)

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Continued)**

- f) Marketing and recruiting. PDST funds were used to develop and distribute recruiting materials, program brochures, web pages and landing pages. They were also used in our primary recruiting efforts through Facebook and Google Ads, purchasing GRE contact information, and to send program personnel to recruiting fairs in Southern California. Data analysis suggests that these efforts have been successful.
- g) Orientation and intensive. Funds in this category were used to support new MSBTM students being included in a day-long Merage Orientation and the pre-fall quarter MBA intensive (MBA 200, 3 days). This is an MSBTM student's first step into the culture of the business school. It is a valuable one, and it provides a foundation for both years of business training.
- h) Career Services. Our original PDST budget plan did not include a category for Student and Career Support Services, although hiring a professional was noted and planned. That professional has now been in place since 2014-15, and she has been essential in helping the students land internships and ultimately full-time positions. Overall, feedback from our students strongly suggests that they value the training provided by Student and Career Support Services, and that they fully support the use of PDST funds to maintain the staff in the program.

Quantitatively, the quality of our applicants is very high (average undergrad GPA being 3.3 and 3.4 in 2016 and 2017, respectively), all students who began the program have completed it, and all our graduates landed positions within 6 months of graduation.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our goals going forward are to increase the size of the MSBTM program while maintaining the quality of the training our students receive, as well as to expand support and career services for a larger number of students. We plan to expand our curriculum, and increase and intensify marketing, recruiting and outreach, especially to under-represented minorities and prospective students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Finally, we plan to increase the supplement we provide to student research labs in order to place more students in the best labs. The cost of attending our program is extremely low relative to that of our comparator institutions, both public and private. This is in part because we have made concerted efforts to minimize increases in PDST levels, including no increases in 2014-15, 2016-17, and 2018-19. Fee increases have been requested only when program leadership deems them absolutely necessary. Should the PDST levels requested not be approved, we would be unable to continue the program in its present form. Critical features like career services, marketing, outreach, and instructional support, including staff, would have to be cut. In turn, that would mean that the training and experience our students receive, academically, professionally and personally, would suffer greatly.

**Market Comparison:**       **Total Annual Charges**       **Total Charges to Degree**

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$26,630	\$26,970	\$27,988	\$29,049	\$30,148	\$31,296
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$29,943	\$30,842	\$31,767	\$32,720	\$33,701	\$34,713
	<i>Privates</i>	\$42,740	\$44,022	\$45,343	\$46,703	\$48,104	\$49,547
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$37,948	\$38,288	\$39,261	\$40,271	\$41,319	\$42,413
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$41,485	\$42,730	\$44,011	\$45,332	\$46,692	\$48,092
	<i>Privates</i>	\$42,740	\$44,022	\$45,343	\$46,703	\$48,104	\$49,547

Comparison publics: University of Wisconsin, San Jose State University, University of Central Florida  
 Comparison privates: Keck Graduate Institute, Johns Hopkins University  
  
*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:* For the period covered in this proposal, the MSBTM program's in-state costs fall below the costs of all public and private comparator institutions. We believe this reflects our sustained effort to make our program affordable without sacrificing quality.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$10,000	\$500	\$525	\$551	\$579	\$608	\$12,763
Benefits Cost	\$2,700	\$135	\$142	\$149	\$156	\$164	\$3,446
Providing Student Services	\$135,168	\$80,983	\$80,659	\$62,815	\$71,243	\$80,110	\$510,978
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$26,854	\$1,343	\$1,410	\$1,480	\$1,554	\$1,632	\$34,273
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$100,193	\$46,801	\$41,765	\$36,969	\$40,189	\$43,628	\$309,545
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$2,700	\$59	\$61	\$62	\$63	\$65	\$3,010
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$26,000	\$12,000	\$2,000	\$10,000	\$8,000	\$6,000	\$64,000
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$303,615	\$141,822	\$126,561	\$112,026	\$121,785	\$132,207	\$938,016

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	17%	\$56,000	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$55,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	15%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.



Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American					
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	7%	4%	0%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0%</b>	N/A	N/A
Other Domestic	29%	34%	31%	N/A	N/A
International	64%	62%	69%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients					
	25%	17%	0%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male					
	43%	46%	39%	N/A	N/A
% Female					
	57%	54%	61%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	14	26	23	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

We currently make a strong effort to recruit and matriculate underrepresented minority students, but we need to intensify it. This is accomplished through recruiting fairs, outreach via mailings, and by purchasing contact information of students who have taken the GRE and noted an interest in biotechnology or biotech management. We also flag minority students who contact us through our Google and Facebook ads, and maintain contact with them before and after offering admission. It should also be noted that we admitted three Latino(a) students (one in 2015-16 and two in 2016-17) who chose not to join the program (their presence in the program would have raised the percent of Latino(a) students to 13% and 18% in those years).

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

In the future, we plan to intensify our efforts in the identification and recruitment of minority students, and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. We intend to ramp up recruiting efforts in general, to increase the total number of applications received each year. We also plan to target recruiting at designated schools and communities where the number of minority students and students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds is higher. The MSBTM program is young, having just enrolled its fifth class. At the end of this multi-year plan, six more classes will have graduated, and the anticipated success of placing those grads will help "sell" the program to prospective applicants, including minority students. With increased outreach and focus on those students, as well as increased financial aid targeted to them, we are confident that we can grow the percentage of minority students and Pell grant recipients enrolled in MSBTM. We also expect that gender parity will continue to be maintained.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, School of Biological Sciences)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	2.9%	3.0%	3.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.9%	3.0%	0.0%
	International	2.9%	3.0%	3.3%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	11.8%	9.1%	6.7%
	International	11.8%	12.1%	13.3%
White	Domestic	44.1%	45.5%	50.0%
	International	23.5%	24.2%	23.3%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		32.4%	33.3%	36.7%
Male		67.7%	66.7%	63.3%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, School of Biological Sciences)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	3.3%	3.5%	3.9%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	3.3%	3.5%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	10.0%	6.9%	3.9%
	International	10.0%	10.3%	11.5%
White	Domestic	46.7%	48.3%	53.9%
	International	26.7%	27.6%	26.9%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		33.3%	34.5%	38.5%
Male		66.7%	65.5%	61.5%

**Note:**  
"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (Paul Merage School of Business)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.8%	2.3%	2.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	3.0%		5.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	22.0%	21.8%	22.9%
	International	5.3%	6.8%	4.6%
White	Domestic	60.6%	57.9%	57.3%
	International	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	7.6%	5.3%	6.1%
	International	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		31.8%	33.8%	34.4%
Male		68.2%	66.2%	65.6%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (Paul Merage School of Business)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.1%	2.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	35.4%	35.3%	34.0%
	International	6.3%	7.8%	8.0%
White	Domestic	56.3%	54.9%	48.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		43.8%	43.1%	46.0%
Male		56.3%	56.9%	54.0%

**Note 2: The MSBTM program is an interdisciplinary program organized by the Paul Merage School of Business and the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry in the School of Biological Sciences. As such, faculty diversity data have been included for both academic units.**

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

## **Financial Aid Strategy**

---

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* For each year of the proposal the return-to-aid is 33%. The MSBTM program is actively engaged in finding additional sources of financial aid, which are described below.

*Goals/Strategies:* While the PDST is critical to the quality, sustainability, and ultimate success of the MSBTM program, our goal is that no admitted student will choose not to attend based on financial concerns. Thus far, in the first five years of the program's existence, no student offered admission has told us they would not attend because they had no way to finance program costs. Strategies to develop additional sources of financial aid include ongoing corporate outreach aimed at establishing fellowships (in progress). We are also in negotiations with the Graduate Associate Deans of both the Paul Merage School of Business and the Ayala School of Biological Sciences to provide funds for recruitment fellowships for under-represented minority students, students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, first-generation graduate students, and for students with exceptional credentials.

We are also attempting to keep the MSBTM program affordable in several ways by committing to generate additional forms of financial aid and to continue finding ways to allow our students to generate income during their time in the program. These include paid summer internships and teaching assistantships for our students. To aid program affordability, for the last two years every MSBTM student has received a paid summer internship. Additionally, the majority have been able to TA in their second year of the program. Beginning with the 2014-15 academic year (the year our initial class reached their second year), Molecular Biology and Biochemistry has filled 32 TA positions with MSBTM students (30 at 50%, two at 25%). Merage has also contributed by offering four TA positions (25%) and several appointments as readers. It is noteworthy that essentially all MSBTM students who wanted TA positions, and were also eligible to TA, received assignments in two quarters during their second year.

## **Student and Faculty Consultation**

---

*Students:* Both first and second year MSBTM students were contacted via email twice regarding input on this proposal; once by the Paul Merage School of Business, and once by the Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry in the School of Biological Sciences. In those emails, all aspects of the PDST were explained (necessity, how it is used, etc.), and future proposed increases outlined. Student comments and concerns were requested via email, and two weeks were allotted for replies. To keep the identities of the respondents confidential, email replies were sent to departmental office personnel, not program faculty or administrators. Only the comments of the respondents were forwarded to the latter. We received two replies, one from a first-year student, and one from a second-year. Both were supportive of the proposed fee and subsequent increases in light of the student services and other benefits they receive.

*AGS President:* Irvine AGS President Michelle Chan was provided with the MSBTM multi-year plan as part of the campus review and feedback process. Ms. Chan recommended that the program notify applicants and current students of incremental increases to the PDST in a timely manner to help students understand the purpose of the PDST and allow students to budget appropriately. Ms. Chan felt it would strengthen the multi-year proposals as well as provide a plan for future reporting including short-form reporting in subsequent years. In response to Ms. Chan's feedback (also included in the program's last short-form review), the program now discusses all aspects of the PDST with students including what it is used for, and, in years where it is increased, why the increase is necessary.

*Faculty:* As with the MSBTM students, both Merage and Molecular Bio and Biochemistry faculty were contacted via an email in which the PDST and how it is used was explained, as was why it is necessary to increase it in future years. Comments and concerns were requested via an email reply, and again, two weeks were allotted for those replies. The replies were not confidential. Email responses were limited, but several faculty gave us comments in person. All strongly supported the PDST and proposed increases. One faculty member suggested that we eliminate the difference in the PDST amount charged to residents versus nonresidents, since both receive the same benefits from the PDST (our standing policy has been to charge nonresidents a lower fee to offset increases

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: Irvine M.S. in Engineering Management - Samueli School of Engineering**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,583	\$15,315	\$16,044	\$16,845	5%	\$660	5%	\$693	5%	\$732	5%	\$729	5%	\$801
Nonresident:	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,583	\$15,315	\$16,044	\$16,845	5%	\$660	5%	\$693	5%	\$732	5%	\$729	5%	\$801

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

UC Irvine's Master in Engineering Management program is proposing consistent 5% increase in PDST over five years to accomplish three goals: 1) increase California resident, low socioeconomic, first generation, and underrepresented student enrollment; 2) maintain consistent and satisfactory levels of service quality; and 3) increase course offerings to expand in the areas of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. These goals will benefit students since they will provide higher levels of access to underrepresented students, allow the program to continue offering services that are relevant to the students' career objectives, and offer courses that are of interest.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Master of Science in Engineering Management program is a graduate professional degree jointly offered by The Paul Merage School of Business and The Samueli School of Engineering that will prepare engineers for leadership roles in technology, science, government, and engineering-based companies and organizations. The program is designed to be completed in one full-time year. The curriculum includes practical and experiential courses. Students emerge as innovators by taking on the role of business and engineering project managers tasked with solving complex engineering product development challenges through consulting projects, business plans, and exposure to current issues within the engineering sector. Through this process, quantitative and qualitative skills along with business communication skills will be developed.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

In the previous multi-year plan, covering AY 2012-13 through AY 2015-16, the specific objectives for the program were as follows:

- 1) to maintain and provide continuous improvement to the quality of the program;
- 2) to maintain and provide improved support services to students in the program (e.g., professional career development, library resource materials, team building, career placement, and consulting experiences that are not provided in our existing MS programs) and increase those services in proportion to the number of students in the program; and
- 3) to provide financial support to students in need.

The desire to attract and support students in financial need, including those who have been historically underrepresented in engineering fields, has continued to be a consideration.

The MSEM PDST has provided the funding necessary for the program to work towards achieving these goals. Specifically, the PDST has maintained and improved the quality of the program by providing the funds necessary for continuing the two-week orientation program, which includes the MBA 200 intensive course. We have also hired a lecturer to continue the ENGR 280 course that is part of the core curriculum for the program.

In terms of student services, two of the biggest impacts from the PDST revenue have been in the hiring of a part-time career counselor dedicated to the EM program and the hiring of a part-time admissions coordinator; these staff positions have significantly improved student support services and have resulted in higher student and alumni satisfaction. The hiring of the career counselor was motivated by student feedback we received at our town hall meetings indicating that the campus's sole graduate career counselor, who must support all of Irvine's graduate students across all disciplines, was not able to supply the level of career development some of our graduates required in order to launch successful careers within six months of graduation. The EM career counselor has been very effective. For example, to date, of the 15 spring 2017 graduates, eight have obtained full-time positions, one has obtained an internship that can lead to a full-time position, four have contract/internship positions, one had been accepted into the MS Statistics program at Columbia and only one is actively interviewing. The part-time, limited admissions coordinator's main responsibilities are to organize the structure of admissions review and more quickly respond to prospective student and applicant inquiries. The hiring of an admissions coordinator dedicated to the EM program was motivated by the program's inability to admit students in a timely manner for fall 2016, which resulted in a number of high quality students electing to attend other EM programs. The administrative coordinator was very effective in managing the fall 2017 admissions cycle: 10 applicants were admitted in January 2017 and admissions were completed before June 2017.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

With the increase in PDST, we hope to accomplish three goals:

- 1) to increase California resident, low socioeconomic, first generation, and underrepresented student enrollment;
- 2) to maintain consistent and satisfactory levels of service quality; and
- 3) to increase course offerings to expand in the areas of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

Goal 1 will be accomplished by means of an increase in marketing activities, the offering of yield events, and providing higher level fellowships to this group of students. Permanent staff will serve as admissions coordinator, yield coordinator, and academic advisor. The yield coordinator will maintain communication with the applicants we choose to admit. This seems to be an effective strategy used by other programs. Goal 2 is to add administrative consistency via increased staff. We have already hired a part-time career counselor dedicated to this program, and as enrollment grows, we would like the ability to add more hours to maintain quality career planning services for students. Additionally, as the application pool increases in size and we incorporate more contact with admitted students and the review process is more defined, we would like to increase the hours of our part-time program coordinator. Our goal is to make this position permanent so applicants and matriculated students can receive high-quality service. Goal 3 will involve funding a lecturer for the ENGR 180/280 class, since the volunteer lecturer has stepped out of his role as instructor due to other commitments. We would also like to expand the course topic to include other developing areas such as intrapreneurship and potentially increase offerings to two or three times a year rather than one quarter.

**Market Comparison:**

Total Annual Charges       Total Charges to Degree

**Comparator Figures Below are Projections**

		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$26,630	\$27,630	\$28,681	\$29,778	\$30,877	\$32,061
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$27,823	\$28,658	\$29,517	\$30,403	\$31,315	\$32,254
	<i>Privates</i>	\$54,419	\$56,051	\$57,733	\$59,465	\$61,249	\$63,086
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$38,875	\$39,876	\$40,929	\$42,023	\$43,122	\$44,306
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$35,758	\$36,830	\$37,935	\$39,073	\$40,246	\$41,453
	<i>Privates</i>	\$54,419	\$56,051	\$57,733	\$59,465	\$61,249	\$63,086

Comparison publics: University of Massachusetts - Amherst, University of Minnesota, University of Colorado - Boulder  
 Comparison privates: Northwestern McCormick, Stanford, USC, Duke-Pratt

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** For California residents, the MSEM program's total annual charges are consistently lower than those of its public and private comparators.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$6,500	\$3,738	\$5,887	\$9,271	\$14,602	\$19,999	\$59,997
Benefits Cost	\$2,522	\$1,450	\$2,284	\$3,597	\$5,666	\$7,760	\$23,279
Providing Student Services	\$84,000	\$17,970	\$3,011	\$3,149	\$3,244	\$3,341	\$114,715
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$22,500	\$1,852	\$2,479	\$2,333	\$3,367	\$3,726	\$36,257
Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$79,118	\$14,275	\$11,014	\$10,903	\$20,793	\$17,612	\$153,715
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$33,500	\$375	\$3,769	\$1,432	\$454	\$476	\$40,006
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$238,140</b>	<b>\$39,660</b>	<b>\$28,444</b>	<b>\$30,686</b>	<b>\$48,126</b>	<b>\$52,914</b>	<b>\$437,970</b>

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	13%	\$25,518	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$68,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	5%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
					<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i>	Afr-American	0%	0%	0%	0.7%	5%
	Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	10%	0%	0%	7%	8%
	American Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>
	Other Domestic	20%	21%	33%	71%	44%
	International	70%	79%	67%	22%	43%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<i>Socioeconomic:</i>	% Pell recipients	33%	33%	25%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i>	% Male	65%	64%	53%	76%	46%
	% Female	35%	36%	47%	24%	54%
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Our goal is to increase the percentage of resident, first generation, low income, and underrepresented minorities. Specific actions we plan to take are to offer more information sessions, focused marketing, and increased financial support packages to our top applicants in the aforementioned groups. In addition, we will provide funding to domestic students to come to campus for a visit day and information session. Hiring a dedicated staff person to help with recruitment and admissions will help improve response time, enhance customer service, and establish relationships.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

By the final year of this plan, we hope to increase our domestic student enrollment to at least 33%, underrepresented students to at least 10%, Pell Grant recipients to 33% or higher, and female students to at least 45%. The program has developed effective strategies to attract and yield female students. These include continuing interaction between the time of acceptance and the start of the academic year, campus visits, and fellowships. We will continue our demonstrated effective strategies. We will also increase our fellowship and outreach efforts to applicants in low socioeconomic groups, but as the data show, with the exception of 2016-17, we are effective in attracting and yielding students in this group. It should be noted that with such a small program a reduction or increase of one student in one particular subgroup can lead to a significant change in the percentage of students in a particular group.

**Faculty Diversity\* - Samueli School of Engineering**

<b>All Faculty (School)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	29.4%	31.0%	30.5%
	International	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%
White	Domestic	63.3%	60.2%	61.0%
	International	1.0%	2.7%	1.7%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	16.8%	19.0%	19.1%
	Male	83.2%	81.0%	80.9%

**Faculty Diversity\* - Paul Merage School of Business**

<b>All Faculty (School)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.8%	2.3%	2.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	3.0%	4.5%	5.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	22.0%	21.8%	22.9%
	International	5.3%	6.8%	4.6%
White	Domestic	60.6%	57.9%	57.3%
	International	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	7.6%	5.3%	6.1%
	International	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	31.8%	33.8%	34.4%
	Male	68.2%	66.2%	65.6%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	29.4%	31.0%	30.5%
	International	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%
White	Domestic	63.3%	60.2%	61.0%
	International	1.8%	2.7%	1.7%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	16.5%	20.4%	20.3%
	Male	83.5%	79.6%	79.7%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.1%	2.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	35.4%	35.3%	34.0%
	International	6.3%	7.8%	8.0%
White	Domestic	56.3%	54.9%	48.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	43.8%	43.1%	46.0%
	Male	56.3%	56.9%	54.0%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

**Note: This program is a joint program between the Paul Merage School of Business and the Samueli School of Engineering. All faculty in both Schools can participate and teach courses within the program. For this reason, we have provided two versions of this summary, one for each School.**

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

## **Financial Aid Strategy**

---

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* Over the five-year period of the proposed multi-year plan, the program will set aside approximately 37% of the total Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition revenue for student aid; this is above the minimum PDST RTA policy of 33%. Graduate Division will provide additional student aid in from USAP funds. Additionally, several of the companies that have expressed support for the program have indicated that they would provide some financial support to employees who enrolled in the program.

*Goals/Strategies:* We continue to ensure that no qualified student is prevented from enrolling in the MS Engineering Management program due to unmet financial need. To that end, we have set aside 33% of the income from the PDST to meet the needs of students in financial need. For California residents, the PDST is about the same amount as UC mandatory systemwide tuition and fees. Thus, for every six residents who pay full fees, approximately one student can be offered a fellowship that pays for the systemwide tuition and fees and the PDST. As noted previously, we will continue our goal of having 33% of our students come from an undergraduate population of Pell grant recipients. Strategies with regard to reaching the affordability goals include:

- 1) Targeted funding opportunity identification efforts: One of the duties of the Student Affairs Officer is to assist underrepresented students in locating and applying for various fellowships, scholarships, or assistantships that could assist them in funding their graduate study. Simultaneously, the Graduate Student Affairs Office of the SSoE will continually work to identify funding opportunities for all students in the program, as it currently does for the traditional Engineering programs.
- 2) The SSoE Graduate Student Affairs Office will work with all applicants and admitted students to consult with the Office of Financial Aid regarding filling out the FAFSA and learning about any loan programs for which they are eligible.

## **Student and Faculty Consultation**

---

A subgroup of the steering committee consulted with students in the program, faculty, and a representative of the Graduate Student Association regarding the proposed fee increase, proposed program changes, use of fees and other issues.

Fourteen of the eighteen students enrolled in the program attended the Town Hall Meeting that was held on October 10th, 2017. The students who attended were interested in the use of the funds, but did not express any objections to the fee increase. In addition, several of the nonresident students who had considered Duke's program in Engineering Management noted that the cost of the UCI EM program was more than \$10,000 less than the program cost at Duke. They noted that this difference in cost was one of the reasons they chose UCI.

The plan was also shared with Aaron Concha, the President of the Merage Student Association; to date, no feedback has been received.

We also consulted the Michelle Chan, Irvine's AGS President who supported the fee increase but wanted to make sure that we continue to consult with students in the EM program. Ms. Chan's comments were as follows: "While the justifications for the PDST are reasonable and provide evidence of direct benefits to students, I would recommend that programs include a plan to notify applicants and current students of the incremental increases in PDST. Because the students in Master's programs are often self-funded, timely notification of increasing fees will help students understand the PDST and allow them to budget for their education appropriately. There is no specific question asking about this level of detail, but it would strengthen the multi-year proposals as well as provide a plan for future reporting when the programs eventually submit a short form in subsequent years."

The program provided the following response to Ms. Chan: "Currently, the program is nominally a one-year program. Prior to submission of the application, students are provided with the estimated PDST fees that will be in effect during the year in which they are matriculated students. In addition, quarterly town hall meetings are held with students in the Engineering Management Program. At that town hall meeting, we seek input from the students regarding the proposed fees for the following year, explain how the professional fees are used, and, also, should students need to stay an extra quarter, inform them of the estimated fee amount for the following year. As noted in the forgoing, at the fall town hall meeting, the proposed fees for the following year were discussed with the current students."

We consulted with faculty by email to seek input regarding the proposed fee increase. Responses from faculty who responded were all supportive of the fee increase.



All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: Irvine / Master of Public Health**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year 2017-18	Year 1 2018-19	Year 2 2019-20	Year 3 2020-21	Year 4 2021-22	Year 5 2022-23	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$6,498	\$6,822	\$7,164	\$7,521	\$7,896	\$8,292	5%	\$324	5%	\$342	5%	\$357	5%	\$375	5%	\$396
Nonresident:	\$6,498	\$6,822	\$7,164	\$7,521	\$7,896	\$8,292	5%	\$324	5%	\$342	5%	\$357	5%	\$375	5%	\$396

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

UC Irvine’s Master of Public Health program proposes consistent 5% increases in PDST over the course of five years in order to enrich students’ professional training and career preparation. The PDST will be used to achieve five specific goals: (1) To continue administering the Certified Public Health examination multiple times per year in order to facilitate the credentialing and advancement to degree candidacy of our M.P.H. students at no cost to them; (2) to develop and implement another M.P.H. emphasis area in global health; (3) to partner with Apple Corporation for iPad and internet-enabled curriculum enhancement for all M.P.H. students; (4) to establish an alumni-student professional mentor-matching program now that we have a substantial alumni base; and (5) to expand career development services for M.P.H. students.

**Brief Description of Program**

The UC Irvine Master of Public Health (M.P.H.) program was established in 2010 as the first professional degree of the Department of Population Health and Disease Prevention. M.P.H. students generally need 5 academic quarters to fulfill degree requirements. The mission of the program is to create public health practitioners who are trained to develop and implement effective strategies to reduce the burden of disease and disability in culturally diverse communities. In 2012, following a rigorous self-study process and a site visit by experts, the M.P.H. program was accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH). Students enrolled in the UCI M.P.H. program have the opportunity for in-depth pursuit of one out of four emphasis areas: Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental Health, and Sociocultural Diversity and Health. Graduates of UC Irvine’s M.P.H. program find employment in both public and private agencies and institutions that are committed to preventing diseases and promoting health at the population level.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

In the previous approved multi-year plan covering 2015-16 through 2017-18, we proposed to increase the PDST for the UC Irvine M.P.H. in order meet the following goals:

- 1. Expansion of curricula options and emphasis areas to maintain high quality instruction and career options for the accredited M.P.H.:** The program used PDST funds to purchase software licenses for M.P.H. students for statistical analysis programs such as SAS, Stata, and ArcGIS. Additionally, the program used PDST funds to expand the variety of seminars and invited speakers for M.P.H. students. In the area of Global Health, the program successfully recruited a new faculty member. During 2016-2017, our new M.P.H.-Biostatistics emphasis was approved by the UC Irvine Graduate Council, and we have successfully recruited students beginning fall quarter 2017. The Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) also approved the Biostatistics emphasis as part of our accredited degree areas.
- 2. Sustaining professional development services:** The program used PDST funds to provide focused career counseling, and to expand the range of working professionals that we invited to interact with M.P.H students.
- 3. Meeting the requirements of discipline-specific accreditation standards:** We used PDST to fund achievement and maintenance of accreditation status through the CEPH. We also used PDST to maintain membership in the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health (ASPPH). Our accreditation status and our ASPPH membership (\$35,000 annual membership fee) provide several excellent opportunities for our students. Students and alumni are eligible for several unique fellowship and internship opportunities at prestigious agencies and institutions, for example.
- 4. Attracting the best qualified applicants to our program, through the SOPHAS enrollment portal:** PDST supported our subscription to the School of Public Health Application Service (SOPHAS), which has increased the quality and yield of our applicant pool. SOPHAS is a national, centralized public health application service for CEPH-accredited schools and programs. Using SOPHAS increased the visibility of our program on a national level and reduced time and effort for applicants by streamlining the application process through a centralized, online service with dedicated customer support.
- 5. Increasing financial aid and enriching student diversity and excellence:** We used PDST to support our attendance at student-recruitment fairs and workshops aimed at attracting and recruiting a diverse student population. We also provided financial support to students through employment as hourly-paid course readers for each academic quarter. We labeled this employment opportunity our Student Readers initiative. This financial incentive allowed us to attract and recruit a more socioeconomically diverse M.P.H. student population. By increasing the PDST, we also aimed to increase merit funding by guaranteeing funds for the summer months when students struggle because loan money is not available. This has been a successful outcome of our increased PDST.

## **Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

---

We request consistent 5% increases in PDST through the five years of this proposal to enhance our ability to meet the following goals.

- 1. Make the administration of the Certified Public Health (CPH) examination a permanent feature of our M.P.H. program at no cost to students:** UC Irvine is the only institution in California that arranges for M.P.H. students to take and pass the CPH examination as part of their training. We introduced the examination half-way through our last multi-year plan in part because of student demand for professional credentials that will provide them with an advantage over peers during career prospecting in public health. The department covers the cost of registration for the examination for every student. Individual registration for the CPH examination ordinarily costs \$385 per student. We negotiated with the National Board of Public Health Examiners a group discount rate of \$250 per student. So far, the success rate is 100% and feedback from current students and alumni indicate that this is an extremely positive component of our program.
- 2. Develop and implement an M.P.H. emphasis area in global health with the necessary establishment of international practicum sites:** A recent gift of \$200 million is expected to expedite the implementation of our initiative to establish a School of Population Health, which will host the existing M.P.H. degree. To become an accredited School, we need another emphasis area within the M.P.H. Establishment of the M.P.H.-Global Health will incur costs associated with vetting practicum sites and supporting students for international practicum projects.
- 3. Cover a leasing agreement with Apple Corporation for iPad and Internet-enabled curriculum enhancement:** We have met twice with representatives of Apple Corporation's Education team to explore opportunities to use the tools available for digital information processing, electronic health records, and virtual reality. We believe that this partnership will be important as we envision building our health informatics program.
- 4. Implement an alumni-student professional mentor-matching program:** This program will require funds to support travel of alumni to the UCI campus at least once a year and the hosting of professional mentoring activities. This program will require us to be better engaged with alumni, and to provide funds for supporting alumni to travel back to campus for occasional events, and for M.P.H. mentees to meet with alumni mentors.
- 5. Expand career development fairs:** The results of our 2016-17 graduate exit survey showed us that students would like for us to provide more career advising services. In order to improve these services, over the 2018 winter quarter we will be hosting our first ever Population Health Graduate Career Fair. We are aiming to have around 25-30 different companies with whom our students can interview and network.

**Market Comparison:**

**Total Annual Charges**       **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$19,898	\$20,562	\$21,262	\$21,984	\$22,729	\$23,508
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$24,896	\$25,642	\$26,411	\$27,203	\$28,019	\$28,859
	<i>Privates</i>	\$44,206	\$45,532	\$46,897	\$48,303	\$49,752	\$51,244
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$32,143	\$32,807	\$33,507	\$34,229	\$34,974	\$35,753
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$40,780	\$42,003	\$43,263	\$44,560	\$45,896	\$47,272
	<i>Privates</i>	\$44,206	\$45,532	\$46,897	\$48,303	\$49,752	\$51,244

Comparison publics: University of Michigan, University of Pittsburgh, University of Illinois, Chicago  
 Comparison privates: Harvard University, Yale University, Washington University of St. Louis

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges: Our charges are the lowest of all comparison institutions, public and private, including the proposed 5% increases over the multi-year period.*

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est. Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits/UCRP Cost*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Services	\$20,000	\$2,000	\$2,200	\$2,420	\$6,655	\$8,319	\$41,594
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$30,000	\$3,000	\$3,300	\$3,630	\$9,983	\$12,478	\$62,391
Instructional Support Staff	\$9,500	\$950	\$1,045	\$1,150	\$3,161	\$3,951	\$19,757
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$5,000	\$250	\$263	\$276	\$289	\$304	\$6,382
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$153,000	\$47,100	\$46,300	\$51,100	\$36,250	\$72,125	\$405,875
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$10,148	\$1,428	\$1,397	\$1,067	\$2,293	\$2,077	\$18,410
ASPPH Membership	\$40,000	\$800	\$816	\$832	\$849	\$866	\$44,163
CPH Examination Fees	\$12,750	\$1,750	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,250	\$2,500	\$21,250
Travel for Students	\$51,000	\$7,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$85,000
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$331,398	\$64,278	\$62,820	\$67,974	\$65,730	\$112,620	\$704,820

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	68%	\$42,276	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$55,000
Public Comparisons:	69%	\$50,400	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	11%
Private Comparisons:	75%	\$161,772		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
					<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i>	Afr-American	5%	5%	7%	7%	7%
	Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	19%	13%	2%	7%	5%
	American Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>12%</b>
	Other Domestic	70%	74%	87%	71%	56%
	International	5%	8%	5%	15%	32%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i>	% Pell recipients	35%	50%	57%	35%	16%
<i>Gender:</i>	% Male	11%	23%	28%	24%	35%
	% Female	89%	77%	72%	75%	65%
	Total Enrollment	34	39	50	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

For 2016-17, our yield of Chicano/Latino students was low. We will need to redouble our efforts in attracting Chicano/Latino applicants, and to be more aggressive in our efforts to recruit qualified applicants in this population. As part of the first steps in our efforts, in 2017, Chair Ogunseitan was appointed to the Board of Directors of "Latino Health Access," the premier nonprofit agency engaged with health education in Orange County. We also reserved a Table at the gala event of Latino Health Access in 2016 and 2017. We used the opportunities to present our commitment to workforce development and public health training to improve the health of Latinos/Latinas. We expect that this investment will pay off in number of inquiries and applications from the local Latino community members. We also plan to increase the frequency of our attendance at SACNAS conferences and recruitment programs that emphasize the advancement of Chicanos, Latinos, and Native Americans in the Sciences. We note that the representation of African Americans in our student population increased slightly in 2016-17. Although it is a bit early to tell, we think that some of our outreach efforts through recruitment fairs are having an impact.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect that by 2022-23, our investments in recruiting faculty members and having research collaborations on health topics of particular interest to the Native American population in California will help us advertise specifically to this group of students. For example, we are beginning a collaboration with Hoag hospital's Diabetes clinic. Realistically, we expect that our accomplishments in attracting African American and Latino/Latina students will increase only modestly by 2022-23. We will not relent in our efforts to make our program attractive to these groups of students. We are focusing our efforts on attracting more Latino/a students, evidenced by recruitment of a joint faculty member with split appointment in Public Health and the department to Chicano/Latino Studies. Since our program started, we have always attracted and enrolled more female students than male students. By 2022-23, we hope to achieve a 35-65 (male-female) ratio, to at least match the current ratio for private institutions. The number of Pell grant recipients in our M.P.H. is higher than at the average private or public institutions. By the end of this multi-year plan, we expect to maintain this trend. Our emphasis in sociocultural diversity and health attracts students who are passionate about serving in underserved communities, and we will continue to strengthen that emphasis in our advertisements.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	10.0%	5.3%	4.8%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	15.0%	15.8%	14.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
White	Domestic	60.0%	68.4%	52.4%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	10.0%	10.5%	19.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	55.0%	47.4%	57.1%
	Male	45.0%	52.6%	42.9%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	7.7%	7.7%	6.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	23.1%	23.1%	20.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
White	Domestic	61.5%	61.5%	53.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	7.7%	13.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
	Female	38.5%	46.2%	53.3%
	Male	61.5%	53.8%	46.7%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* For the period covered by of our multi-year proposal, return-to-aid (RTA) is approximately 68%, which exceeds the minimum RTA requirement in the policy.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our primary goal in offering financial aid continues to be to recruit and provide highly qualified and eligible students a mechanism of support to make their education more affordable. We have need-based financial aid distributed by the Office of Financial Aid and departmental aid in the form of recruitment incentives, employment positions, and support for public health-related activities. We measure our success in part by monitoring rates of persistence and graduation from the program. We now have data on the debt level for our first set of graduates through exit surveys and the corporate data system, and we will continue to monitor trends in this data with future graduates.

## ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

This multi-year plan was shared with continuing MPH students on October 11, 2017. The students suggested using a portion of the additional PDST revenue to:

- Support a staff member to secure a Memorandum of Understanding between governmental agencies (federal, state, & local level), corporations, organizations and the program to provide internship positions with a guaranteed-employment upon the successful completion of the internship.
- Supply the following items in the MPH study room for the entire calendar year (including holidays and summer break): at least 2 desktop computers; a color printer, scanner, and copier; textbooks (one for each course) for all required courses; study materials for the CPH Examination; white board, markers, and erasers; projector; water fountain; and 10+ Lockers.

We noted that many of these items were already in our infrastructure development plans, and they will be implemented.

This plan was also shared with faculty and discussed as an agenda item at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Faculty unanimously agreed with the proposed multi-year plan and the implementation of initiatives to be supported by the 5% annual increase in the PDST. No specific changes were made to the proposal as a result of this feedback.

We consulted the President of Associated Graduate Students on October 3, 2017. We received the following feedback:

“While the justifications for the PDST are reasonable and provide evidence of direct benefits to students, I would recommend that programs include a plan to notify applicants and current students of the incremental increases in PDST. Because the students in masters programs are often self-funded, timely notification of increasing fees will help students understand the PDST and allow them to budget for their education appropriately. There is no specific question asking about this level of detail, but it would strengthen the multi-year proposals as well as provide a plan for future reporting when the programs eventually submit a short form in subsequent years.” These suggestions have been incorporated into the “Information and Consultation Plan.”

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

*All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.*

**Campus and Program: UCLA - Art MFA Program**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>2021-22</b>		<b>2022-23</b>	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$8,478	\$8,478	\$8,478	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident:	\$5,298	\$5,298	\$5,298	N/A	N/A	N/A	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The UCLA Department of Art proposes no increases for a two-year period, after which it will re-assess its fee structure. The PDST funds are used to pay its graduate program's core operating costs --including career staff, student assistants, visiting faculty for graduate courses, teaching supplies, equipment maintenance, visiting artist lecture series, as well as return-to-aid student scholarships. All building operations are paid out of PDST funds as well. While we are mindful of the deep impact of such fees on the art students, we also recognize that the revenues generated currently provide vital support for the continuation of the program.

**Brief Description of Program**

The UCLA Department of Art has one of the leading Master of Fine Arts programs for training artists. The program, which normally requires two to three years of residency, focuses on individual studio-based practices through six areas of study: Ceramics, Interdisciplinary Studio, New Genres, Painting/Drawing, Photography, and Sculpture. For decades, the program has maintained a very competitive standing, with an average admit rate of 2.8%, and has recruited and retained a stellar faculty of practicing artists. The graduate students work independently in a facility off-campus, each with a private studio, a feature that adds to the program's vitality and attractiveness. Recently, a private donor has made a major gift for the complete renovation of a deteriorating graduate studios facility, launching a capital project to break ground by the end of 2017. The goals of the program will remain the same while at a temporary staging building in West Los Angeles, and eventually at the newly constructed UCLA Margo Leavin Graduate Art Studios in 2019 – to maintain the best MFA program in the country at a public research university and continue to inspire the most talented young artists from across the country and the world to move to Los Angeles.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The last multi-year plan, submitted for AY 2011-12 to 2013-14, initiated these fees to meet basic operational expenses and to maintain the quality of our nationally, and internationally, renowned program, attracting some of the best students and retaining its valued faculty. Our goal was – and continues to be - to provide a consistent, professional working environment for our graduate students, both on campus and at the off-campus Graduate Studios, with a broader base of support for our general operations while simultaneously fundraising for scholarship support with the aim to continue to attract students representing a range of socio-economic and geographic diversity. PDST revenue has been used to support students, faculty, and staff in the Department of Art. We have used revenues gained from PDST to provide students with scholarships, recruit highly qualified visiting faculty, pay for program staff, and cover operating costs of the graduate studios, all of which are essential to the program. In addition, we have been able to provide students with studio spaces at the off-site Graduate Studios, allowing them to work on developing their professional skills and artistic talents. The revenue from these fees has helped to bolster our presence throughout the Los Angeles community through exhibitions, galleries, and visiting artist lectures. Support from these fees has been necessary for equipment upgrades, and keeping our students competitive in the profession.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

The department's ultimate goal is to supplant the PDST with other sources of support, but in the short-term, continue the existing fees with no increase to students. Current students, faculty, and external evaluators for the program's Academic Senate 8-year review have all expressed concern that the PDST charged to its MFA students -- and ensuing debt for graduates -- are not sustainable in the economic climate for artists entering the MFA program and pursuing their professional work upon graduation, and that a major effort should be made to replace these funds with permanent outside sources of support -- either with campus or external funds. In addition, department faculty have indicated that in recent years, several top graduate applicants have selected competing schools to attend for financial reasons. These concerns are being taken seriously. However, the reality is that the program would not be able to cover some of its core program costs without the funding currently generated by these fees. There are several conditions at work over the next several years: the renovation of the UCLA Margo Leavin Graduate Art Studios facility, a new dean of the School of the Arts and Architecture, and the major efforts to raise funds for the program and the new building. The department and school are committed to not adding more financial burden to graduate students venturing unpredictable careers in the arts and to seeking more viable long-term sources of support. The department plans to re-assess the program fees following this critical period of change.

**UCLA - Art MFA Program**

**Market Comparison:**

▣ **Total Annual Charges**    □ **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$21,481	\$21,828	\$22,193	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$12,720	\$13,102	\$13,495	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,319	\$53,889	\$55,505	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$30,546	\$30,893	\$31,258	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$24,978	\$25,727	\$26,499	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>	\$52,319	\$53,889	\$55,505	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comparison publics: Hunter College, UT Austin, Virginia Commonwealth Univ.

Comparison privates: Art Center, CALArts, Columbia University, RISD, School of Art Inst. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago, Yale University

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** The program's in-state charges are more than other public institutions but less than its competitors at private institutions. The UCLA Department of Art's competitors, in terms of quality of programming, are the private institutions listed. Public institutions are included to recognize the fact that some candidates in recent years have chosen to attend less expensive programs, despite their lower rankings.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$59,700	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$59,700
Benefits Cost	\$22,645	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$22,645
Providing Student Services	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$10,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$49,984	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$49,984
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$25,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$97,020	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$97,020
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$9,171	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$9,171
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$275,520</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$275,520</b>

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	67%	\$46,806	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$55,035
Public Comparisons:	info	not available	of Median Salary:	12%
Private Comparisons:	info	not available		

**Note:**

The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.



**UCLA - Art MFA Program**

2015-16 Comparison

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	16%	19%	11%		
Chicano(a)/Latino(	8%	14%	16%		
American Indian	3%	0%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	57%	44%	49%		
International	16%	22%	24%		
Total	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	58%	25%	44%		
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	54%	50%	43%		
% Female	46%	50%	57%		
Total Enrollment	37	36	39		

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

The department's graduate student population has grown increasingly diverse over the past eight years; in 2016-17, 27% of students were underrepresented minorities and another 24% were international students. While it is clear that the percentage of underrepresented groups has increased— diversity in the program continues to be important to maintain, and scholarship support would assist our recruitment and retention efforts overall.

Long-term strategies for increasing the enrollment of underrepresented groups must include addressing a much larger systemic concern bigger even than the scope of our program -- the quality of arts education in the public high schools that feed undergraduate arts programs that, in turn, feed our graduate program. The applicant pool can be strengthened with a bolstering of fine arts educations at the primary and secondary levels.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect no substantial changes to the composition identified in the tables as a result of our PDST rates, as we are proposing no change to the existing rates at this time.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	4.1%	2.4%	2.3%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	8.2%	7.1%	6.8%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	4.1%	2.4%	9.1%
	International			
White	Domestic	81.6%	57.1%	36.4%
	International			2.3%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	2.0%	28.6%	36.4%
	International		2.4%	6.8%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		46.9%	45.2%	43.2%
Male		53.1%	54.8%	56.8%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	6.7%	7.1%	7.7%
	International			
Chicano(a)/ Latino(a)	Domestic	6.7%	7.1%	7.7%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic			
	International			
White	Domestic	73.3%	71.4%	69.2%
	International	13.3%	14.3%	15.4%
Other/Unknown	Domestic			
	International			
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		46.7%	50.0%	53.8%
Male		53.3%	50.0%	46.2%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* Currently, the majority of the return-to-aid requirement is being met by PDST funds.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our affordability goals for the program are to provide every MFA candidate tuition and fees in full. We would like to see every MFA candidate at UCLA receive a free graduate education. In recent years, we have made new efforts to articulate more clearly to students the details of their funding packages, including a quarterly breakdown of anticipated costs of attendance, tuition and fees. We also provided details of expected fee remissions, TA salaries, and award disbursements provided to each student upon admission and annually thereafter. We plan to continue to analyze and improve our strategies for student support as we move forward.

Last year, with the announcement of the major capital gift for the re-design and construction of the graduate studios, a major fundraising effort has been underway to match the gift as well as to raise funds for graduate student scholarships. Among other gifts for the building project, approximately \$75,000 in scholarships were also raised - through an exhibition/sale of faculty and alumni donated artwork - with the commitment of the Chancellor to match those donations by 50%. Through the heightened awareness of the program's stature and the deepening financial needs of its graduate art students, the department anticipates that these next two years will yield major increases in support for the program, as fundraising for MFA program support is a high priority for the School's development team.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The PDST renewal plan – of no increase of the PDST fees for the next two-year period -- was presented to the graduate MFA students and the Senate faculty of the UCLA Department of Art.

The plan to not increase the fee was first raised at the Fall 2017 All-Graduate Meeting. The Graduate Student Representatives subsequently met with the department chair to discuss the PDST in depth. While students understood the necessity for the fees, they were unanimously opposed to any fee increases, due to the concerns of future indebtedness and the unpredictability of their income in the years following graduation. Following their meeting, the graduate student representatives reviewed the debt data included in the proposal, and submitted a written response.

In their letter, the students first expressed a great sense of appreciation for the UCLA Department of Art, for the program's incredible learning environment, the generous program support available to them, and the opportunity they have to study with some of the greatest artists of our time. However, they expressed that the addition of the PDST to the costs of attendance has generated unmanageable financial debt for MFA graduates as they enter a profession in which only a very small proportion of graduates are able to develop self-sustaining and financially stable careers as working artists.

The Senate faculty also met to discuss the 2017 PDST proposal and provide feedback. Faculty were unanimous in favor of not increasing the PDST. They all shared the same concern— that program and scholarship support has not kept up with needs and tuition/fee increases. As a result, some top applicants attend other schools with better financial support packages than we are able to offer.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

*All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.*

**Campus and Program: UCLA - Dentistry (DDS)**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$26,127	\$26,913	\$27,720	\$28,554	\$29,412	\$30,294	3%	\$786	3%	\$807	3%	\$834	3%	\$858	3%	\$882
Nonresident:	\$23,280	\$24,444	\$25,668	\$26,952	\$28,302	\$29,718	5%	\$1,164	5%	\$1,224	5%	\$1,284	5%	\$1,350	5%	\$1,416

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

PDST increases are needed to help fund wage increases for PDST-funded faculty and staff, and to support equipment and facilities renewal. The current budget may not be able to fully support planned equipment upgrades and facilities renewal if PDST increases are not approved. Without PDST increases, there is a risk of facing real competitive disadvantage to other top tier dental schools in the recruitment and training of the best students who consider facilities as an important factor when selecting between dental schools.

**Brief Description of Program**

The DDS program grants the Doctor of Dental Surgery designation upon graduation. This program trains students over the course of four years to sit for the state licensing board exam and become dentists in order to improve the oral health of the people of California and other locations where our graduates may practice. We provide our students with educational programs and clinical experiences of the highest caliber and serve our teaching clinic patients by offering accessible, high-quality dental care.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The last multi-year plan covered AY 2011-12 to AY 2013-14 and contained the following goals for which PDST funds were used:

- **Sustain our operations and programs at desired levels to continue to attract the best possible students to our degree programs:** The UCLA School of Dentistry continued to attract the best possible students to our DDS program. The incoming first year students in the Class of 2016 had an average GPA of 3.69 and an average Dental Admissions Test (DAT) score of 22. Five years later, the incoming first year students in the Class of 2021 had an average GPA of 3.74 and an average DAT score of 22. This incoming student profile is generally known to be one of the strongest among dental schools.
- **Continue to attract and retain a highly regarded faculty:** One of the reasons top prospective dental students come to UCLA is because of the faculty quality and reputation shared by alumni and other members of the dental community not directly affiliated with UCLA. When open teaching positions were posted, there was consistently a high level of interest displayed nationally and internationally as given by a strong number of job applications for the positions.
- **Provide stability in the curriculum offerings by allowing continuity for the four year degree programs, in light of budget cuts and imposed expenses that decrease the value of state general funds.**
- **Allow for targeted investment in the highly technical infrastructure and maintain the teaching clinics to provide optimal student experience for the time spent here, in spite of a 40+ year-old facility designed for a non-digital era:** Within the last two years some of the major infrastructure expenditures directly related to the DDS program included renovating the academic and clinic lobby in preparation for upcoming accreditation (\$1.1M), replacing our DDS program patient management software system (Axium, \$750K), renovating CHS B0-148 to provide a conference room with video conferencing capability (\$722K), replacing the Fire/Life/Safety System (\$750K), and refurbishing Oral Diagnosis (part of teaching clinic – ceiling, lights, cubicles, \$250K).
- **Generate a sufficient level of support for all academic and student activities so that no element of excellence is without adequate support.**

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our plan includes two main goals for the DDS Program:

- **Fund wage increases for PDST-funded faculty and staff:** The PDST will be used to cover mandated cost of living increases for faculty and staff.
- **Support equipment and facilities renewal:** PDST funds, in combination with other available fund sources, will be used to support equipment and facilities renewal. In particular, the complete renovation of the pediatric dentistry teaching clinic will cost \$2.3M and the refurbishment (dental chairs and cabinets) of the endodontic teaching clinic will cost \$300K. The integrated digital treatment planning project, which is still in development, is expected to range in cost from \$500K to \$1M.

**Market Comparison:**

▣ Total Annual Charges

▣ Total Charges to Degree

**Comparator Figures Below are Projections**

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident: <i>This program</i>	\$40,715	\$41,850	\$43,026	\$44,235	\$45,474	\$46,750
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$59,570	\$61,358	\$63,198	\$65,094	\$67,047	\$69,059
<i>Privates</i>	\$109,596	\$112,884	\$116,270	\$119,759	\$123,351	\$127,052
Nonresident: <i>This program</i>	\$50,113	\$51,626	\$53,219	\$54,878	\$56,609	\$58,419
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$82,009	\$84,469	\$87,004	\$89,614	\$92,302	\$95,071
<i>Privates</i>	\$109,596	\$112,884	\$116,270	\$119,759	\$123,351	\$127,052

Comparison publics: UCSF, Iowa, Washington  
 Comparison privates: Penn, USC, University of Pacific

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:* For the course of this plan, both the program's resident and non-resident annual charges will remain well below the public and private averages.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		Incremental 2018-19 PDST revenue	Incremental 2019-20 PDST revenue	Incremental 2020-21 PDST revenue	Incremental 2021-22 PDST revenue	Incremental 2022-23 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$1,885,415	\$56,562	\$58,259	\$60,007	\$61,807	\$63,662	\$2,185,713
Benefits/UCRP Cost*	\$1,019,670	\$10,197	\$10,299	\$10,402	\$10,506	\$10,611	\$1,071,683
Providing Student Services	\$30,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$355,000	\$10,650	\$10,970	\$11,299	\$11,638	\$11,987	\$411,542
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$1,042,168	\$31,265	\$32,203	\$33,169	\$34,164	\$35,189	\$1,208,158
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$175,418	\$5,263	\$5,420	\$5,583	\$5,751	\$5,923	\$203,358
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$2,218,220	\$156,270	\$99,136	\$102,656	\$105,920	\$109,184	\$2,791,386
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$51,000	\$1,530	\$1,576	\$1,623	\$1,672	\$1,722	\$59,123
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$65,000	\$431,368	(\$27,469)	\$44,201	\$46,495	\$48,671	\$608,266
Other - Supplies and services	\$2,083,667	(\$234,294)	\$102,014	\$39,028	\$39,808	\$40,604	\$2,070,827
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$8,925,558	\$468,810	\$297,408	\$307,967	\$317,760	\$327,552	\$10,645,056

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income
This Program:	76%	\$181,148	Median Salary at Graduation: \$147,361
Public Comparisons:	90%	\$216,374	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary: 18%
Private Comparisons:	84%	\$336,309	

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

2015-16 Comparison

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	2%	3%	3%		
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	6%	7%	9%		
American Indian	1%	0%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	91%	90%	88%	100%	100%
International	0%	1%	0%		
Total	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	54%	53%	53%	51%	51%
% Female	46%	47%	47%	49%	49%
Total Enrollment	351	350	350	n/a	n/a

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

Underrepresented groups have increased from 9% of the student body in 2014-15 to 12% in 2016-17. We consistently fund an Outreach and Diversity Coordinator, Dr. Edmond Hewlett, who is tasked with making inroads to increase underrepresented student enrollment. Current efforts include summer training programs for high school students and college students to prepare them for dental school and the admissions process. Dr. Hewlett also attends conferences aimed at providing best practices to foster outreach and diversity.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

While gender parity is very similar among our comparators, UCLA will remain involved with outreach to females and minorities to ensure a higher volume of applications from those groups to increase the likelihood of identifying high quality students that will succeed through UCLA's dental program. Additionally, for those that are not accepted, summer training programs are offered that advise on which areas require improvement for better chances of admission during the next admissions cycle. As these initiatives mature, we hope to see enhanced diversity among our student body. Given that data is not readily available for demographics at our comparators, it is difficult to gauge how UCLA compares in terms of demographic diversity.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.2%	5.2%	5.2%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac IS	Domestic	39.7%	39.7%	39.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	50.6%	50.6%	50.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		34.1%	34.1%	34.1%
Male		65.9%	65.9%	65.9%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	6.1%	6.1%	6.1%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Asian/Pac IS	Domestic	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	61.6%	61.6%	61.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		22.5%	22.5%	22.5%
Male		77.5%	77.5%	77.5%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund** For the course of this multi-year proposal, incremental return-to-aid (RTA) is approximately 33% which complies with the policy mandated RTA. The program also supplements Sources: PDST-funded RTA by providing scholarships from various scholarship gift funds.

**Goals/Strategies:** UCLA School of Dentistry aims to price its program at the middle range of our comparator spectrum. Currently, we are one of the least expensive among our comparators of similar quality and do not foresee any major changes to that position during the coming five-year period.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The UCLA School of Dentistry convened a focus group of elected student leadership including the three sitting class presidents, the ASDA President, and the ASB President. Note, the first-year class president has not yet been elected; thus the class presidents included second, third, and fourth-year presidents. There were no major concerns expressed by the focus group. Attendees thought the 3% annual planned rate of increase for residents was reasonable and will keep UCLA's DDS program among the most affordable top-tier dental schools. Also, they understood the rationale to gradually increase the non-resident PDST at a slightly faster rate so that over several years the non-resident PDST will at least be equal to the resident PDST. As for the faculty consultation, Dean Krebsbach presented the multi-year plan at the 10/18/17 Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) meeting. FEC's consensus was supportive of the multi-year proposal and no major concerns were expressed.



**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

*All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.*

**Campus and Program:**                    **UCLA - Public Health (MPH/DrPH)**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,200			0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0				
Nonresident:	\$7,656	\$7,656	\$7,656	\$7,656			0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0				

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The UCLA Fielding School of Public Health (FSPH) proposes no increases for a three-year period for its Masters of Public Health (MPH) and Doctor of Public Health (DrPH) programs. We have chosen to maintain the current fee structure for the next three years in order to reduce the impact of increased campus fees and debt load of our professional students who, when they graduate, pursue community service careers that do not pay high incomes.

**Brief Description of Program**

The MPH (typically a 2 year program) and DrPH (with programs varying from 4 - 6 years) professional degrees prepare students to solve public health problems by applying professional disciplinary approaches and methods in professional environments such as local, state, national, or global public health agencies and health care organizations. These degree programs offer broad training in public health, while at the same time allowing students to specialize a portion of their studies in one of the School’s five departments: Biostatistics, Community Health Sciences, Epidemiology, Environmental Health Sciences, or Health Policy and Management.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

Our goals listed in our last multi-year plan submitted for the 2011-12 through 2013-14 years included: 1) hiring a career counselor, 2) renovating classrooms and adding instructional equipment including LCDs in all classrooms, 3) creating two student lounges, 4) installing wireless access within the school, 5) increasing outreach to diverse student populations by expanding recruitment activities, 6) providing funding for internship program support for each department, 7) partnering with the UCLA biomedical library to provide students access to quality IT and study facilities, 8) improving the FSPH website, 9) implementing an electronic admissions process, and 10) provide targeted financial aid.

All of these goals were achieved utilizing PDST and other resources. PDST fees have been used to create and expand student services that did not exist before PDST fees were charged, and have allowed the FSPH to align funding with program goals wherever fiscally feasible.

A career counselor was hired to expand services such as (but not limited to) career guidance; basic training in resume writing, interviewing skills, and techniques needed to succeed in a work environment; job lists; and alumni mentoring services.

PDST Revenue has also been allocated to departments each year to fund the coordination of each department’s internship program for professional students. The funds have enabled the departments to expand support for PDST students and improve their experiences.

PDST revenue has enabled the expansion of FSPH recruitment to a national level and created a more diverse student population where, prior to the PDST, recruitment was severely limited because of lack of available resources. Over 33% of our PDST revenue each year is used to provide financial aid to our neediest PDST students. This funding has been a small but valuable source of student support for our program. PDST resources have been allocated to the hiring of a Student Affairs Officer whose focus has been recruitment and identification of new financial aid resources for students in order to reduce or eliminate potential student debt to make it financially feasible for students to attend FSPH.

The PDST revenue has allowed the School to initially invest in the hiring of a programmer to create an application that improved and streamlined the admissions and student tracking process. It also allowed the School to utilize an Associated Schools and Programs of Public Health system to provide expanded electronic outreach to qualified students who otherwise might not have considered UCLA. Investments were made into improving the FSPH website so students could more easily navigate to find available resources such as research opportunities; Campus, School and Department notices/information; connections with faculty and community; communication with student leadership or groups; and also to highlight their achievements in key mission areas such as global internship experiences.

Other important investments have included the installation and management of an instructional system, Mediasite, to record classes and provide students with the ability to access lectures online. Mediasite has been installed in both lecture halls.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

The existing PDST allows the FSPH to pursue our goal of improving student support in the areas of:

- Need-based financial aid packages which enable us to recruit students who would otherwise be unable to afford to attend
- Management of the internship/practicum projects in each department (a requirement of the MPH degree)
- Student Counseling and Career Center
- Departmental student support
- Upgraded instructional tools
- Programmatic support

**Market Comparison:**

▣ Total Annual Charges      □ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$20,203	\$20,550	\$20,915	\$21,287		
	<i>Other Publics(Avg)</i>	\$19,976	\$20,276	\$20,580	\$20,888		
	<i>Privates</i>						
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$32,904	\$33,251	\$33,616	\$33,988		
	<i>Other Publics(Avg)</i>	\$32,386	\$32,872	\$33,365	\$33,865		
	<i>Privates</i>						

Comparison publics: U of Minnesota, UNC-Chapel Hill, U of Washington  
Comparison privates: None

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges: Total charges are comparable to those at other publics. Charges include campus fees plus PDST, excluding Medical insurance.*

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Services	\$468,614	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$468,614
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,000
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$729,258	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$729,258
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$887,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$887,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$2,209,872</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,209,872</b>

	Debt Pct with Debt	Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income
This Program:	49%	\$47,392	Median Salary at Graduation: \$66,595 Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary: 10%
Public Comparisons:	N/A	\$33,313	Median Salary at Graduation: \$69,409 Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary: 7%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A N/A	

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

2015-16 Comparison

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics (Avg)</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	6%	9%	7%	6%	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	16%	17%	19%	6%	N/A
American Indian	1%	1%	0%	1%	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic	69%	65%	61%	76%	N/A
International	9%	9%	13%	11%	N/A
Total	101%	101%	100%	100%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	34%	42%	45%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	21%	23%	21%	29%	N/A
% Female	79%	77%	79%	71%	N/A
Total Enrollment	324	327	302	N/A	N/A

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

FSPH is able to attract a diverse set of applicants in part because we have a national reputation for our work on health equity in partnership with underserved communities – many of our students come from those same communities. These students do not have the financial means or earning potential to cover high tuition. One of the primary reasons that we are able to maintain a high level of ethnic (and socioeconomic) diversity in our student body is that we keep our fees as low as possible.

The UCLA Fielding School of Public Health continues to outreach to students from low socioeconomic backgrounds including outreach to undergraduate campuses throughout California. In addition we continue to target HBCUs and Hispanic Serving Institutions which enroll a large number of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. We have implemented a new form of peer to peer student support via ‘Fielding Ambassadors’, who are current students that will focus on recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups including those who are first generation and providing support to applicants and students. 22% of entering students for fall 2016 reported being first generation students at FSPH.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

Because we feel that training individuals who represent the communities that we serve is critical to the health and wellbeing of all Californians, our goal is to further increase the percentage of our students who come from underrepresented minority groups and economically-disadvantaged backgrounds over the next five years . Keeping our professional fees at the current amount (and not continue to raise them) is a critical part of our strategy for accomplishing this goal.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	4.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	15.0%	15.0%	15.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
White	Domestic	77.0%	75.0%	72.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	1.0%	2.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		49.0%	48.0%	51.0%
Male		51.0%	52.0%	49.0%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	4.0%	6.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	17.0%	16.0%	17.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
White	Domestic	74.0%	72.0%	70.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	1.0%	3.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		46.0%	45.0%	47.0%
Male		54.0%	55.0%	53.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* 33% of our PDST is RTA.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our primary goal is to grow our financial aid resources in order provide support to as many students with financial need as possible. Due to limited resources, it is always a challenge to provide enough resources within our means to make it financially possible for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, many of whom are from underrepresented communities, to study in our School. We use various sources of financial aid to provide as many students as possible a package that is comprehensive and covers as much of the cost as possible.

Success can be measured by the reduction in overall loans students consume while in their graduate studies. Success can also be measured in the number of scholarships awarded based on financial need. The percent of FSPH students taking out Federal student loans has steadily decreased over time (from 42% in AY2010-11 to 35% in AY2013-14 to 30% in AY2016-17). During the same time period, the average amount taken out in loans by FSPH students who take loans has decreased when inflation is taken into account. (The average FSPH student loan amount was \$22,200 in AY2010-11, which is equivalent to over \$32,000 in 2017 dollars when inflation is taken into consideration. By contrast, the average FSPH student loan amount was \$25,600 in AY2016-17.) Likewise, we more than doubled the number of scholarships awarded to our students based on need (from 56 to 131) from AY2013-14 to AY2016-17.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

Faculty and students were consulted about the plan to not increase the PDST fees. All agreed that PDST fees continue to create a significant student debt burden and would prefer that no fee increases be requested for at least three years. In some cases, faculty and students requested that no PDST fees ever be increased. After consulting with both groups, it was decided that our submission would be revised and the plan for no fee increases would be expanded from two to three years.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

*All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.*

**Campus and Program: Riverside School of Medicine**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>2021-22</b>		<b>2022-23</b>	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$21,756	\$22,848	\$23,988	\$25,188			5%	\$1,092	5%	\$1,140	5%	\$1,200				
Nonresident:	\$21,756	\$22,848	\$23,988	\$25,188			5%	\$1,092	5%	\$1,140	5%	\$1,200				

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of the multi-year proposal is to modestly increase PDST each year to improve the students' educational overall experience by providing enhanced classroom equipment, increasing academic student appointments within the School of Medicine (SOM), and to increase the available resources for financial aid support.

The funding is also required in order to address some of the observations on the most recent LCME visit which are vital to the school. As a new medical school, recently accredited by LCME, it is important that we address the specific LCME recommendations mentioned above, which exclusively focused on expanding the student study space, so that we successfully continue to carry out the SOM mission, in support of our students. It is also important to note that one of our highest priorities will be to increase the number of teaching faculty, particularly as we increase enrollment, and in order to improve the student-faculty ratio. This goal is not only imperative to our mission but to help us ensure that the quality of our program improves, particularly since we are a new school. As such, we need to continue to optimize the overall quality and standards in order to keep working toward sustaining a comparative edge that would differentiate us from other similar programs.

**Brief Description of Program**

The SOM was conceived to address a shortfall of health care professionals in Inland Southern California. The mission of the UCR SOM is to improve the health of the people of California and, especially, to serve Inland Southern California by training a diverse workforce of physicians and by developing innovative research and healthcare delivery programs that will improve the health of the medically underserved in the region and become a model to be emulated throughout the state and nation.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

Based on the last approved multi-year plan that was for AY 2016 to 2019, the SOM goals included the following:

1. Investing in acquiring additional medical school equipment, space, financial aid support and staff support in order to continue to enhance the student's educational experience.
2. Producing primary care physicians that will practice medicine in the Inland Southern California. Our mission-based scholarships help facilitate this goal, along with our interest free loans and many other scholarship opportunities available to students.
3. Reducing student loan debt primarily through financial aid and generating funding for scholarships.

The PDST revenue collected during the last fiscal years was used as follows, in an effort to work toward achieving the goals mentioned above:

1. Strategically worked to replace some obsolete equipment in the SIM Lab, replaced all the tele carts, and incorporated additional SIM sessions to help the students participate in more sim training activities. We also addressed some of the recommendations noted in the LCME review, where we purchased two modular units to address the students' concerns for additional study space and to provide a secure safe place for socialization. This also enabled us to significantly increase the number and capacity of Peer to Peer tutors.
2. In terms of working toward scholarships, in addition to the mandated 1/3rd return-to-aid, we invested in additional financial aid support, including the annual Mission Scholarship and additional funding financial aid packages as part of a Kaiser grant that required a financial aid commitment. In terms of our affordability goals, we continue to find opportunities to seek other revenue sources in order to reduce the % of students that graduate with debt. For example, 85% of our first graduating class in June 2017 graduated with debt. This is despite our investments of the mandated financial aid contribution, and our annual Mission scholarship of \$1M. Nonetheless, we will continue to work toward improving this important goal.

Some of the initiatives that were executed to address the goals above were initiated in AY 2016-2017 and continued as a work in progress projects through AY 2017-2018. Specifically, while in AY 2016-2017 we expanded some of the student space and purchased modular units, these units will be fully installed and ready for move-in by December 2017. We purchased two units last year, but the overall installation project will be completed within the next month.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of the multi-year proposal is to improve the student's educational overall experience by providing enhanced classroom equipment, increasing academic student appointments within SOM, and to increase the available resources for financial aid support. The funding is also required in order to address some of the observations in the most recent LCME visit which are vital to the school. As a new medical school, recently accredited by LCME, it is important that we address the specific LCME recommendations mentioned above, which exclusively focused on expanding the student study space, so that we successfully continue to carry out the SOM mission, in support of our students. It is also important to note that one of our highest priorities will be to increase the number of teaching faculty, particularly as we increase enrollment and in order to improve the student-faculty ratio. This goal is not only imperative to our mission but to help us ensure that the quality of our program improves, particularly since we are a new school. As such, we need to continue to optimize the overall quality and standards in order to keep working toward sustaining a comparative edge that would differentiate us from other similar programs.

**Market Comparison:**       **Total Annual Charges**       **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$35,524	\$36,992	\$38,520	\$40,118		
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$45,582	\$47,861	\$50,254	\$52,767		
	<i>Privates</i>	\$59,280	\$62,244	\$65,356	\$68,624		
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$47,769	\$49,237	\$50,765	\$52,363		
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$61,791	\$64,881	\$68,125	\$71,531		
	<i>Privates</i>	\$59,280	\$62,244	\$65,356	\$68,624		

Projections for comparators' totals assume 5% annual increases for public and private institutions, respectively.

**Comparison publics:** Oregon Health & Science University, Pittsburg School of Medicine, Colorado Denver School of Medicine;  
**Comparison privates:** Loma Linda University, Keck School of Medicine.

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:**  
 Based on the reported statistics, this program's in-state total charges will be lower than both, the public and private averages.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$836,038	\$41,802	\$20,420	\$74,816	\$0	\$0	\$973,076
Benefits Cost	\$290,035	\$14,502	\$9,136	\$50,781	\$0	\$0	\$364,454
Providing Student Services	\$925,248	\$46,262	\$48,576	\$51,004	\$0	\$0	\$1,071,090
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$300,000
Instructional Support Staff	\$361,338	\$18,067	\$18,970	\$19,919	\$0	\$0	\$418,294
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$772,562	\$38,628	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$811,190
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$1,836,850	\$137,472	\$146,608	\$189,367	\$0	\$0	\$2,310,297
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$25,321	\$184,123	\$556	\$14,144	\$0	\$0	\$224,144
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$5,047,392</b>	<b>\$480,856</b>	<b>\$444,266</b>	<b>\$500,031</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,472,545</b>

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	85%	\$149,173	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$206,920
Public Comparisons:	77%	\$181,179	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	10%
Private Comparisons:	72%	\$206,204		

**Note:**  
 Note - UCR SOM just graduated its first class in 2017. Hence, utilized FY17 data for the above statistics. The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

## 2015-16 Comparison

**Enrollment**

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	3%	5%	5%	4%	4%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	10%	13%	12%	4%	4%
American Indian	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Asian/East Indian	15%	18%	20%	18%	18%
White	13%	12%	12%	60%	60%
Other/Unkown	59%	52%	51%	13%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	45%	35%	51%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	48%	48%	47%	N/A	N/A
% Female	52%	52%	53%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	100	150	205	695	765

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy****1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

To identify “mission fit” applicants for admission to our medical school, the Admissions Committee uses a holistic review, with academic metrics as a threshold for identifying qualified applicants. The Committee strongly considers applicants who have documented significant experience working in medically underserved communities, a strong commitment of community service, and a demonstrated desire to practice in Inland Southern California. Furthermore, the medical school mission is supported through a number of robust pipeline programs (e.g., FastStart, Future Physician Leaders, Health Professions Advising Center, Health Coach Program, Leaders of Tomorrow, Medical Scholars Program, Mini Medical School, and Premedical Postbaccalaureate Program) which focus on regional students coming from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, learned English as a second language, went to underperforming high schools, and grew up in medically underserved communities. Combined with our pre-medical post-baccalaureate program, applicants coming from these pipeline programs are evaluated carefully for their potential as UCR SOM medical students and add to the diversity of our matriculating medical students.

Based on our diversity data, the diversity mix has changed over time and more enrollment for the underrepresented population has increased.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

At the end of the plan, we expect that the underrepresented student population will remain relatively steady. Furthermore, we anticipate that the female population will either increase slightly, based on the reported trend, or remain steady.



**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	9.6%	10.1%	8.4%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	4.1%	7.9%	5.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	16.4%	18.0%	15.9%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	58.9%	50.6%	52.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	11.0%	12.4%	16.8%
	International	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		38.4%	41.6%	42.1%
Male		61.6%	58.4%	57.9%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	3.3%	5.6%	5.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	3.3%	5.6%	5.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	10.0%	13.9%	14.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	80.0%	69.4%	65.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	3.3%	5.6%	8.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		40.0%	38.9%	37.1%
Male		60.0%	61.1%	62.9%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund** For the course of this multi-year proposal, one-third of return-to-aid (RTA) will be returned to students. The program also supplements RTA by providing Diversity Sources: Scholarships via funding from the Graduate Division (e.g., GOP Fellowships).

**Goals/Strategies:** Our primary financial goal is the reduction of student loan debt. We allocate one million dollars annually from our budget to fund scholarship awards. Our campus community partners believe in our Mission and have donated generously to create individual Mission scholarships for our medical students. We have received over 1.5 million dollars in mission based scholarship funding from private donors. We also return 1/3rd of PDST funding to our students through the Professional Fee off Set grant. The maximum grant award is \$20,000, which is roughly 53.7% of tuition and fees. We have other scholarship opportunities for our students that help facilitate the reduction of the overall loan debt.

UCR SOM just graduated our Inaugural Class in June 2017. Our mean debt level for the our first graduating class was \$149,173, which is below the national average.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

In preparation for this proposal, the SOM took the following steps to consult with the entire SOM student population: 1) Developed a survey that was sent to all students, 2) scheduled meetings with the class representatives to ensure they fully understood the proposal and survey questions so that they too would help answer any specific questions students would have, and 3) consulted with the GSA President for the Campus.

The majority of the students understood the proposal. Students supported the rationale provided for the proposal and understood the importance of continuing to improve the medical teaching infrastructure while increasing faculty and staff to support their educational journey. They also understood and support that one third of the revenue is to provide financial aid opportunities; however, they were less supportive of the proposed increase. Nonetheless, we were very transparent, and illustrated the materiality of the increase and the exact increment that would be directed to Financial Aid for SOM students only. Student provided ideas on how the additional revenue should be utilized. Many of the items mentioned by the students were already included as part of the SOM educational budget for FY18.

In addition, we compiled a similar consultation process for the faculty, where we disseminated a survey to all of the SOM faculty regarding this proposal. In general, the faculty understood and was supportive of this proposal.

The SOM leadership reviewed the student feedback and will assess the PDST revenues and expenses to ensure that the appropriate budgets are in place to address as many of the concerns noted by the students as possible, some of which are already part of the SOM budget for FY18, while other projects are planned for the upcoming years.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program:** UC Riverside - Public Policy

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	n/a	n/a	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Nonresident:	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	n/a	n/a	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our proposal keeps the PDST fee for the program at the current level of \$5,952 annually through the third and final year (2020-21) of this multi-year plan. The purpose of this multi-year plan is to support direct benefits to students in the form of one-on-one career and professional advising for students, skills-development workshops, and expanded networking opportunities with various public, private, and non-profit agencies/organizations. Students will continue to benefit from high quality personalized career advice and professional development guidance. Additionally, students will continue to receive support with internship placements, fellowships, and financial aid.

**Brief Description of Program**

The objective of the UCR School of Public Policy’s (SPP) two year Master of Public Policy (MPP) Program, for which PDST is charged, is to prepare socially-motivated and idealistic students for careers in government, politics, and public affairs within public, non-profit, or private sectors. This goal is accomplished by providing students with rigorous analytical tools to use evidence and normative values in formulating, implementing, and evaluating public policies. Thinking globally and acting locally, students learn to apply what they learn at UCR to solve the problems that have been plaguing many regions for decades. MPP students can choose to specialize in a broad variety of fields. Specialization can take the form of a concentration within coursework, in the capstone project, in one’s internship, or in any combination of these. Concentrations are available in the following policy areas: Environmental and Resource, Health, and Education, Urban, Inequality and Poverty, and Race and Immigration.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

We had one primary goal for the use of PDST funds in our last multi-year plan that covered AY 2015-16 through AY 2017-18 and established the PDST for the first time:

- **Implement academic and administrative services** essential to remain competitive in recruiting high achieving students and retaining the best faculty and students.

Consistent with this goal, the SPP hired a Career Counselor and Internship Coordinator that provides one-on-one career and professional advising for students, hosts skills-development workshops, and assists students with questions specific to public policy career tracks, internships, and fellowships. These appointments provide students with personalized career advice and professional development guidance no matter where they are in their careers. The Career Counselor and Internship Coordinator also assists students with internship placements and networking with various public, private, and non-profit agencies/organizations. In these early years of the program, the majority of PDST revenue has been used to support competitive financial aid packages for students to ensure that our program is able to compete with other more established programs and in recognition of the population of students applying to our program being from economically-disadvantaged communities.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

We have three primary goals for this multi-year plan.

Our first goal to **continue to support the enhancement of our career advising services** by providing high quality personalized advising to students and more opportunities for professional skills development. In that respect, in addition to our existing Career Counselor and Internship Coordinator, the SPP has recently hired a part-time retired professional to serve as a Coach in Residence with over 30 years of experience working with the local public agencies in the region. This individual will be responsible for assisting our Career Counselor and Internship Coordinator with career and professional development events, including career exploration panels, career fairs, and identifying prominent speakers for seminar talks by public policy professionals through the SPP Seminar and Lecture Series each quarter. This individual will also be partnering with the SPP faculty to assist with engaging policy practitioners as guest lecturers to assist with supplementing the existing curriculum for students. The second goal is to **continue to provide competitive financial aid packages for students** in the form of grant and academic merit- based financial aid, competitive fellowships, and summer stipends for need-based students traveling in the summer for their internship. The third goal is to **support the implementation of academically enriching opportunities** such as an experiential cohort trip to Sacramento to experience first-hand how policies are made and the impact of those policies on various communities. This trip will also provide opportunities to network with various policy professionals and connect students with future possible employers.

**Market Comparison:**

▣ **Total Annual Charges**

▣ **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$19,659	\$20,035	\$20,422	\$20,821	n/a	n/a
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$20,805	\$21,430	\$22,073	\$22,735	n/a	n/a
	<i>Privates</i>	\$41,696	\$42,947	\$44,236	\$45,565	n/a	n/a
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$31,904	\$32,280	\$32,667	\$33,066	n/a	n/a
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$33,685	\$34,876	\$35,922	\$36,999	n/a	n/a
	<i>Privates</i>	\$41,696	\$42,947	\$44,236	\$45,565	n/a	n/a

Comparison publics: University of Washington and University of Minnesota  
 Comparison privates: Pepperdine University and University of Southern California

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:*

Our tuition and fee costs (to include the professional degree supplemental tuition) are comparable to the public institutions and significantly under for the private institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Benefits Cost	\$35,537	\$1,108	\$1,143	\$1,180	n/a	n/a	\$38,968
Providing Student Services	\$76,902	\$2,559	\$2,648	\$2,741	n/a	n/a	\$84,850
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$96,014	\$27,373	\$19,642	\$19,641	n/a	n/a	\$162,670
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a	n/a	\$0
Other	\$11,770	\$16,576	\$36,086	\$35,958	n/a	n/a	\$100,390
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$220,223</b>	<b>\$47,616</b>	<b>\$59,519</b>	<b>\$59,520</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>\$386,878</b>

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
			<b>Median Salary at Graduation:</b>	<b>Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:</b>
This Program:	n/a	n/a		
Public Comparisons:	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Private Comparisons:	n/a	n/a		

**Note:**

The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

\* Public Policy Data specific to our program was not available.

## 2015-16 Comparison

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American		7%	12%		
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		36%	35%		
American Indian		4%	2%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic		53%	51%		
International					
Total	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients		67%	79%		
<i>Gender:</i> % Male		42%	42%		
% Female		57%	58%		
Total Enrollment	0	27	44		

\* Enrollment data for comparison universities specific to the program was not available on-line.

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

The SPP has developed a comprehensive marketing and recruitment strategy to assist with recruiting students into the MPP program. The strategy includes attendance of the various diversity recruitment forums to recruit high-achieving, low-income/URM undergraduate students. Additionally, UCR's undergraduate public policy program – in which one-half to two-thirds of students belong to disadvantaged ethnic and racial groups – will continue to provide a pipeline of students to the MPP.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

The SPP has recently enrolled our third cohort of students into the MPP program and we feel that the ethnic breakdown of our students is reflective of the student population at UCR and in the Inland Empire region. The MPP program continues to draw applicants from the Inland Empire, which is one of the most diverse regions of the state. Riverside and San Bernardino counties (with a total population of approximately 4.4 million persons) are exceptionally diverse, multicultural environments. UCR has shown itself to be a campus that welcomes and celebrates diversity. Its student body is one of the most diverse in the nation. UCR's undergraduate public policy program will continue to provide a pipeline of diverse students to the MPP program. Given these statistics, we expect our gender and ethnic composition to remain similar to what is currently represented.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	10.0%	13.3%	10.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	9.0%	86.7%	79.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		20.0%	26.7%	21.0%
Male		80.0%	73.3%	79.0%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	10.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	10.0%	13.3%	10.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	90.0%	86.7%	79.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		20.0%	26.7%	21.0%
Male		80.0%	73.3%	79.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.  
 \*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:** The program is redirecting above the 33% mandated in return to aid to students in the form of scholarships and financial assistance. We are continuing to identify additional funding sources for employment-based financial support for students as Graduate Student Researchers, Readers, and Teaching Assistants. We are additionally working with our SPP Research Centers to provide service-learning opportunities and fellowships for students in the program. We will also continue to fund summer stipends for need based students doing their internships in the middle of their 1st and 2nd year who are currently not employed and for whom an unpaid internship would be a financial hardship.

**Goals/Strategies:** The program's goals are to recruit high achieving students who are socially-motivated and idealistic students from all financial backgrounds. Financial aid will be awarded based on academic achievement in an effort to remain competitive with offers from others institutions for recruitment of high achieving students. Additionally, the program will continue to provide need-based financial aid to ensure that students from all financial backgrounds can attend the program. Additionally, the School of Public Policy will continue to fund need-based internship stipends for students. The School of Public Policy is actively cultivating donors to provide scholarship opportunities for students to ensure that we keep the cost of attendance as manageable as possible since a majority of our students come from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The program conducted student focus group discussions with current students, prospective students, and the SPP Graduate Student Association as well as the UCR Graduate Student Association. The SPP faculty were also consulted as part of a faculty meeting. The overall feedback was very positive. Students and faculty felt that the rate of the PDST was fair in comparison to rates charged by other similar programs. Additionally, the students were pleased to hear that the SPP was not proposing a fee increase to the PDST for the next three years and instead would be working very diligently to secure external sources of funding. The students and faculty also generally agreed that the current services funded by the PDST were important for the program to continue. The students also provided feedback that more effort should be made to publish the use of the PDST revenue so that students are aware and take advantage of the services. In response to this feedback, the SPP will be adding more information on the website that covers the purpose and use of the PDST. Currently, students receive PDST information during prospective student information sessions and at their MPP orientation. Written feedback was provided by students and faculty of the program.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UC San Diego - Pharmacy (PharmD) Program**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$21,456	\$23,388	\$25,494	\$27,789	\$30,291	\$33,018	9%	\$1,932	9%	\$2,106	9%	\$2,295	9%	\$2,502	9%	\$2,727
Nonresident:	\$21,456	\$23,388	\$25,494	\$27,789	\$30,291	\$33,018	9%	\$1,932	9%	\$2,106	9%	\$2,295	9%	\$2,502	9%	\$2,727

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The goal of the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) is to continue to provide a premier professional education program that meets the new national accreditation standards set by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE), and to prepare pharmacy students to be leaders in the profession of pharmacy. To meet evolving state and national standards, the program requires substantial fee increases for facilities upgrades that will provide the infrastructure for technological media and educational upgrades and simulations. Doing so will maintain and improve program quality and ensure that our academic, experiential, and career-oriented programs are financially sustainable. The PDST fee increases outlined in this proposal will support the goals of the program while still maintaining overall annual student costs that are below the average of the program's primary comparator institutions in California.

**Brief Description of Program**

The UC San Diego SSPPS educates and trains future pharmacists and scientific investigators to become leaders in diverse fields that impact human health (more than 60% of our students pursue post-graduate training--compared to the national average of 20%--which better positions our students for leadership roles). We are an accredited graduate professional school that awards a PharmD degree in four years. This includes innovative clinical pharmacy services, optimizing medication therapy management for patients, and developing new, efficacious and safe medications that address existing and emerging needs in global health. Founded in 2000, our program (ranked 13th in the QS World University Ranking) is relatively less mature compared to the other ranked CA pharmacy schools--UCSF (5th) and USC (49th)--both of which were founded over one hundred years ago.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

The last multi-year plan was for AY 2016-17 through AY 2018-19 and the program was focused, as it is now, on providing a premier professional education to prepare a highly talented and diverse group of pharmacy students to be leaders. We also sought to ensure that no qualified candidate was denied the opportunity to attend pharmacy school on the basis of financial need. To those ends, PDST funds were used for the following purposes:

- **Maintain and Enhance Program Quality:** We received ongoing monitoring by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE) and by the leadership within the school. The curriculum quality was improved by using PDST funds for pharmacy practice supplies and equipment, technological upgrades to the audio/video lecture capturing system, creation of a multi-functional student web portal, and faculty recruitment with much needed expertise to fill in curriculum gaps. PDST funds were also used to support student services (e.g., wellness programs, student organizational activities, and student participation in patient counseling competitions at professional pharmacy meetings). We met all accreditation requirements and our students achieved high pass rates (99% 5 year average pass rate for first-time takers) on the North American Pharmacist Licensure Examination (NAPLEX). The program continues to rank well among Pharmacy programs: as of 2016, 25th out of 138 accredited schools of pharmacy by US News and World Report, and 13th out of 200 schools ranked by the QS World University Ranking. Moreover, based on feedback from course evaluations and town hall meetings, our students have provided positive feedback on their educational experience and curriculum/classroom improvements.
- **Improve Diversity:** PDST funds were used for faculty and staff salary support on outreach activities. We partnered with other campus units to target events that focused on underserved students (e.g., Medical Education for Diverse Students) and we hosted or participated in events that promoted diversity. We enrolled a high proportion of students who were Pell grant recipients as undergrads over the last three years (44% in 2014-15 to 64% in 2016-17). While URM enrollment is still low, we doubled the number of URMs over the last three years and strive to do better.
- **Maintain and Enhance Affordability:** Our program offered both merit and need-based scholarships for our students each year. Per the PDST policy, we returned 33% of new PDST revenue to the students as financial aid for the period of our last multi-year plan; nearly \$2.6M in 2016-17 (from a variety of sources) was used to provide scholarships to our students in order to reduce their student loans. These funds provided 152 students in 2016-17 with financial aid grants, ranging from \$10K to an average of \$29K for the neediest students. We also worked closely with UC San Diego Development to identify funding opportunities that would create scholarships for our students; 96 students in 2016-17 were awarded merit-based scholarships acquired through fundraising compared to 61 students in 2014-15.
- **Enhance External Business Ventures:** We worked to diversify/expand our external funding sources through a variety of business ventures, which help offset the expenses of delivering the educational program and funding portions of clinical faculty salaries. Not funded from PDST, ventures like our Partners in Medical Therapy (PMT) Program and the Medication Therapy Management (MTM) services it offers to businesses have provided expanded clinical practice, education, and research opportunities for our students and clinical faculty--students working with PMT earned experiential credits required for graduation. Revenue from this new program exceeded \$850K.



## ***Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal***

---

Ensuring the school's financial health and long-term sustainability is essential to our ability to provide a premier professional education program. Accordingly, the school is taking a multi-year, multi-pronged approach to improve its financial position by reducing costs and exploring various ways to expand and diversify revenues. On the cost side, we are participating in centralized shared services, expanding use of internal clinical training sites within our Health System, and restructuring staffing levels among other efficiencies to reduce cost. On the revenue side, we are expanding Masters program offerings, increasing PharmD enrollments, increasing fundraising efforts, and marketing our Medication Therapy Management services to a variety of local and national businesses. One component of this revenue growth plan is increasing the PDST fee to achieve the following goals:

- **Enhance Program Quality** to meet national accreditation standards and continue to prepare pharmacy students to be leaders in the pharmacy profession. We must incur costs (beyond inflation) to accommodate new Accreditation Standards implemented in 2016 and to properly prepare our students to pass two examinations required for pharmacy licensure. Both examinations restructured their content, exam format, and difficulty level in the past year, requiring the addition of new curricula to ensure our students meet academic competencies to pass. We are also preparing for our next accreditation site visit in 2020. To these ends, new PDST funds will be used to phase in a series of facilities and classroom upgrades (e.g., high performance data network services), improvements to our pharmacy practice simulation laboratory, and provision of more ergonomic workstations. These upgrades will enable the program to roll out innovative educational materials and services – examination simulation services, laboratory materials, and pharmacy products; a backup data storage system; and access to the latest technologies and web-based services—directly benefitting students by enhancing their experience and ensuring we meet the new 2016 accreditation requirements.
- **Increase Diversity and Support Student Services.** We plan to invest PDST and other resources for more targeted outreach and recruitment efforts focusing on URMs. PDST funds also will be used to expand and improve student services in multiple areas (wellness programs, professional travel, professional competitions, etc.).
- **Maintain and Improve Affordability.** We will continue to direct at least 1/3 of new PDST revenue in student financial aid support; specifically, the program will provide scholarships to reduce the overall impact to a net 5% PDST increase for continuing students. The PDST fee increases outlined in this proposal will support the goals of the program while still maintaining overall annual student costs that are below the average of the program's primary comparator institutions in California.

**Market Comparison:**

☑ **Total Annual Charges**      ☐ **Total Charges to Degree**

		<b>Comparator Figures Below are Projections</b>					
		<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$34,902	\$37,181	\$39,652	\$42,318	\$45,213	\$48,329
	<i>CA Private Average</i>	\$58,685	\$60,445	\$62,259	\$64,126	\$66,050	\$68,032
Nonresident:	<i>This program *</i>	\$47,147	\$49,426	\$51,897	\$54,563	\$57,458	\$60,574
	<i>CA Private Average</i>	\$58,685	\$60,445	\$62,259	\$64,126	\$66,050	\$68,032

\*Note: Our students acquire California residency after the first year of pharmacy school.

Comparison publics: See below\*

Comparison privates: Chapman University, Southern California (USC), Western University

**\*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** The majority of SSPPS PharmD students come from CA and very few out of state, non internationally. All non-UC schools in CA are private. Thus SSPPS Pharm D programs true competitors are California based Private Pharmacy schools. A review of the last three years of admissions data indicate that 2/3 of the students that decline our admission offers attend UC San Francisco and the remaining 1/3 attend other CA based private Pharmacy schools. Further, Southern California (USC) and Western (both southern California based schools) account for a large proportion of the 1/3 of students that decline our offers. Over the course of this PDST proposal the UC San Diego resident total charges will remain between 29% and 38% lower than the private institution averages.

**Expenditure Plans**

	<b>Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue</b>	<b>Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue</b>					<b>Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year</b>
		<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$1,988,654	\$59,660	\$61,449	\$63,293	\$65,192	\$67,147	\$2,305,395
Benefits	\$755,688	\$43,154	\$23,965	\$46,415	\$48,459	\$50,584	\$968,266
Providing Student Services/Programs	\$892,013	\$26,760	\$27,563	\$28,390	\$29,242	\$30,119	\$1,034,088
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Materials/Supplies	\$440,285	\$38,521	\$28,370	\$68,269	\$109,714	\$161,907	\$847,066
Instructional Equipment/Educational Upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$50,000	\$600,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$1,287,360	\$314,905	\$314,598	\$304,873	\$84,396	\$251,075	\$2,557,207
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Classroom Educational Upgrades	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$250,000	\$150,000	\$900,000
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$5,364,000</b>	<b>\$483,000</b>	<b>\$755,946</b>	<b>\$1,011,240</b>	<b>\$837,003</b>	<b>\$760,833</b>	<b>\$9,212,022</b>

**Category**

Faculty Salary & Benefits

Student Services/Programs

Instructional Materials/Supplies

Instructional Equipment/Educational Upgrades

Providing Student Financial Aid

Classroom Educational Upgrades

**Additional**

Faculty salaries/benefits trending off of base year (17/18) percent of total

Student outreach, student wellness programs, student travel, student organization support.

Laboratory supplies, OSCE materials, ExamSoft, OASIS, PILS, Turning Technology, pharmacy products and supplies.

Audio-visual and other media, computers, and lecture-captioning.

Incremental PDST RTA at 33% over 5 years. Front-loaded in early years owing to scholarships for students enrolled as of 17/18.

Pharmacy simulation laboratory, OSCE laboratory, auditorium and classroom improvements.

**Affordability**

	<b>Pct with Debt</b>	<b>Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt</b>	<b>Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income</b>	
This Program:	85%	\$132,455	Avg Salary <sup>1</sup> :	\$127,880
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		
Private Comparisons <sup>2</sup> :	N/A	\$189,874	Debt Pmt as % of Avg Salary:	15%

<sup>1</sup> Based on the following report: "SOFI'S 2017 PHARMACY SCHOOL RANKINGS - WHAT YOU'LL LIKE AND WHAT YOU'LL LOVE," Mar. 7, 2017

<sup>2</sup> Private Comparison based on averages of USC and Western from the following report: "SOFI'S 2017 PHARMACY SCHOOL RANKINGS - WHAT YOU'LL LIKE AND WHAT YOU'LL LOVE," Mar. 7, 2017b

**Note:**

The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Average Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross average salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2016-17 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	0.8%	1.2%	2.0%	N/A	2.4%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	1.2%	2.8%	3.2%		6.8%
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>		<b>9.1%</b>
Other Domestic	98.0%	96.0%	94.8%		90.3%
International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	44.3%	54.1%	64.3%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	30.8%	33.2%	32.9%	N/A	34.5%
% Female	69.2%	66.8%	67.1%	N/A	65.5%
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>249</b>		

UC San Diego Ethnicity and Gender data taken from AACPS, Table 45, Fall 2014, 2015, 2016 Enrollments in Doctor of Pharmacy as the First Professional Degree (Pharm.D.1) Programs by School, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. Private comparison based on the weighted average using Chapman and Western (2 of the 3 comparator schools for UC San Diego) - Data per AACPS, Table 45, Fall 2016 Enrollments in Doctor of Pharmacy as the First Professional Degree (Pharm.D.1) Programs by School, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity.

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

***1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?***

SSPPS will continue to partner with organizations including the UC San Diego Medical Education for Diverse Students, the San Diego Society of Health-System Pharmacists, and the California Pharmacist Association to host educational and outreach events targeting underrepresented minorities. The program will also work more closely with the UC San Diego VC for Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and campus student organizations to consult on partnerships and strategy. Additionally, SSPPS will attempt to broaden its applicant pool (traditionally majority UC) by expanding outreach efforts at California State University (CSU) schools.

***2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?***

Currently ~2/3 of the students are female and ~1/3 are male and we expect the gender composition to be similar in the final year of this plan. Additionally, we will strive to improve the level of underrepresented students in the program and have a goal of doubling the number by the end of the proposed multi-year plan. SSPPS has included this goal in its new Five-Year Strategic Plan.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	7.0%	8.0%	8.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	24.0%	22.0%	21.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	58.0%	60.0%	60.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other(East Indian)	Domestic	9.0%	8.0%	9.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		41.0%	41.0%	40.0%
Male		59.0%	59.0%	60.0%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic			
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	6.0%	9.0%	9.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	17.0%	14.0%	13.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	77.0%	77.0%	78.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other (East Indian)	Domestic			
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		34.0%	32.0%	30.0%
Male		66.0%	68.0%	70.0%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* The school will direct at least 1/3 of the additional PDST revenue to student financial aid support. The program also supplements RTA by providing scholarships from non-PDST sources to students who have demonstrated leadership in public service, outreach to underserved communities, and interest in global health initiatives.

*Goals/Strategies:* Our primary goal for financial aid is to award a combination of need- and merit-based grants and scholarships to enable the program to enroll a highly talented and socioeconomically diverse group of students. We seek to ensure that no qualified candidate is denied the opportunity to attend pharmacy school on the basis of financial need. In order to measure our success in meeting this goal, we monitor the average indebtedness over time. In addition, we will provide supplemental financial aid to continuing students to reduce their net PDST increase to 5% annually.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

**Student Consultation:** We have consulted with students multiple times. First we met with student leaders, ASP President and President Elect on September 27, 2017 on the plan as it would impact the current student body; the plan contained PDST increases of 5%. They then shared the proposed PDST information with the student body via email. We met with the students "at large" on October 18, 2017 and provided substantive information on the proposed multi-year plan as it would impact the current student body. A final meeting with student leadership was held on December 8th on the full proposal containing a higher PDST increase of 9%; student leadership discussed ways to engage students early and throughout the whole process, including on the many issues of costs, comparative institutions, etc. **Faculty Consultation:** We convened focus groups comprised of the Dean's leadership team to review and discuss the multi-year plan at regularly scheduled meetings that took place on August 7, 2017 and September 6, 2017. The Dean consulted with faculty and shared the information via email with the faculty at large.

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

### Campus and Program: UC San Francisco PharmD

<b>Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:</b>					<b>Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year</b>						<b>Quarterly Rates</b>			
4 Year Program (12 quarters)					<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>Current Year</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>
Resident:	\$21,456	\$22,101	\$22,764	\$23,448	3%	\$645	3%	\$663	3%	\$684	\$7,152	\$7,367	\$7,588	\$7,816
Nonresident:	\$21,456	\$22,101	\$22,764	\$23,448	3%	\$645	3%	\$663	3%	\$684	\$7,152	\$7,367	\$7,588	\$7,816

  

<b>Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:</b>					<b>Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year</b>						<b>Quarterly Rates</b>			
3 Year Program (12 quarters)					<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>Current Year</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>
Resident:	\$0	\$29,468	\$30,352	\$31,264	N/A	N/A	3%	\$884	3%	\$912	\$0	\$7,367	\$7,588	\$7,816
Nonresident:	\$0	\$29,468	\$30,352	\$31,264	N/A	N/A	3%	\$884	3%	\$912	\$0	\$7,367	\$7,588	\$7,816

### Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal

UCSF is in the process of shifting the Pharmacy (PharmD) program from four years to three years in length. Instead of summers off, students will attend the program year-round. This proposal is a three-year plan specific to the transitional period in which there will be overlapping curriculums between the existing four-year program and the new three-year program, both of which require completion of twelve quarters. The three-year model is designed to provide students with new curriculum, combining science and therapeutics in an integrated block curriculum model that will allow students earlier entry into advanced training and opportunities for early involvement in real-world pharmacy practice.

The change from a four-year program to a three-year program has two major benefits for our students. One benefit is that a three-year program allows our graduates to pursue advanced training a year earlier or begin working as pharmacists and earning income and advancing their careers. The second benefit is that housing costs for students living in San Francisco, one of the most expensive rental markets in the United States, will be reduced by a full year.

The 3% professional fee increases are needed to cover inflationary increases and costs associated with conducting the PharmD curriculum: faculty salary adjustments (including merits), staff salary merits, and other non-payroll cost increases. The approval of both multi-year plans will allow the program to develop predictable revenue and financial aid forecasts.

### Brief Description of Program

The UCSF PharmD degree promotes student professional development through clinical experiences with diverse patient populations and activities outside the classroom, and it is highly integrated. The curriculum gives students the knowledge base and skills they need for a dynamic career in pharmacy as a caring, patient-centered expert in the safe and effective use of medicines, an effective and vocal member of health care teams, and a leader and change maker who spots and solves problems.

The PharmD program is unique in the way innovative science is threaded through the curriculum. UCSF School of Pharmacy has been number one in NIH grants received for the last 37 years. The scientists responsible for that record of accomplishment teach in our PharmD program. They teach a scientific method of thinking and an awareness of the cutting edge of biomedical science that is not encountered at any of our comparison institutions.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

---

The last multi-year plan was from AY 2016-17 to AY 2018-19 and included the following goals:

**1. Maintain the quality of our program:** We used the PDST to implement a new evaluation system, eValue, and fund customization of the School of Medicine curriculum management system, Ilios. These systems allow us to accurately measure outcomes for our students. We have also partnered with the School of Dentistry and the School of Nursing to develop a Student Educational Data System that will support dashboards on student progression. We leveraged the work that the School of Medicine had done developing their MedSIS program.

We ranked number three in the 2016 U.S. News and World Report. Our NAPLEX pass rate in 2017 was 99.1%. Upon graduation, 73% percent of our students go on to a fellowship, residency, or another advanced degree. In the national survey done by the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (AACP), only 41.9% of PharmD graduates went on to any type of postgraduate education.

**2. Meet national accreditation standards for schools of pharmacy:** We used funds generated by PDST to pay for expenses related to providing the 300 hours of Introductory Pharmacy Practice Experiences required by our accreditor. We have passed two interim reviews since our last comprehensive accreditation.

**3. Continue to attract and retain qualified faculty:** Cost of living increases to faculty and staff are vital for retention in a high priced housing market like San Francisco. We hired 10 additional staff to provide support to faculty and hired new faculty, including a new Director of Experiential Training and a new faculty member to run the Applied Patient Skills course.

**4. Enhance the diversity of our student body:** We have made greater outreach to Historically Black Colleges and have attracted students from these schools to our postbac program. A number of them have admitted to our program. We have gone from 8% URM students in the 2005-2010 years to 13-14% in the last few years.

**5. Improve the affordability of the PharmD program:** 33% of new PDST revenue was returned to students in the form of student aid. We focused on fundraising to be able to offer more scholarships. We also participated in the Cost of Living supplement program, providing \$144,000 per year for the last two years to give students with demonstrated need a housing supplement to allow them to afford the high rents in San Francisco.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

---

The School of Pharmacy is requesting this 3% annual increase to enhance and maintain the quality of our programs. Doing so will be particularly challenging as we move from a four year program to a three year program. We need to cover faculty salaries for those faculty who are tasked with developing and enhancing the new curriculum over time.

Additionally, PDST funds are necessary to supplement State support of our programs on an ongoing basis, specifically to provide staff support in a number of areas, including instructional technology. The school is combining PDST funds with donor funds to create a skills lab that will open in 2018. A 3% adjustment is needed to address salary, benefit, and other non-salary cost increases in these areas.

We will also have an ongoing need for additional staffing in our Office of Educational and Instructional Support group due to the added complexity of the new curriculum and will need sufficient staff coverage for a curriculum that runs year-round with no summer break. The school is hiring two staff positions to act as advisors in a new model of advising. These two positions will have individual meetings with students to provide referrals to campus services, programs for wellness, career development, and community building. They will assist faculty in implementing remediation plans for students that are struggling.

The consequence of these fee levels not being approved is the possible failure of our effort to implement our new block curriculum. We will also be drawing on reserves and gift balances to implement the program, but the fee increase provides a valuable supplement to that funding.

UC San Francisco PharmD

Market Comparison:

■ Total Annual Charges    □ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$34,307	\$35,295	\$36,312	\$37,404		
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$31,034	\$31,965	\$32,924	\$33,912		
	<i>Privates</i>	\$67,035	\$69,046	\$71,117	\$73,251		
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$46,552	\$47,540	\$48,557	\$49,649		
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$36,168	\$37,253	\$38,371	\$39,522		
	<i>Privates</i>	\$67,035	\$69,046	\$71,117	\$73,251		

**Comparison publics:** Univ. Texas at Tyler, Univ. Michigan, Univ. Pittsburgh  
**Comparison privates:** Univ of the Pacific, Chapman Univ., Univ. of Southern California

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:**  
 As the table shows, we are more affordable than private institutions in our state. We are one of only two public schools of pharmacy in California, which has 14 schools of pharmacy. Compared to other public universities we are slightly higher, but we operate in one of the most expensive cities in the country and we are a top tier school, consistently ranking in the top three.

Expenditure Plans

Affordability

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$1,457,987	\$43,740	\$45,052	\$46,403			\$1,593,182
Benefits Cost	\$143,467	\$4,304	\$4,433	\$4,566			\$156,770
Providing Student Services	\$1,203,492	\$60,175	\$126,367	\$139,003			\$1,529,037
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$1,000,000	\$62,029	\$315,508	\$255,539			\$1,633,075
Instructional Support Staff	\$2,000,000	\$100,000	\$210,000	\$242,074			\$2,552,074
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$500,000	\$30,000	(\$9,476)	\$52,052			\$572,576
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$2,733,494	\$154,463	\$463,873	\$449,544			\$3,801,374
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$300,000	\$20,071	\$32,007	\$35,207			\$387,285
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$1,000,000	(\$11,392)	\$203,856	\$124,242			\$1,316,706
Other	\$175,000	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$175,000
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$10,513,440</b>	<b>\$463,390</b>	<b>\$1,391,619</b>	<b>\$1,348,630</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$13,717,079</b>

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income
This Program:	82%	\$135,695	Median Salary at Graduation: \$145,297
Public Comparisons:	86%	\$131,153	
Private Comparisons:	89%	\$182,417	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary: 13%

**Note:**  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

UC San Francisco PharmD

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	4%	5%	5%	4%	2%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	7%	8%	8%	3%	2%
American Indian	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Other Domestic	87%	85%	87%	90%	96%
International	1%	1%	1%	3%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	40%	49%	50%	31%	25%
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	31%	31%	31%	40%	37%
% Female	69%	69%	69%	60%	63%
Total Enrollment	485	478	483	952	1554

**Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

**1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

The trend with URMs has been steady the last three years, hovering between 13-14%. This is double the average URM percentage in other public institutions in the United States. We have a strong commitment to outreach and recruitment of underrepresented students. As part of our larger goal of visibility, we are committed to having a presence at campuses with historically large underrepresented populations, such as CSU Hayward, CSU Long Beach, and CSU Los Angeles. In addition, we have always maintained our presence in the Central Valley, with an annual outreach program held in Fresno and campus visits at locations such as UC Merced, CSU Fresno, and CSU Bakersfield. We also do outreach to HBCUs including Xavier and Elizabeth City.

Two programs that we invest a great deal of resources in serve as pipelines for underrepresented students: (1) UCSF Pharmacy Post-Baccalaureate Certificate Program; and (2) Inside UCSF. These two programs have provided opportunities for underrepresented students to see UCSF's PharmD program as "reachable" and, as a result, many past participants of these outreach programs have matriculated into our PharmD program.

**2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect it to be very similar to our current composition with a slight uptick in the URM category due to increased outreach to these students. There is a certain amount of unknown for our school at this point due to our move to a three year curriculum and preference for students who want to go into residencies or other post graduate education.



**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.4%	1.2%	1.2%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	23.5%	24.4%	25.9%
	International			
White	Domestic	71.8%	70.9%	69.1%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	1.2%	2.3%	2.5%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		44.7%	46.5%	46.9%
Male		55.3%	53.5%	53.1%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.6%	2.8%	2.8%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	19.4%	22.2%	22.2%
	International			
White	Domestic	72.2%	72.2%	72.2%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		30.6%	30.6%	30.6%
Male		69.4%	69.4%	69.4%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:** The amounts set aside for RTA in 2018-19 through 2020-21 meet the 33% RTA requirement. Between financial aid managed by the Student Financial Aid office and supplementary scholarships from the School of Pharmacy, the total amount of financial aid issued in the 2016-2017 year was \$4,794,085.

**Goals/Strategies:** Our goal is to provide sufficient need-based financial aid such that the cost of the PharmD program is not a barrier to low income students. We measure our success by the number of students who receive Pell grants that enroll in the PharmD program. The fact that the number of students receiving Pell grants has increased from 40% to 49% is indicative of our success in this area.

We have been aggressively seeking funding for student scholarships, highlighting this need in our annual fund drive and with specific donors capable of making a major gift.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

Faculty consultation was done at full faculty meetings and was discussed with a smaller group of faculty who are actively involved in teaching the PharmD students. Faculty were supportive of keeping the increases in line with the CPI for the San Francisco Bay Area. Student consultation was done by e-mail to the P1-P3 students. The P4 students were not consulted because this fee increase will not impact them. Two students requested additional information. One student wanted know the expense categories that student fee money was spent on. She was sent a pdf of the Organization Report in MyReports specific to the PDST funds. Another student wanted to see the fee schedules for the 3 year program and the 4 year program. She was sent this information. One student voiced an objection. We responded with some information about how, unlike the other three Schools at UCSF, we are highly dependent on PDST for funding staff and faculty salaries. We let him know that we are utilizing these additional funds for staff that directly support the PharmD curriculum and have hired an additional 10 people for our Office of Educational Instructional Support. We are not planning to modify our request due to the anticipated higher cost of supporting two overlapping curriculums over the next three years. We will reassess at that time whether we can hold the line on tuition increases or will need to request increases in subsequent years.

**SUMMARY OF PROPOSED MULTI-YEAR PLAN AND MULTI-YEAR PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION (PDST)**

*All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.*

**Campus and Program: UCSB - Technology Management (Master of Technology Management)**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							<b>2018-19</b>		<b>2019-20</b>		<b>2020-21</b>		<b>2021-22</b>		<b>2022-23</b>	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$32,970	\$33,960	\$34,980	\$36,030	\$37,113	\$38,229	3%	\$990	3%	\$1,020	3%	\$1,050	3%	\$1,083	3%	\$1,116
Nonresident:	\$32,970	\$33,960	\$34,980	\$36,030	\$37,113	\$38,229	3%	\$990	3%	\$1,020	3%	\$1,050	3%	\$1,083	3%	\$1,116

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of the multi-year proposal is to increase PDST 3% each year to provide students with specialized educational offerings, specialized student services, adequate financial aid, and improved student facilities and instructional equipment. Our current data suggest that we are delivering well on our goals and, therefore, do not need to add additional PSDT funds to achieve them beyond a nominal increase to cover cost of living and inflation.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Master of Technology Management (MTM) is a rigorous one-year instructional program in business and engineering management for scientists and engineers. The MTM degree complements other engineering offerings at UCSB by providing an opportunity for advanced technical students to better prepare themselves for careers in business, and enabling and empowering them to become innovative leaders in technology-driven businesses. Unlike most of our peer institutions offering traditional business administration (MBA) programs, UC Santa Barbara does not currently have a business school. The campus's MTM program, however, offers an alternative to an MBA for students with technical work experience. UCSB's MTM degree program and curriculum has been carefully crafted in consultation with prominent national academic and business leaders to provide a new and exemplary form of management education for students with strong backgrounds in science or engineering. AY 2018-2019 will be the MTM program's fourth year in existence.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

In the last multi-year plan that included AY 2015-16 through AY 2017-18, we proposed that PDST resources would be used to achieve the following goals for the benefit of our students:

- 1. Specialized educational offerings:** Fee revenue was used to hire qualified leaders from industry, and UCSB is currently implementing a new type of adjunct faculty appointment (called "Professor of Practice") for these hires. We were able to hire two Professors of Practice and three lecturers to aid in instruction. Each of these instructional faculty have deep applied experience and domain knowledge in areas related to technology management.
- 2. Specialized student services:** There are currently four state-funded staff that the College of Engineering uses in support of the Technology Management Program (TMP). PDST revenue was used to hire four additional FTE staff. These positions include an associate director who focuses on marketing and corporate outreach; an admissions director who focuses on recruitment and admissions; a student affairs officer who helps students enroll in courses, processes financial aid, and runs all events in which students participate during the program; and a career development manager who helps prepare students for the job market, introduces them to companies, and helps them to negotiate job offers.
- 3. Student financial aid:** During each year of our program, we have distributed more than 33% of the MTM PDST funds for financial aid for our students. In year 1 (AY 2015-2016) we distributed 35%, in year 2 (AY 2016-2017) we distributed 37%, and in year 3 (2017-2018) we distributed 38%.
- 4. Improved student facilities and instructional equipment:** PDST revenue was used to pay for the creation of a new "Executive Learning Facility", which involved a significant "adaptive re-use" renovation project in Phelps Hall on campus. PDST revenue was used to cover all subsequent maintenance and upkeep, as well as costs for associated instructional equipment.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

During the period of this multi-year plan, PDST revenue will be used to continue delivering on the goals identified in the last multi-year plan.

**1. Specialized educational offerings:** The PDST resources will be used to provide the professionally-oriented curricula designed expressly for our MTM students, including the all-important integrative "capstone" team project. The course and project offerings are not offered on campus elsewhere. In addition to our ladder-rank faculty, qualified leaders from industry will serve as adjunct professors and lecturers for a small number of courses.

**2. Specialized student services:** As with comparable top professional programs, our MTM students will expect tailored, high quality career placement, student cohort development, and high-impact professional and networking services. PDST funds will be used to support the additional levels of staffing that have been put in place to serve this substantial need for our MTM students.

**3. Student financial aid:** As per Regental policy, we will use 33% of the MTM PDST funds for financial aid for our students. This aid will allow us to attract the most talented students and assist those who would otherwise be unable to attend.

**4. Improved student facilities and instructional equipment:** To provide the finest education for our MTM students, our instructional facilities will require resources to be similarly excellent. Meeting and project space will be provided with staff oversight to maximize the student experience. PDST revenue will be used to pay for the maintenance of the new "Executive Learning Facility."

All of the activities, personnel costs, and facilities costs necessary to achieve those goals continue to climb each year. Our current data suggest that we are delivering well on our goals and, therefore, do not need to add additional PSDT funds to achieve them beyond a nominal increase to deal with cost of living and inflation.

**Market Comparison:**

☐ Total Annual Charges

☑ Total Charges to Degree

**Comparator Figures Below are Projections**

	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Resident: <i>This program</i>	\$46,539	\$47,172	\$48,192	\$49,242	\$50,325	\$51,441
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$69,328	\$71,472	\$73,616	\$75,825	\$78,100	\$80,443
<i>Privates</i>	\$70,843	\$73,034	\$75,225	\$77,482	\$79,806	\$82,200
Nonresident: <i>This program</i>	\$58,784	\$59,723	\$61,057	\$62,429	\$63,842	\$65,295
<i>Other Publics</i>	\$101,881	\$105,032	\$108,183	\$111,428	\$114,771	\$118,214
<i>Privates</i>	\$70,843	\$73,034	\$75,225	\$77,482	\$79,806	\$82,200

**Comparison publics:** University of Texas, Austin Master of Technology Commercialization – University of Illinois, MBA with technology management focus –Colorado University, Boulder – MBA with technology management focus– Michigan U., Ann Arbor, Master of Engineering  
**Comparison privates:** Dartmouth, Master of Engineering Management – Stanford, Management Science and Engineering – Duke, Master of Engineering Management – Dartmouth, Master of Engineering Management

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** The program's in-state charges will be lower than the public institutions. These charges will also remain below both public and private institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

**Affordability**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est Total PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$306,000	\$357,020	\$32,336	\$22,666	\$18,011	\$35,417	\$771,450
Benefits Cost	\$17,000	\$3,482	\$2,048	\$2,253	\$2,478	\$2,726	\$29,987
Providing Student Services	\$55,000	\$103,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$10,000	\$2,000	\$172,000
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$6,000	\$20,000	\$7,000	\$7,500	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$42,500
Instructional Support Staff	\$411,800	\$12,354	\$12,725	\$13,106	\$13,500	\$13,095	\$476,580
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$6,000	\$9,000	\$5,406	\$4,594	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$28,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$482,000	\$359,000	\$8,000	\$17,000	\$20,000	\$14,000	\$900,000
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$5,000	\$15,000	\$2,000	\$4,861	\$1,641	\$498	\$29,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$5,000	\$11,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,940	\$110	\$20,050
Other	\$25,000	\$750	\$773	\$796	\$820	\$844	\$28,983
<b>Total Projected Use of Revenue</b>	<b>\$1,318,800</b>	<b>\$890,606</b>	<b>\$72,287</b>	<b>\$74,776</b>	<b>\$70,390</b>	<b>\$72,500</b>	<b>\$2,499,359</b>

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:			Median Salary at Graduation:	\$70,000
Public Comparisons:			Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	0%
Private Comparisons:				

**Note:**  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American		5%	0%		
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)		10%	15%		
American Indian		5%	0%		
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic		70%	27%		
International		10%	58%		
Total	0%	100%	100%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients					
<i>Gender:</i> % Male		81%	62%	70%	65%
% Female		19%	38%	33%	35%
Total Enrollment					

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

UCSB is a Hispanic serving institution that, coupled with other efforts (including participation in the Diversity Forum), should expand underrepresented ethnicities in the program. We work actively to create racial and ethnic diversity. We advertise our promotional materials to engineering and science societies that represent minority students (e.g. National Society of Black Engineers and Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers). We also specifically target potential recruits to the program who indicate affiliations with these societies on sites such as LinkedIn. Our admissions director also visits professional associations representing minorities during recruiting.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to under represented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect the composition to be similar to what it is today given the demographics of students who have expressed an interest in our offerings.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	4.5%	12.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	0.0%	91.5%	83.5%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		0.0%	27.2%	29.2%
Male		0.0%	72.8%	70.8%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
White	Domestic	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Female		28.6%	28.6%	28.6%
Male		71.4%	71.4%	71.4%

**Note:**

"All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\*For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* During each year of our program, we will distribute more than 33% of the MTM PDST funds for financial aid for our students. The program also supplements RTA by providing scholarships via endowed gifts in the department.

*Goals/Strategies:* We believe it is essential that a UCSB Engineering education remain accessible to students of all socioeconomic backgrounds. As per Regental guidelines, one-third of our MTM PDST revenue is for student aid and support. This substantial allocation of resources will greatly help maintain accessibility to the program

Success will be measured by monitoring key indicators such as trends in student debt level, student yield (the percent of admitted students who enroll in our program), and changes in the ethnic and racial diversity of our entering classes. Students who are admitted but who do not enroll will be surveyed to see whether cost played a significant factor in their decision.

As with all of our existing graduate programs on campus, eligibility for financial aid will be ascertained as part of the admissions process. We deploy our MTM PDST funds towards student aid in a broadly defined, strategic manner to assure that qualified students admitted to the program have the greatest possible chance of attending. We seek to ensure that no qualified candidate is barred from attending UCSB MTM on the basis of financial need.

One of the most popular and successful programs linking our engineering students to public service is our Engineering Without Borders program. In recent years, this program has brought new low-cost methods for producing clean water and solar energy to many disadvantaged communities in North and South America. A recent addition to this program has been an entrepreneurial element in which student teams compete for funding for the most compelling sustainable service concept, an activity in which our program (TMP) has been actively involved.

Private support provides additional assistance for need-based aid. For example, our program currently manages a \$500,000 endowment that supports student fellowships, and expanding this endowment is part of our overall Development strategy. Also included in this strategy is an expansion of corporate sponsorships and internships for student support.

***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

The PDST levels proposed for 2018-19 were discussed in a "town hall" style meeting with 39 (of 40) MTM students on October 26, 2017. Professor Bob York facilitated the town hall meeting. The meeting lasted about 20 minutes, from 9:00am to 9:20am. Fees and the proposed 3% increase in fees were described to students, followed by an open discussion. The following is a summary of specific student feedback/comments that capture the range of topics discussed:

- A 3% increase seems fair to me given that it supports staff for our program.
- I support fee increases if they are used to maintain the extra privileges we enjoy as MTM students, like dedicated staff and meetings rooms.
- I wish that the UC would reduce its top-heavy administration to save costs instead of increases to our fees.
- Fee increases are okay as long as this program continues to provide a higher return on our investment than other degree programs on campus.
- We all have a stake in the success of this program. I would support even larger fee increases, say up to 5%, if it helped grow the program and provide more space and staff support.

At the end of the town-hall discussion, by a show of hands, the MTM students indicated their unanimous support for the increase in PDST levels proposed for 2018-19.



All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program:** UC Santa Cruz, M.S., Applied Economics and Finance

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year <b>2017-18</b>	Year 1 <b>2018-19</b>	Year 2 <b>2019-20</b>	Year 3 <b>2020-21</b>	Year 4 <b>2021-22</b>	Year 5 <b>2022-23</b>	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$8,001	\$9,000	\$9,243	\$9,492	\$9,750	\$10,011	12%	\$999	3%	\$243	3%	\$249	3%	\$258	3%	\$261
Nonresident:	\$8,001	\$9,000	\$9,243	\$9,492	\$9,750	\$10,011	12%	\$999	3%	\$243	3%	\$249	3%	\$258	3%	\$261

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

This proposal seeks a 12% increase in PDST in 2018-19 followed by 3% increases through 2022-23. The program received campus seed funding in 2011 to cover lecturer and instructional expenses for 23 units of classes. These funds will fully expire after 2017-18, and thus, the initial 12% increase (\$1000 per student) is necessary to continue covering the lecturer needs of our classes not taught by senate faculty (Econ 186, 233, 201, and four offerings of 294A).

Even with an initial 12% increase in PDST, the program's total charges will remain below those of its public and private comparators for the duration of this plan. Further, the existing PDST has been constant for the last four academic years, despite being initially approved up to 4% annual growth. We chose not to increase PDST at this rate to keep costs as low as possible while building momentum in the revised one-year program, but inflation and tapered seed funding now require a larger initial adjustment in fees and smaller adjustments thereafter. Had the program followed the initially approved growth rate, PDST would be at approximately \$9,350 next academic year, and our proposal remains below this in levels and growth.

Our proposed PDST levels will enable the program to: (1) provide students with course support to develop their analytical, empirical and communication skills related to applied economics and finance; (2) further enhance student services through professional development and job search support; (3) maintain a core group of senate and non-senate faculty teaching in the program to ensure continuity of expertise and instructional support for faculty and students; and (4) offer students financial aid at or above current levels.

**Brief Description of Program**

The one-year M.S. in Applied Economics and Finance program at UCSC provides analytical graduate training designed to prepare students for careers in business, international and domestic banking, consulting firms, government, and nonprofit organizations. The program combines core training in economic theory with meaningful applications that students are likely to face in their careers. The program provides more training in economics, statistics, and econometrics than most M.B.A. programs; one of its greatest strengths is its emphasis on building students' fluency in econometric techniques, statistical software packages, and large-scale financial and microeconomic datasets.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

Our original and most recent PDST proposal was for AY 2012-2013 to 2014-2015; however, the launch of the PDST-charging program was delayed until 2014-15. Beginning in 2014-15, PDST was used to support the following four goals:

1. Strengthened Core Curriculum: The PDST has been instrumental in providing funding for specialized instruction, as well as funding for supplemental instruction that would otherwise not be offered for classes of the size in the program. For example, we have used the PDST to fund additional lab lecturers to teach new programming languages to complement the existing econometrics and finance courses that make up the core of the curriculum. Importantly, we have also used the PDST to staff each core course with a highly qualified teaching assistant to provide additional instructional support. In total, we have spent 40% of available PDST funds on this area.
2. Emphasis on Empirical Analysis: Related to our core curriculum, we have used the PDST to fund software licenses for Stata, a server, general computer lab support. In total, we have spent 2% of available PDST funds on this area.
3. Student Financial Aid: Per Regents policy, we used 33% of our PDST in every year as financial aid to students. This financial aid was distributed according to performance on standardized tests. We also "topped up" financial aid offers using donor funds for students that were both promising and added diversity to each cohort.
4. Student Services: In the initial three years of this program, an increasing portion of the PDST funds were used to promote professional development and job and program outreach for the students. We used PDST funds to support job development seminars, to launch and host APEF-specific job fairs at the UCSC University Center, and to hire student workers to develop databases to support professional development and networking outreach efforts for students in the program. Finally, in time for the 2016-2017 cohort, we reached a size large enough to be confident to financially support a 50% staff member to act as job outreach coordinator. This position has significantly enhanced the professional development activities offered to the students while easing the burden on existing staff and faculty administration for organizing and expanding job search activities for the students.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

There are six goals and objectives of this multi-year proposal, which are informed by extensive consultation with students, faculty, and staff over the last four academic years.

1. The additional \$1000 per student is needed in part to cover the lecturer needs for 23 units of classes that are not taught by senate faculty (our annual program schedule includes a total of 66 units in class offerings).
2. We wish to expand the program and course offerings over the next 2-3 years. To do so within our existing paradigm of assigning a teaching assistant to support each course, we will need to raise additional tuition to cover these expenses.
3. We anticipate needing to cover faculty leaves from the program.
4. The student services expense category will increase as we continue to improve the professional development and job placement services to our students.
5. The non-salary expense category will increase as we further our networking and outreach efforts to support current and subsequent cohorts, and continued growth of the program.
6. The proposed fee increase will allow us to do more outreach and offer more attractive aid packages, which we hope will increase the diversity of our cohorts.

**Market Comparison:**

☐ Total Annual Charges      ☐ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$21,838	\$23,233	\$23,894	\$24,569	\$25,263	\$25,976
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$27,464	\$28,288	\$29,137	\$30,011	\$30,911	\$31,838
	<i>Privates</i>	\$54,259	\$55,887	\$57,563	\$59,290	\$61,069	\$62,901
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$34,083	\$35,478	\$36,139	\$36,814	\$37,508	\$38,221
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$34,514	\$35,549	\$36,616	\$37,714	\$38,846	\$40,011
	<i>Privates</i>	\$54,259	\$55,887	\$57,563	\$59,290	\$61,069	\$62,901

Projections for comparators' total charges assume 3% annual increases.

Comparison publics: U of Ill-Urbana-Champ, U of Oregon, UNC-Chapel Hill, U of Wisc  
Comparison privates: USC

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges: The total charges for this plan are currently lower than the average for its comparison public institutions and will remain lower than the average for its comparison public institutions during the full course of the proposed plan. The charges are and will also remain far below the program's comparison private institution during the full course of the proposed plan.*

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est.Total New PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$26,108	\$24,717	\$3,168	\$1,620	\$2,946	\$3,112	\$61,671
Benefits Cost	\$9,879	\$11,584	\$443	\$7,966	\$4,382	\$3,184	\$37,438
Providing Student Services	\$58,125	\$6,978	\$11,775	\$7,260	\$9,067	\$9,598	\$102,803
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$123,455	\$7,934	\$3,942	\$17,999	\$4,600	\$4,738	\$162,668
Instructional Support Staff	\$19,066	\$1,129	\$837	\$948	\$880	\$904	\$23,764
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$124,096	\$21,796	\$27,647	\$24,195	\$11,135	(\$6,889)	\$201,980
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$4,318	\$815	\$1,017	\$563	\$1,396	\$954	\$9,063
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$11,000	(\$10,000)	\$50	\$105	\$58	\$60	\$1,273
Other	\$0						\$0
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$376,047	\$64,953	\$48,879	\$60,656	\$34,464	\$15,661	\$600,660

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	30%	\$43,545	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$65,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	10%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:** The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	0%	2%	0%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	8%	6%	4%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	4%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>4%</b>	N/A	N/A
Other Domestic	50%	29%	34%	N/A	N/A
International	38%	63%	62%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	31%	44%	31%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	58%	48%	56%	52%	46%
% Female	42%	52%	44%	48%	54%
Total Enrollment	24	48	45	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

We actively recruit from the student population at UCSC, which is a Hispanic Serving Institution and exhibits a stronger diversity profile. We also have increased efforts in sending promotional material to institutions across the US, especially other universities within California and on the West Coast. In particular, to ensure that we are providing opportunities to students of all backgrounds, along with additional California resident students, we actively market our program to students at other UC institutions as well as all California State Universities (CSUs). We have translated our brochures to be more attractive to non-native English speakers. The proposed increase in PDST fees will allow us to test the effect of offering more attractive financial aid packages (see "Financial Aid Strategy" below). Fundraising efforts may also assist in this area. Finally, we conduct an anonymous program climate survey each year to ensure that our program is a welcoming environment for students from all backgrounds.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

One concerning aspect of our program is the lack of growth in domestic resident applications, which is needed to increase overall diversity of our student population. We intend to work on this with in-person visits to a number of CSUs to further promote our program to the entire California student population. As many lower income students are also served by these schools, and the UC provides an opportunity to attend the state's flagship research campuses, we believe this approach will (1) increase domestic applicants and enrollees; and (2) increase the share of our cohorts that are from underserved and low-income populations. Concretely, we plan to maintain the percentage of students who are domestic to at or above 40% of total, of which we aim to have 50% from underrepresented groups. Further we aim to keep the percentage of female students at or above 50% of each cohort.

**Faculty Diversity\***

All Faculty (School or Department)**				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic			3.0%
	International	3.0%		
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	International	3.0%		
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	8.0%	5.0%	9.0%
	International	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
White	Domestic	68.0%	73.0%	66.0%
	International	5.0%		
Other/Unknown	Domestic	8.0%	14.0%	14.0%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Female	23.0%	14.0%	14.0%
	Male	78.0%	86.0%	86.0%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Black/Afr-American	Domestic			
	International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.0%	11.0%	10.0%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	10.0%	11.0%	14.0%
	International	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
White	Domestic	71.0%	63.0%	62.0%
	International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	10.0%	11.0%	10.0%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
	Female	10.0%	11.0%	14.0%
	Male	90.0%	89.0%	86.0%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.  
  
 "Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

*Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:* The multi-year proposal guarantees a minimum return-to-aid of 33% in accordance with policy to help offset fees. This will be supplemented in one or two ways -- one by donor funds and two by additional PDST when funds allow.

*Goals/Strategies:* With limited resources, we cannot provide full financial aid to many students. Instead, we aim to help students with a rebate on fees, especially those who have performed well in undergraduate coursework as well as those who enhance the diversity of our cohorts. In many cases we "top up" the financial aid using donor funds. We currently distribute financial aid to everybody, but in different sums (\$2000, \$3000, or \$4000) based on cutoffs in quantitative GRE scores. The data compiled over the last three years to measure how these financial aid efforts have helped recruit students to the university paints a very noisy picture, and interestingly, those students to whom we have given more aid have been less likely to accept our offer of admission. This relationship persists even after controlling for grades, scores, and other characteristics. We hypothesize that these students are either deciding to attend schools that have offered more competitive packages, or have decided to remain in the workforce. These effects are primarily driven by nonresidents. When focusing on CA residents, there is virtually no impact of aid on acceptances of our admission offers.

We plan to adjust this strategy in a simple but meaningful way that should make financial aid more effective and help with diversity goals. To increase the opportunities afforded to underrepresented groups, we plan to target up to 10 CA resident applicants each year with an additional \$4000 stipend in addition to the GRE-based allocation. This stipend will be sourced from donor funds and less generous offers to non-resident students. For some students, this will amount to a full PDST rebate, and thus, an approximate one-third reduction to the tuition cost of attending the program.

## ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

A Google survey was utilized to measure the student response to our proposed multi-year PDST fee plan and to measure general interest in the services we provide. Students were presented the entire fee schedule through 2022-23, and were asked to rate their agreement with the proposed fees and timeline for increases from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The average for this measure was 3.53. Only two respondents rated the fee schedule below 3, while 8 rated the schedule 4 or 5. One student, via the open-ended comment section at the end of the survey, asked "Is there an end date to the 3% increase?". We have explained to the students that this 3% increase is only for the stated years in the proposal, and that the 3% increase is meant to cover inflationary expenses, almost exclusively driven by the increased portion of faculty and staff labor expense funded by PDST fees.

With regards to the services provided by the PDST fee, like TA support, coding labs, additional electives, and professional development services, students were asked to rate their importance for the program from not important (1) to very important (5). Across the board, the students rated these services and classes as very important. The scores from the student survey were as follows: math camp (4.5), TA support (4.66), computer labs (4.6), professional development (4.86), and electives (4.46).

We supplemented this effort with a focus group meeting extended to 16 domestic and foreign students to discuss the PDST fees usage and proposed increase schedule. Generally, students provided excellent feedback. Given the loss of seed funding, inflation, and the fact that we have made an effort to keep fees low for the last four years, students were generally fine with the proposed increases. They also appreciated that the PDST is routed directly back to the program they are attending. The discussion included many helpful ideas about how we can best use the fees. A few international students asked whether the increased fees would cause additional barriers to proof of funding that they must provide for visa applications. As we have not received many requests for lowering fees for this reason during the admissions cycles, we explained that we address financial aid needs such as these on a case-by-case basis.

The students were unanimous in their thinking that the program should not grow considerably unless duplicate primary class sections with the same TA support could be replicated. Students did not express any opposition or concern to growing the program by 10 more students. One student explicitly stated: "I think [the proposed fee structure] is totally fair as long as you can keep the student to TA and teacher ratio" constant. Should we grow program enrollment significantly, duplicating the course offerings to maintain the desired student-TA & Faculty ratios would require a much higher (PDST) fee structure. A common refrain was that while the PDST-funded computer labs are helpful, we might think about extending them into the summers, and potentially adding some additional computer languages. As this is a permitted use of the fees, we will convene the masters committee to discuss these possible changes.

We regularly discuss PDST levels amongst department administration and with the master's degree committee. This renewal proposal was created with that consultation. We also discuss the master's program regularly in department meetings and have discussed the renewal proposal at a department meeting. The proposal was met with support.

We also conducted an annual exit survey of students, asking what resources they used the most and what we should do if we were able to raise more money for resources. The students overwhelmingly stated that the student workspaces, which are funded and maintained via the PDST, are crucial resources for development and enjoyment within the program. One student from the 2016 graduating class wrote, "Honestly, a few other classmates and myself pretty much lived in E2, room 414. Having this room was such a lifesaver. I couldn't imagine studying and working anywhere else on campus, and it was the room that I visited first before any others when coming to school each day." As for what we could add with additional funds, students frequently cited items that are strongly related to the courses and professional development that we intend to implement with this proposal.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UCSC Games and Playable Media M.S. Program**

Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:							Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	\$30,980	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	-73%	(\$22,565)	8%	\$636	5%	\$453	5%	\$474	5%	\$498
Nonresident:	\$30,980	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	-73%	(\$22,565)	8%	\$636	5%	\$453	5%	\$474	5%	\$498

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

The purpose of this proposal is to seek approval for a decrease in PDST in 2018-19, and then an increase of between 5% and 8% thereafter. As a consequence, the Games and Playable Media (GPM) program is projected to be cheaper than both public and private comparators in 2018-19. GPM is transitioning from a 1 year (4 quarter) to a 2 year (5 quarter) program and will no longer require a summer term. We are able to decrease the PDST fee by 73% (from \$30,980 to \$8,415) in 2018-19 as a result of the elimination of the summer term, and because of a campus commitment to fund two new faculty FTE. The PDST fee will continue to support industry experts to teach specific courses, equipment costs, and financial aid. New proposed expenses include the salary of an Admissions Outreach Coordinator to improve student diversity, and instructional expenses related to supporting students in highly technical game programming courses. By sharing resources with the Serious Games M.S. program, which will also be administered by UCSC’s Computational Media Department, we plan to realize efficiencies that reduce program expenses.

**Brief Description of Program**

Located at UCSC’s Silicon Valley campus, the Games and Playable Media M.S. program trains students to be professionals in the computer game industry. The cornerstone of the program is a high-touch project-based educational experience that connects students with industry practices, professional development, and networking. The program is transitioning from a 1 year (4 quarter) to a 2 year (5 quarter) program. By lengthening the program, we are able to require three new technical courses and offer opportunities for students to take more technical electives. Whereas the current model requires students to take courses in the summer to earn their degree in one calendar year, students will now have the opportunity to participate in summer internships organized by the program during the summer. This revision reflects the increased demand in the game industry for strong technical skills.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

During our previous multi-year plan, which covered the period of 2013-14 to 2015-16, PDST funds were used to address:

- 1) Student services staffing: the program used PDST funds to employ a program director, creative director, and program administrator to help students complete game projects, navigate the professional industry, and create networking opportunities.
- 2) Curriculum and related educational training activities: PDST funds were used to attract high-profile industry practitioners to teach select courses and give talks and workshops to enhance students’ professional portfolios; program faculty, hired through the PDST fee, also provided substantive and frequent feedback on classroom projects.
- 3) State-of-the-art equipment and facilities: PDST supported the purchasing of equipment related to gaming design hardware and software, and helped customize existing building space into game design labs and team spaces.
- 4) Financial Aid: 33% of PDST revenue was dedicated to student financial aid. We set forth the goal that the PDST fee would not deter qualified students from applying to our program.
- 5) Student diversity: We intentionally marketed our program to diverse undergraduate programs and female-focused groups such as Intel Corporation’s women in games program to accelerate diversity and inclusion in the field. As a result, in 2016-17 female students increased by 38%, helping us reach the goal of increasing the participation of women in GPM.

In 2016-17, PDST also funded 26 guest speakers along with student attendance at the annual Game Developers Conference. Students engaged with a commercial studio on a cooperative project. Thus, in addition to the high-quality and highly interactive courses funded through the PDST, students participated in many game industry events outside the classroom. None of these educational activities would have been possible without student services staffing.

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

The goal of this multi-year proposal is to continue to provide students with a high-touch educational experience that connects students with industry practices, professional development, and networking. The increased PDST level will allow the program to enroll more students, to strengthen the technical training in the game programming courses, replace existing equipment as needed, and focus on recruiting a more ethnically and gender diverse student body.

More specifically, after the proposed 73% reduction in 2018-19 (which will bring our total charges below the averages of those of our public and private comparators), we are proposing an 8% increase in 2019-20 because we are adding a second cohort that year, which will increase the need for industry practitioners to teach courses. The 8% increase will enable the program to double the number of students served by the program. By 2019-20, the program will reach a steady state with 30 continuing students and 30 new students added each year. The 5% increase in PDST in subsequent years is to address increases in salary and benefits costs. Some of the PDST fee increase will cover the cost of new equipment as existing equipment becomes outdated and more students are added to the program. Overall, we are proposing a reduction in the current PDST fee level.

**Market Comparison:**

☐ Total Annual Charges    ☑ Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>	\$49,366	\$ 38,450	\$ 40,089	\$ 41,575	\$43,118	\$ 44,713
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$37,419	\$ 38,542	\$ 39,698	\$ 40,889	\$42,116	\$ 43,379
	<i>Privates</i>	\$81,663	\$ 84,113	\$ 86,636	\$ 89,235	\$91,912	\$ 94,670
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>	\$61,611	\$ 63,528	\$ 65,168	\$ 67,013	\$69,115	\$ 71,189
	<i>Other Publics</i>	\$68,294	\$ 70,343	\$ 72,453	\$ 74,627	\$76,866	\$ 79,172
	<i>Privates</i>	\$82,200	\$ 84,666	\$ 87,206	\$ 89,822	\$92,517	\$ 95,292

Comparison publics: Univ.Central Florida, Univ. of Utah, UofT-Dallas  
 Comparison privates: Worcester Polytechnic, Carnegie Mellon, Rochester Inst of Tech, SMU Guildhall, NYU, Digipen, USC

**Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:** In 2018-19 when the program's PDST fee decreases dramatically, GPM's in state tuition is below the average for public universities and significantly lower than the average for private universities.

When comparing total charges on an individual level, GPM's in-state tuition is the third most affordable and only \$674 more than the second most affordable public program. GPM is significantly more affordable than five of the private institutions.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est.Total New PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$101,028	(\$71,908)	\$17,790	\$3,780	\$2,536	\$2,722	\$55,948
Benefits/UCRP Cost*	\$140,748	(\$98,248)	\$3,850	\$1,391	\$1,432	\$1,475	\$50,648
Providing Student Services	\$259,467	(\$224,418)	(\$5,398)	\$1,071	\$1,111	\$1,154	\$32,986
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$10,300	\$309	\$318	\$328	\$11,255
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$93,000	(\$93,000)	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
Providing Student	\$337,372	(\$253,222)	\$66,700	\$7,550	\$7,900	\$8,300	\$174,600
Other Non-salary Cost	\$92,024	(\$37,024)	\$0	\$0	(\$10,000)	\$0	\$45,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Admissions Outreach Coordinator	\$91,701	\$0	\$0	\$31,827	\$955	\$983	\$125,466
Other Reserve		(\$91,701)	\$0	\$48,004	(\$11,818)	\$8,632	(\$46,883)
Other Teaching Assistantships		\$6,631	\$13,858	\$21,718	\$1,266	\$1,304	\$44,777
Total use/projected use of revenue	\$1,022,340	(\$769,890)	\$200,100	\$22,650	\$23,700	\$24,898	\$523,798

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	18%	\$49,310	Median Salary at Graduation:	\$72,000
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	10%
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**  
 Public and private comparison data not available publicly.  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

Enrollment	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16 Comparison	
				Publics	Privates
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American	5%	3%	0%	N/A	N/A
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	0%	0%	10%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	0%	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	N/A	N/A
Other Domestic	36%	24%	42%	N/A	N/A
International	59%	73%	48%	N/A	N/A
Total	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients	33%	100%	18%	N/A	N/A
<i>Gender:</i> % Male	82%	85%	62%	N/A	N/A
% Female	18%	15%	38%	N/A	N/A
Total Enrollment	25	18	21	N/A	N/A

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### ***1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?***

We are committed to increasing our racial and gender diversity. We have created a full-time Admissions Outreach staff position (a shared resource with the Serious Games M.S. program), which will focus on diversity recruitment efforts. This position will travel to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and American Indian Serving Institutions and attend national gatherings like the Richard Tapia Celebration of Diversity in Computing in order to increase our visibility and form informal and formal relationships with organizations supporting students of color.

#### ***2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?***

With increased affordability of the program and the commitment of a staff member towards recruitment efforts, our goal is to increase the percentage of underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and women. We will be monitoring enrollment data annually to assess effectiveness of our strategy.



**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	11.8%	11.8%	10.5%
White	Domestic	82.3%	64.6%	78.9%
	International	0.0%	5.9%	5.3%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	11.8%	5.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		41.2%	29.4%	21.1%
Male		58.8%	70.6%	78.9%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	33.0%	28.6%	14.3%
White	Domestic	67.0%	57.1%	71.4%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		33.0%	42.9%	28.6%
Male		67.0%	57.1%	71.4%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:** For each year of the multi-year proposal, 33% is earmarked for financial aid. The program also supplements financial aid for select students by providing corporate sponsored fellowships.

**Goals/Strategies:** Our aim is to keep the GPM program cost competitive with other professional master's programs, while growing the GPM program's reputation both domestically and internationally. We will continue to engage corporate partners, like Intel, to financially support students with demonstrable need. We also will continue to reserve some financial aid to assist students who experience financial hardship while progressing through the program. We will also examine students' level of indebtedness and monitor the amount of aid given to students in financial need.

### ***Student and Faculty Consultation***

---

On September 14, 2017, we convened six students who recently completed the 12-month GPM M.S. program and shared with them both the PDST of the current model, and comparisons with the PDST and overall costs of the proposed program. Students were inquisitive about the general rise in PDST costs, and asked whether this tracked with the general inflation of competitive programs. When informed that it does, they were satisfied with this answer.

As expected, the students were far more interested in the implications of the move to the 15-month program. First, our graduates were nearly universally supportive of the move to five quarters over 15 months. While they believe they received excellent training in the four-quarter program, and they are finding success, they nonetheless completed the program feeling exhausted and somewhat rushed. When the new curriculum was shared with the students, the six convened were unanimously supportive.

Given that both the PDST and total cost to degree drop in the revised program despite its expanded length, this was viewed as a strength. We were curious how these students would react given that they just completed paying the higher amount. While they certainly wished they could have enrolled in the less expensive program, they are pleased with the education they received, and none expressed outward resentment in the focus group. They were happy for future students and the new opportunities this can represent.

#### **Faculty:**

On October 2nd, 2017, at the regularly scheduled faculty meeting, the Computational Media department faculty were shown the PDST and total cost information for the GPM M.S. 15-month program, and for the Serious Games program. Since both programs share the same financial model, these two conversations occurred simultaneously. The faculty showed particular concern over the total cost as compared with competitor schools, so the faculty were also shown the comparator documentation. Upon seeing that, particularly for in-state students, the UCSC programs are well below the overall average in cost, and lie between the two public schools we compare most closely to (Utah and UCF), the faculty were satisfied and did not express dissent.

All information presented in this document has been rigorously reviewed by UCOP. Questions (if any) regarding the proposed plan or the accompanying information have been addressed by the program prior to the presentation of the plan to the Regents.

**Campus and Program: UCSC Serious Games M.S.**

**Multi-Year Plan for PDST Levels to be Approved:**

	Current Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Increases/Decreases Over Prior Year									
							2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Resident:	0	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	8%	\$8,415	8%	\$636	5%	\$453	5%	\$474	5%	\$498
Nonresident:	0	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	8%	\$8,415	8%	\$636	5%	\$453	5%	\$474	5%	\$498

**Statement of Purpose of Multi-Year Proposal**

UCSC's Serious Games M.S. program seeks to establish PDST in its inaugural year (\$8,415), with a proposed 8% increase in its second year and 5% increases in the three following years. These proposed PDST levels, which match those of the Games and Playable Media (GPM) PDST program also located at UCSC's Silicon Valley campus, will enable the program to provide students with state-of-the-art equipment, training from industry experts in and outside of the classroom, summer internship opportunities, and hands-on instruction and support for computer programming-intensive courses. This proposal will also support the program's efforts to provide students with financial aid and recruit a gender and ethnically diverse student body.

**Brief Description of Program**

The Serious Games M.S. program is the first of its kind to be offered in the United States. Serious games use the design elements developed for entertainment games to further government or corporate training, education, health, public policy, issue advocacy, scientific, or strategic communication objectives. Types of serious games include games to promote exercise and physical therapy, games that harness people to perform citizen science, games to promote positive health outcomes, and educational games. The economic market for serious games is estimated to reach between \$5 and \$15 billion by 2020.

The program trains students in six key areas: game design, game technology, eliciting and integrating subject matter knowledge, designing and conducting efficacy measurements, effective teamwork, and career planning — all within the context of the serious games field. The cornerstone of this five-quarter program is to provide a high-touch educational experience that connects students with industry practices, professional development, and networking. Campus-level approval has been secured and system-level approval is pending review. The program will be administered by UCSC's Computational Media department, which currently offers a Games and Playable Media (GPM) M.S. program at its Silicon Valley campus. Although a number of courses and resources will be shared, the game-making goals, process, and product differ between entertainment games and serious games, as do the employment goals and prospective employers. Launching another professional degree program now is consistent with UC Santa Cruz's standing as a leader in games and game development.

**Evaluation of Goals Set in Previously Submitted Multi-Year Proposal (Not Applicable to Programs Proposing to Initiate PDST)**

N/A

**Goals and Objectives of Multi-Year Proposal**

Our goal is to provide a professional master's degree for students who wish to pursue serious games as a profession. The program is proposed to be strategically located in Santa Clara among the software powerhouses of Silicon Valley. No other program like this exists in the U.S., and yet we see that serious games are all around us. Serious games serve as helpful social tools, from formal and informal education and training to improving social connectedness.

We are able to keep program expenses low by sharing many resources with our existing, successful professional master's program, Games and Playable Media (GPM). For example, two full-time staff positions will be shared. Five courses overlap allowing curricular efficiency and both programs will share some facilities resources including a sound booth and control room.

The cornerstone of our program is to provide a high-touch educational experience that connects students with industry. We define high-touch as a program in which students receive substantive and ongoing feedback on their work, constant interaction with program faculty and staff, and a low student-to-faculty ratio in the classroom to allow for interactive learning. In order to provide a high-quality program that achieves our program goals, the PDST fee will support state-of-the-art equipment and an administrator that supports program activities. The reality of the gaming field is that hardware, software, and equipment costs are expensive, especially when technology changes rapidly. A program that trains students must keep up with technology used in industry.

The program will provide funds to hire industry experts to teach in the program which is essential to keeping students in touch with real-industry practices and challenges. In addition, many co-curricular events will be supported to put students in contact with game companies and industry professionals. In addition, the Serious Games M.S. program will have a full-time Admissions Outreach staff member focused on enhancing our student diversity goals. This full-time staff member, which is shared with GPM, will reach out to a diverse pool of prospective students. Per the policy, a third of new PDST revenue will be directed to student financial aid; PDST funds will also be used to support teaching assistants.

**Market Comparison:**

Total Annual Charges     Total Charges to Degree

		Comparator Figures Below are Projections					
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident:	<i>This program</i>		\$ 38,450	\$ 40,089	\$ 41,575	\$43,118	\$ 44,713
	<i>Other Publics</i>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>		\$ 85,052	\$ 87,604	\$ 90,232	\$92,939	\$ 95,727
Nonresident:	<i>This program</i>		\$ 58,858	\$ 60,498	\$ 61,984	\$63,527	\$ 65,115
	<i>Other Publics</i>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Privates</i>		\$ 85,052	\$ 87,604	\$ 90,232	\$92,939	\$ 95,727

Comparison publics: There are no public comparators.  
 Comparison privates: Worcester Poly Inst, Carnegie Mellon ETC, USC

*Brief Description of Program's In-State Total Charges:* Since all programs vary in length, we discuss costs in terms of total program costs. All of the currently existing comparable programs are private; they do not have differing program costs for resident and nonresident students. Our proposed program does. For California residents, the total program cost would be cheaper than for all three comparators.

**Expenditure Plans**

	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Proposed Uses of Incremental PDST Revenue					Est.Total New PDST Revenue in Final Year
		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$19,202	\$21,998	\$24,376	\$4,522	\$1,749	\$71,847
Benefits Cost	\$0	\$42,500	\$6,425	\$1,468	\$1,512	\$1,557	\$53,462
Providing Student Services	\$0	\$0	\$20,600	\$618	\$637	\$656	\$22,510
Improving Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$15,817	\$76,019	(\$40,217)	(\$11,641)	(\$9,978)	\$30,000
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$0	\$42,075	\$63,520	\$42,229	\$18,459	\$18,791	\$185,074
Other Non-Salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$3,140	\$61,860	(\$5,000)	\$0	\$60,000
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other: Admissions Outreach Coordinator	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,782	\$983	\$33,765
Other: Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,526	\$9,838	\$22,364
Other: Teaching Assistants	\$0	\$6,631	(\$1,142)	\$36,718	\$1,266	\$1,304	\$44,777
Total Projected Use of Revenue	\$0	\$126,225	\$190,560	\$127,052	\$55,063	\$24,900	\$523,800

**Affordability**

	Pct with Debt	Avg. Debt Among Students w/Debt	Estimated Debt Service Compared to Income	
This Program:	N/A	N/A	Median Salary at Graduation:	N/A
Public Comparisons:	N/A	N/A	Debt Pmt as % of Median Salary:	N/A
Private Comparisons:	N/A	N/A		

**Note:**  
 The figure corresponding with "Debt Payments as % of Median Salary" represents the estimated portion of the monthly gross median salary required to repay the average debt indicated, assuming a standard 10-year repayment plan and current interest rates.

<b>Enrollment (Not Applicable)</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16 Comparison</b>	
				<b>Publics</b>	<b>Privates</b>
<i>Ethnicity (Domestic):</i> Afr-American					
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)					
American Indian					
<b>Subtotal Underrepresented</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Other Domestic					
International					
Total	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<i>Socioeconomic:</i> % Pell recipients					
<i>Gender:</i> % Male					
% Female					
Total Enrollment					

### **Enrollment and Diversity Strategy**

#### **1) What is your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?**

We are committed to increasing our racial and gender diversity. We have created a full-time Admissions Outreach staff member, which is shared with GPM, who will reach out to a diverse pool of prospective students. Responsibilities will include participation in graduate school fairs at Hispanic Serving Institutions (many of these are located in California), Historically Black Colleges and Universities, American Indian Serving Institutions, and Women's Colleges; outreach to groups focused on diversity in computer games such as IGDA Women in Games special interest group; and travel to national gatherings like Games for Change, Grace Hopper Celebration of Women in Computing, and Richard Tapia Celebration of Diversity in Computing.

#### **2) In the final year of this plan, how does the program expect the composition of its students to compare with the composition identified in the table with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender?**

We expect that the representation of underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and women will improve with each year of the program. We will conduct annual assessments to monitor our success and improve recruitment efforts of the Admissions Outreach staff member to increase visibility and bolster relationships with organizations supporting these groups.

**Faculty Diversity\***

<b>All Faculty (School or Department)**</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	11.8%	11.8%	10.5%
White	Domestic	82.3%	64.6%	78.9%
	International	0.0%	5.9%	5.3%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	11.8%	5.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		41.2%	29.4%	21.1%
Male		58.8%	70.6%	78.9%

<b>Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)</b>				
<i>Ethnicity</i>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	33.0%	28.6%	14.3%
White	Domestic	67.0%	57.1%	71.4%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
Female		33.0%	42.9%	28.6%
Male		67.0%	57.1%	71.4%

**Note:**  
 "All Faculty" represents academic appointees in a program of instruction and research that have independent responsibility for conducting approved regular University courses for campus credit.

"Ladder Rank and Equivalent" faculty are faculty holding tenured or non-tenured titles in an appointment series in which tenure may be conferred. Academic title series that have been designated by the Regents as "equivalent" to the Professor series are termed equivalent ranks. Titles in the ladder-rank and equivalent ranks are also referred to as tenure track titles since they represent the titles which confer tenure or which permit promotion to tenure.

\* If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead.

\*\* For a list of all faculty titles relevant to graduate professional degree programs, please see the attachment to this document.

**Financial Aid Strategy**

**Return-to-Aid/Fund Sources:** For each year of the multi-year proposal, 33% of incremental PDST revenue is earmarked for financial aid. The program also would like to supplement financial aid for select students by providing corporate sponsored fellowships.

**Goals/Strategies:** The proposed M.S. program will primarily use financial aid packages as a recruitment tool for attracting students to the program. We plan to distribute financial aid to the most qualified students, to increase the quality of the student body, and encourage them to select the UCSC program.

Each year we will reserve some portion of financial aid to distribute according to need. Indeed, the GPM program has encountered cases where it has managed to retain students through program completion by providing some additional financial aid.

**Student and Faculty Consultation**

**Students:**

On September 14, 2017, the program convened six students who have recently completed the 12-month GPM M.S. program to discuss both the GPM and the Serious Games PDST proposals. Students unanimously agreed that Serious Games has a well-priced cost model that provides good value. These students also expressed significant curiosity about the nature of the Serious Games program and were very supportive of its existence, which is promising for the future of the program.

**Faculty:**

On October 2nd, 2017, at the regularly scheduled faculty meeting, the Computational Media department faculty were shown the PDST and total cost information for both the GPM M.S. 15-month program, and the Serious Games program. Since both programs share the same financial model, these two conversations occurred simultaneously. After being shown the costs of comparable programs, the faculty were satisfied that reasonable value is being provided to the students, and did not express dissent.