

Multi-Year Plan for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Levels Effective Beginning Summer or Fall 2022

PART A

The Regents approved the amended *Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition* at the March 2017 Regents meeting. Please review the amended policy and keep it in mind during your planning process and while completing Parts A and B of this form: <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3103.html>. By fall 2020, the amended Regents Policy 3103 will apply to all PDST programs.

I. PROJECTED PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION AND PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

I.a. Specify your projected Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for each year of your multi-year plan. While programs typically craft three-year plans, programs are permitted to craft multi-year plans for two, three, four, or five years. If specified years in the table do not apply to your multi-year plan, please leave those columns blank (and continue to do so throughout the template). Please also refer to the planning assumptions for further details about fee increase rates. For programs that plan to assess different PDST levels based on residency, provide an explanation under “Additional comments.”

	Actual	New Proposed Fee		Increases/Decreases			
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2022-23		2023-24	
				%	\$	%	\$
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (CA resident)	\$10,176	\$10,176	\$10,176	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (Nonresident)	\$10,176	\$10,176	\$10,176	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Mandatory Systemwide Fees*	\$12,570	\$12,852	\$13,176	2.2%	\$282	2.5%	\$324
Campus-based Fees**	\$1,590	\$1,621	\$1,654	2.0%	\$32	2.0%	\$32
Nonresident Suppl. Tuition	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Other (explain below)***							
Est. First-Year Fees (CA resident)	\$24,336	\$24,649	\$25,006	1.3%	\$314	1.4%	\$356
Est. First-Year Fees (Nonresident)	\$36,581	\$36,894	\$37,251	0.9%	\$314	1.0%	\$356

* Mandatory systemwide charges include Tuition and Student Services Fee for the fall, winter, and spring terms.

** Include compulsory campus-based fees for the fall, winter, and spring terms. Do not include the Student Health Insurance Program (SHIP) premium, since this may be waived for students with qualifying coverage under another program.

*** Include Course Materials and Services Fees but not health kits. Include disability insurance fee for medicine and dentistry. Include summer fees (Tuition, the SSF, and campus-based fees).

I.b. Please describe the nature and purpose of the program for which you propose to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition.

The UC Berkeley School of Public Health (BPH) is committed to teaching and training the next generations of Public Health Changemakers. A Berkeley Public Health Changemaker is an identity and set of values that we strive to imbue in our students.

- A BPH Changemaker is a leader who is people-focused, believing that Health is a right for all. We work to empower our Changemakers to advocate for health equity and against systemic injustice and racism.
- Changemakers believe in strength through Diversity, Inclusion and Equity. We believe that diversity is an asset that allows us to collaborate across disciplines and partner with the communities that we serve.
- Changemakers question the status quo, approach problems with curiosity, and are lifelong learners who lead with humility and empathy.
- Changemakers are not only taught to be great thinkers, and researchers, but also to be great “doers” and lead from wherever they are.

We develop BPH Changemakers through a deep commitment to teaching and training in the areas of social and environmental justice, scientific inquiry and discovery, and community-engaged public health action. In addition to providing our students with a world-class education in the science and practice of public health, we are committed to training a diverse public health workforce with the leadership skills to navigate the constantly changing landscape of public health. From global pandemics to antiracism, we work to instill the BPH Changemaker identity into all of our students.

Central to our mission is a commitment to increasing the diversity of our student population to reflect the local and global communities where they will serve. We believe that by training the next generation of diverse public health professionals with these values and skills, we can help change the outcomes of some of our world’s most vexing problems. Through our justice and social transformative change initiatives incorporated into pedagogical praxis and co-curricular activities, students gain a critical lens that enables them to recognize and assuage harms caused by social and structural determinants of health. The PDST helps to provide the critical services and resources to our students to aid in training them as the next generation of BPH Changemakers.

Established in 1944, the two graduate programs affected by this Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) proposal are the Masters in Public Health (MPH) and the Doctor of Public Health (DrPH). The MPH degree can be completed in either one, two, or three years. There is a one year accelerated MPH, a two year MPH, and a three year concurrent degree. We offer options for completing our Masters in Public Health program concurrently with five other Berkeley schools including the Haas School of Business (MBA/MPH), Goldman School of Public Policy (MPP/MPH), School of Social Welfare (MSW/MPH), School of Journalism (MJ/MPH)

and College of Environmental Design and Department of City and Regional Planning (MCP/MPH). BPH has established these concurrent degree programs with other programs and departments on campus to allow students to take advantage of the unique opportunities for interdisciplinary education that a letters and sciences university like Berkeley can offer. These programs are carefully designed to enable students to complete the requirements for two degrees in less time than is normally required to complete the two degrees separately.

The majority of our MPH students complete the two-year MPH program. The DrPH program is typically 3-5 years in length. These two programs enrolled 397 students as of fall 2021 (36 DrPH students and 361 MPH). Through our MPH and DrPH programs, we educate students from California and around the world in multiple disciplines within the field of public health (Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental Health Sciences, Global Health & Environment, Health Policy & Management, Health & Social Behavior, Infectious Diseases & Vaccinology, Maternal Child & Adolescent Health, and Public Health Nutrition, and in interdisciplinary areas such as Global Health and Multicultural Health). Our graduates go on to lead and work in the public health workforce, locally, nationally, and globally and contribute to addressing the public health workforce shortages that we have experienced in recent years.

Our alumni, 18,000 strong, have made historic contributions to the field of Public Health. From the Social Determinants of Health by Sir Michael Marmot, to the Life Course perspective developed by our Dean, Dr. Michael Lu, our alumni are thought leaders in the field globally and locally. The ripple effect of Berkeley Public Health alumni is significant. While many of our alumni remain in California and support the public health needs of our state, a large number also work nationally and globally, leading innovation that affects populations here in California and abroad.

Each year more than 1,200 diverse undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students are trained to develop transdisciplinary solutions to improve population health, especially for the most vulnerable. Our Career Services annually tracks career outcomes of graduates; among the most recent class year of master's and doctoral students (94% response rate, 2019), the top employment areas were: 23% of graduates worked in a healthcare system, 19% in academia, 15% in government, 12% at a non-profit, 10% at a consulting firm, and 21% at another kind of organization in the private sector (e.g., biotech, pharmaceutical). According to the 2021 U.S. News and World Report, the UC Berkeley School of Public Health graduate program is ranked eighth (tied with Boston University).

II. PROGRAM GOAL EVALUATION

II.a. Please identify the goals you listed in your last multi-year plan. Specifically, what were the purposes for which your program proposed to charge PDST, and what were your goals with respect to enhancing affordability, diversity, and program quality? Please feel free to describe other goals, as well. Describe how you used PDST revenue to advance the goals specified. Please elaborate on the extent to which your program has achieved each of the goals, highlighting how goals have been affected due to COVID-19, and include quantitative indicators of achievement wherever possible.

In our last multi-year plan, which spanned three years from 2018-19 to 2020-21, we increased the PDST by 5% annually in order to achieve two goals:

- **Ensure a balanced budget, which included meeting campus-wide budget targets and covering merit increases for the student services staff and salary and fee remission increases for the instructors and GSI/GSRs who are paid from PDST revenues.**
 - **Result-** we have had a balanced budget for the last 3 years.
- **Increase financial aid, in the form of both graduate student awards and fee remissions for GSI/GSR positions**
 - **Result-** Total investment in aid and fee remission to residential students in FY21 was \$8.8M, up nearly 20% over the past three years from \$7.4M in FY19.

We used the funds from the PDST increases to help us maintain a balanced budget by using a portion of these funds to cover 3% merit increases for our Student Services and Diversity, Respect, Equity, Action, Multiculturalism (DREAM) teams and to support the increases in fee remissions for the instructors and GSIs who are paid from PDST revenues. PDST funds supported the salaries of our Student Services Team, including our Assistant Dean for Students, Admissions and Recruitment staff, and members of our DREAM office staff.

It should be noted that most of our Student Services staff are new within the last two years. In our exit surveys from 2015-2021, we have seen a steady increase in student satisfaction for the services that were provided by our Student Services staff as shown in the following table:

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following SPH services and resources: Student Services & Admissions

Among all graduate degree respondents

	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		N/A	Total	Total Less N/A
2021	43	45.30%	37	38.90%	15	15.80%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	96	95
2019	66	34.40%	74	38.50%	37	19.30%	12	6.30%	3	1.60%	6	198	192
2018	65	32.20%	90	44.60%	39	19.30%	8	4.00%	0	0.00%	4	206	202
2017	64	32.20%	94	47.20%	32	16.10%	8	4.00%	1	0.50%	10	209	199
2016	31	17.50%	78	44.10%	56	31.60%	8	4.50%	4	2.30%	20	197	177
2015	33	19.50%	78	46.20%	45	26.60%	9	5.30%	4	2.40%	13	182	169

Please note: No survey was administered in 2020 due to COVID-19.

Additionally, the following table displays the survey results when we disaggregate professional degree students only (MPH, DrPH) for the last four years:

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following SPH services and resources: Student Services & Admissions

Among all professional degree respondents (i.e., excludes MA, MS, PhD)

	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Neutral		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		N/A	Total	Total Less N/A
2021	41	50.00%	29	35.40%	12	14.60%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	82	82
2019	54	32.30%	66	39.50%	32	19.20%	12	7.20%	3	1.80%	6	173	167
2018	56	32.60%	81	47.10%	30	17.40%	5	2.90%	0	0.00%	4	176	172
2017	55	33.30%	79	47.90%	24	14.50%	6	3.60%	1	0.60%	8	173	165

Please note: No survey was administered in 2020 due to COVID-19. Data from 2015 and 2016 respondents are not available disaggregated by degree type.

In summary, the percentage of students reporting satisfaction or high satisfaction with Student Services & Admissions grew from 65.7% among 2015 graduate degree respondents to 84.2% among 2021 respondents. In particular, the percentage of students reporting high satisfaction more than doubled during that time, from 19.5% to 45.3%.

Among professional degree recipients who responded to the exit survey: The percentage of students reporting satisfaction or high satisfaction with Student Services & Admissions grew from 81.2% among 2017 respondents to 85.4% among 2021 respondents. In particular, the percentage of students reporting high satisfaction grew from 33.3% in 2017 to 50.0% in 2021.

We are encouraged by the increased satisfaction with the services provided. In addition, these staff and programs provided important support to our students during the COVID-19 pandemic including:

- **Tutoring support in Biostatistics and Epidemiology:** to help students who are returning to school or who need extra support in these courses. We used PDST to provide Graduate Student Instructors that provide in-person and remote tutoring throughout the semester.
- **Mental health supports:** The COVID-19 pandemic, especially the 18 months of remote learning, exacerbated student's stress and anxiety. While we refer students in crisis to campus health services for emergency support, we were seeing students struggling with day-to-day stress caused by the isolation and stress of the pandemic. To help provide additional support to these students, we provided facilitated support circles for our students. The circles met bi-weekly during the spring and fall 2021 semesters. Trained therapists or coaches facilitated the circles. We plan to continue to offer these circles during the spring 2022 semester as well. PDST funds were used to cover the cost of these circles.
- **Emergency student support:** We use the PDST funds to create a small food and snack pantry for our graduate students. We have a small kitchen in our student center that we stock with healthy snacks and small meals for students while they are on campus and in need of a meal. In addition, we also provided a small assortment of packaged food for students to take home. We are committed to providing our students with basic needs that students need to perform well in school. We utilized PDST funds for these services, in addition to funding from BPH academic programs and donations from faculty.

In addition to funding our Student Services core and providing the support listed above, PDST funds were used to address student debt through increased financial aid for students, fee remissions, and compensation for Graduate Student Instructors. In FY21, the School invested \$3.4M in student awards, \$2.3M in fellowships, and \$3M for GSI/GSR support. The sources of funding included \$5.1M from research funds, \$1.7M from restricted gifts and endowments and \$2M from unrestricted funds (including \$1.6M of PDST). The School of Public Health used PDST funds to support the Graduate Student Instructor positions needed to help teach the core courses that are required for all MPH and DrPH students. It is important to note that the majority of our student aid comes from endowments and restricted funds. The School has 100 different gift and endowment funds dedicated to financial aid – in FY22 there was \$1.65M available in current gifts and payout, plus an additional \$500K balance. Of these funds, eleven are funds-functioning-as-endowments (FFE), with a combined corpus market value of \$2.1M.

III. PROGRAM GOALS AND EXPENDITURE PLANS

III.a. Please provide strong rationale for either initiating or increasing Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition during the years of this multi-year plan. What goals are you trying to meet and what problems are you trying to solve with your proposed PDST levels? How will the quality of your program change as a consequence of additional PDST revenue? What will be the consequence(s) if proposed PDST levels are not approved? What will be the essential educational benefits for students given the new PDST revenue?

We are proposing no increase in the PDST from FY23-FY24. This means that the PDST will remain at the FY22 amount of \$10,176 for the next two years. We are proposing this because we are keenly aware of the financial burdens that have affected our students and their families as a result of COVID-19. Keeping the PDST amount flat will provide time for our students and their families to get back on track financially as we recover from the severe financial impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The goals for the proposed multi-year plan are the following:

- 1. We will continue to maintain student support service levels and support the BPH Student Services Core. This includes our Student Services Team, DREAM Office, and staff in our Center for Public Health Practice and Leadership who are part of the BPH Student Services Core.**
- 2. We will provide GSI support for all core BPH courses, and student financial aid.**

Goal 1- Justification

The PDST funds support our Student Services Core. This includes salary and benefits for the staff in Student Services, the DREAM office, and some staff from our Center for Public Health Leadership (CPHPL). We are aware that there will be merit increases for our personnel that need to be covered over the next two years. We plan to cover those potential increases from other revenue sources. The Student Services Core, DREAM, and CPHPL provide critical support to our students, from tutoring, mentoring, and social support to professional development and career development support for our students as they complete their graduate education at BPH.

In addition, some of these funds support non-compensation activities that benefit our students including:

- Our annual Commencement, Admitted Students Day, and Welcome Week activities.
- Student Support Circles that provide facilitated mental health support to our students in need.
- Tutoring support for our students in the areas of Epidemiology and Biostatistics and writing.
- Continued nutritional support for students through our food pantry and snack and small meals program.

The funded staff positions help to support the mission of BPH and provide our students with the professional, academic, and social support that they need in order to successfully complete their degree and to develop into the future Public Health Changemakers that our world so desperately needs.

Goal 2-Justification

The PDST funds support our Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) for all BPH core courses. BPH students hold the GSI positions. These students receive the fee remission and salary, which help fund their degrees and provide opportunities to learn how to teach. To help maintain the diversity of our student body, some of the PDST funds are used to support student financial aid in the form of scholarships. These funds also are used to help support our undocumented students who are not eligible for federal financial aid. As stated previously, we rely heavily on philanthropic gifts and fellowships to provide financial support to our students. In FY21, the School invested \$3.4M in student awards, \$2.3M in fellowships, and \$3M for GSI/GSR support. The vast majority of these investments, \$5.1M were funded by research funds, as well as \$1.7M of restricted gifts and endowments and \$2M in unrestricted funds (including PDST).

Although we are requesting a flat PDST rate at this time to allow our students and families to recover from the financial losses related to COVID, maintaining our current PDST revenue is critical. PDST is a major source of funding for our Student Services Core, including our Student Service Team, the DREAM Office Staff and our Center for Public Health Practice and Leadership team. The current PDST funds provide critical student support in addition to covering compensation for GSIs and student financial aid. Without PDST revenues, we would be forced to eliminate positions and drastically reduce the services that are provided to students, including tutoring, career services, and GSI opportunities.

III.b. For established PDST programs, please indicate how you are using total actual Professional Degree Fee revenue in 2021-22 in the first column of the table below. In the remaining columns, please indicate how you intend to use the revenue generated by the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition increase (if specified years in the table do not apply to your multi-year plan, please leave those columns blank).

	Total 2021-22 PDST Revenue	Proposed Use of Incremental PDST Revenue		Total Projected PDST Revenue in Final Year
		Incremental 2022-23 PDST revenue	Incremental 2023-24 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits/UCRP Cost	\$510,000	\$0	\$0	\$510,000
Providing Student Services	\$1,352,112	\$0	\$0	\$1,352,112
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$1,700,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,700,000
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$280,000	\$0	\$0	\$280,000
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Please explain in the "Additional Comments" below)	\$197,760	\$0	\$0	\$197,760
Total use/projected use of revenue	\$4,039,872	\$0	\$0	\$4,039,872

Additional comments: The school of public health uses endowments and gifts, as well as unrestricted sources, to meet - and exceed - the 33% return to aid requirement. We are working to grow our fundraising to be able to increase financial aid. In FY21, the School invested \$3.4M in student awards and \$2.3M in fellowships - for a total of \$5.7M. The sources of funding include \$3M from research funds, \$1.5M from restricted gifts and endowments held at the School and \$1.1M in unrestricted funds (including PDST).

III.c. Please describe cost-cutting and/or fundraising efforts related to this program undertaken to avoid Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition increases even greater than proposed. Please be as specific as possible.

Berkeley Public Health has been working hard over the past four years to reduce structural deficits in all parts of the School, including administrative, academic, and research areas. Furthermore, we have absorbed budget cuts due to the campus's goal of achieving financial sustainability plus cuts in FY21 and FY22 because of COVID budgetary impacts. BPH was able to sustain these budget reductions by repurposing existing restricted funds and cutting costs in all areas (e.g., rent costs; during COVID, implementing a hiring freeze and reducing non-comp spending). None of our budgetary cuts have negatively affected MPH and DrPH

students; one positive impact is that due to COVID, we provided more work opportunities to students who helped prepare classes for remote instruction. Despite financial pressures, we have also worked hard to make new strategic investments in key areas that support students despite budget cuts. For example, we created a new position to hire a Chief of Diversity, Equity Inclusion and Belonging and the Dean's Office invested \$250K in FY21 to support academic Divisions so that they could hire more GSIs and support faculty during the pandemic. In FY22 we invested again to expand our student services team, including hiring a 100% FTE student services program manager to support our DrPH and Interdisciplinary MPH students. We also hired a new part-time DrPH director. Because of these budgetary pressures, we have been working hard to fundraise for strategic priorities, including financial aid. In FY21, we spent \$1.5M in restricted gifts and endowments toward financial aid and \$200K towards fee remission.

III.d. If your program proposes uneven increases (e.g., increases that are notably larger in some years than in others), please explain why.

N/A

III.e. Please indicate your program's current and expected resident and nonresident enrollment in the table below. Changes in the proportions of resident and nonresident enrollment by the end of the plan should be explained under "Additional comments."

	Enrollment		
	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Resident	268	268	268
Domestic Nonresident	85	85	85
International	44	44	44
Total	397	397	397

Additional comments:

Resident enrollment comprises 68% of our total MPH and DrPH enrollment. The total number of current DrPH students is 36 and 361 MPH students for a total enrollment of 397.

IV. MARKET COMPARISONS: TOTAL CHARGES

IV.a. In the table below, identify a *minimum* of 3 and *up to* 12 institutions that are comparators, including a minimum of 3 public institutions. If it is the case that your program only compares to a small number of other programs or only private comparators, please list those.

TOTAL CHARGES TO COMPLETE DEGREE BY COHORT START YEAR							
Total <i>Resident</i> Charges to Complete Degree by Cohort Starting in:	Projections			Increases/Decreases			
	2021-22 (\$)	2022-23 (\$)	2023-24 (\$)	2022-23		2023-24	
				%	\$	%	\$
University of Minnesota	52,986	54,576	56,213	3.0%	1,590	3.0%	1,637
University of Michigan	62,560	64,437	66,370	3.0%	1,877	3.0%	1,933
University of Washington	47,226	48,643	50,102	3.0%	1,417	3.0%	1,459
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	38,853	40,019	41,220	3.0%	1,166	3.0%	1,201
Johns Hopkins University	73,980	76,199	78,485	3.0%	2,219	3.0%	2,286
Harvard University	88,134	90,778	93,501	3.0%	2,644	3.0%	2,723
Columbia University	90,713	93,434	96,237	3.0%	2,721	3.0%	2,803
Emory University	75,388	77,650	79,980	3.0%	2,262	3.0%	2,330
Average public comparison	50,406	51,919	53,476	3.0%	1,513	3.0%	1,558
Average private comparison	82,054	84,515	87,051	3.0%	2,462	3.0%	2,536
Average public and private comparison	66,230	68,217	70,264	3.0%	1,987	3.0%	2,047
Your program	48,985	49,655	50,411	1.4%	670	1.5%	756

Total <i>Nonresident</i> Charges to Complete Degree by Cohort Starting in:	Projections			Increases/Decreases			
	2021-22 (\$)	2022-23 (\$)	2023-24 (\$)	2022-23		2023-24	
				%	\$	%	\$
University of Minnesota	68,586	70,644	72,763	3.0%	2,058	3.0%	2,119
University of Michigan	102,776	105,859	109,035	3.0%	3,083	3.0%	3,176
University of Washington	80,508	82,923	85,411	3.0%	2,415	3.0%	2,488
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	73,923	76,141	78,425	3.0%	2,218	3.0%	2,284
Johns Hopkins University	73,980	76,199	78,485	3.0%	2,219	3.0%	2,286
Harvard University	88,134	90,778	93,501	3.0%	2,644	3.0%	2,723
Columbia University	90,713	93,434	96,237	3.0%	2,721	3.0%	2,803
Emory University	75,388	77,650	79,980	3.0%	2,262	3.0%	2,330
Average public comparison	81,448	83,892	86,409	3.0%	2,444	3.0%	2,517
Average private comparison	82,054	84,515	87,051	3.0%	2,462	3.0%	2,536
Average public and private comparison	81,751	84,204	86,730	3.0%	2,453	3.0%	2,526
Your program	73,475	74,145	74,901	0.9%	670	1.0%	756

Source(s): University of Minnesota: <https://www.sph.umn.edu/prospective/tuition-finances/>

University of Michigan: <https://sph.umich.edu/admissions-aid/tuition-aid.html>

University of Washington: <https://sph.washington.edu/prospective/tuition/>

University of North Carolina: <https://studentaid.unc.edu/graduate/costs/>

John Hopkins University: <https://www.jhsph.edu/admissions/tuition-and-fees>

Harvard University: <https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/student-billing/>

Columbia University: <https://www.mailman.columbia.edu/become-student/how-apply/tuition-and-fees>

Emory University: <https://www.sph.emory.edu/admissions/tuition/index.html>

Additional comments: Amounts reflect two-year MPH programs. Most of the comparator institutions charge the same amount for MPH programs as they do for DrPH programs. Also note that the DrPH is a 4-5 year program and, hence, the total cost is higher.

IV.b. Why was each of these institutions chosen as a comparator (and, as appropriate, explain why a minimum of three public comparators were not chosen)? Include specific reasons why each is considered a peer – for example, competition for the same students and faculty, admitted student pools of similar quality, similar student-faculty ratios, similar program quality, an aspirational relationship between your program and the peer program, etc. What other characteristics do they have in common? If you have included aspirational programs, explain why your program aspires to be comparable to these programs and how it expects to do so within five years. Be specific (and if a program is unlikely to achieve comparability to an aspirational program within five years, the aspirational program should not be included).

Each of these institutions was chosen as a comparator because we consider them peers and we consistently compete for the same students and faculty. Each of these institutions (like us) is ranked among the top 10 Schools of Public Health, according to the U.S. News & World Report national rankings and offer comparable programs and degrees with similar program quality. Based on Schools of Public Health Application Service (SOPHAS) data, we have learned that many of the students we admit are often also admitted to these peer institutions. In addition, students who we admit that subsequently decline our admission offer typically choose to attend Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, or one of the other institutions. It should be noted that when we queried students about why they chose a different school, many commented that the cost and more generous financial aid packages offered by our peer institutions played a major role in their decision to go elsewhere.

IV.c. Please comment on how your program's costs compare with those of the comparison institutions identified in the table above.

Berkeley is on average with the other public-school comparators and charges less than the private average for residential and nonresidential tuition. Our current cost to degree completion for our 2-year MPH program in-state residential students is \$48,985 for tuition and fees (excluding health insurance), which is 3% lower than the average of our public and 51% lower than our private peers. Similarly, the tuition and fees (excluding health insurance) for out-of-state students of \$73,475 is 10% lower than the average of our public peer and 11% lower than our private peers.

BPH is located on a letters and science campus, while the other comparable schools are co-located on medical campuses. This difference in campus context may result in widely different cost structures, given that medical schools typically are much more self-funded while letters and science campuses tend to require more outside support. This could lead to public programs on medical campuses being priced artificially low because they receive direct and indirect benefits from the medical school. In addition, the difference in tuition costs may reflect a pricing strategy to keep costs artificially low for residential students at public programs to meet public and legislative objectives and due to the difference in the cost of living. Although our program charges significantly less than the public and private average for in state and out-of-state students, the cost of living in the Bay Area is higher than the average cost of living in other parts of the country. This cost of living differential is becoming an increasing challenge for BPH to recruit students who are coming from states or even areas of California where the cost of living is less expensive. Hence, it is important to be able to offer student aid and keep our tuition and fees at a reasonable level to help offset some of the student debt incurred by living and going to school in the Bay Area.

IV.d. Please comment on how the quality of your program is unique and/or distinguishable from your chosen comparison institutions.

The BPH's impact and promise are built upon a tradition of excellence championed by renowned faculty and alumni who are Changemakers not only in research and scholarship but also in transforming how we think about public health itself. According to data from the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health (ASPPH), BPH offers smaller masters and doctoral cohorts, smaller classes, and lower advisor-student ratios in comparison to our peer institutions. We believe all of these institutional attributes lead to more personalized advising, mentoring and coaching, and a much richer student academic experience.

Berkeley offers a similar educational experience to our comparators with one key difference: the other comparable schools are co-located on medical campuses, while BPH is located on a letters and science campus. That means our environment offers students multiple opportunities to expand public health theories and concepts by integrating other disciplines such as anthropology, business, sociology, political science, public policy, law, journalism or engineering. Schools of Public Health on medical campuses tend to focus more on public health issues from a clinical perspective. Being on a letters and sciences campus allows students to apply an interdisciplinary lens to their work. For instance, students who are interested in advocacy or in business can supplement their degrees by taking elective courses offered by the Schools of Law or Public Policy. This sort of training helps to train public health professionals with more innovative skill sets and the ability to approach public health problems from a multidisciplinary perspective. Our academic programs are highly flexible and customizable with many options for electives inside and outside of the School of Public Health. We also offer five specialty certificates (Global Health, Public Health Nutrition, Maternal Child and Adolescent Health, Aging and Multicultural Health) and we offer our Masters in Public Health program concurrently with five other Berkeley schools

including the Haas School of Business, Goldman School of Public Policy, School of Social Welfare, School of Journalism and College of Environmental Design and Department of City and Regional Planning.

Over the last two years, BPH has also embarked on a journey to become an antiracist institution. This happened in response to the murders of George Floyd and countless other Black people shot and killed by police, and the ongoing need to address structural racism within academia. BPH is working to address structural racism through initiatives at the staff, faculty, student and administrative levels that address the impacts of racism on our community. As a result, members of our community, including our students, are learning new skills and ways to become more antiracist. Through extensive antiracist training for students, graduate student instructors, faculty, staff, and non-faculty academics have gained skills in racial literacy, cultural humility, and accountability. A few examples of how these skills can be seen and experienced through:

- Incorporation of antiracist syllabi language
- Including antiracist content in courses learned from the faculty antiracist pedagogy academy
- Methods to self-assess and move through difficult conversations in the classroom and workspace
- Changemaker antiracist micro course taught by MPH/JMP alumnus
- Proposed second option for the Berkeley Graduate Academic Unit Graduate Certification: Racism, Health and Social Justice
- BPH bias incident form to celebrate and report incidents related to antiracism, diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging
- Graduate level elective course about antiracism and public health offered each spring since 2020.
- Annual antiracism training for all incoming graduate students and the addition of an antiracism course offered in the spring semester of each academic year since 2020.

In addition to the actions and activities above, we have also provided facilitated antiracism training opportunities for our faculty, staff, and students.

- The Faculty Antiracist Pedagogy Leadership Academy is a program for faculty to participate to learn about pedagogical applications of antiracism in the classroom.
- The staff antiracism training guides staff to learn about how to interrupt racism in the workplace.
- Students at BPH are introduced to the concept of antiracism during orientation to the graduate program.
- Students also have the option to take an elective course about antiracism and public health.

Training our school community to be able to interrupt racism is a competency we are proud to be working to instill and we believe is one of the many ways that a degree from BPH is unique.

V. ENROLLMENT AND DIVERSITY STRATEGY

V.a. In the table on the following page, please provide details about enrollment in your program and in your comparison public and private institutions. The enrollment figures provided should align with the most recent three years for which data are available.

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Comparison (2019-20)	
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	Fall 2021	Publics	Privates
Ethnicity						
Underrepresented						
African American	5%	9%	7%	10%	10%	12%
Hispanic/Latino(a)	7%	19%	19%	18%	5%	7%
American Indian	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Subtotal Underrepresented	12%	29%	27%	29%	16%	19%
Asian/Pacific Islander	20%	29%	30%	26%	10%	15%
White	21%	29%	30%	31%	58%	37%
Domestic Unknown	39%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%
International	8%	9%	9%	11%	9%	23%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	97%
Socioeconomic						
% Pell recipients	30%	41%	26%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gender						
% Male	24%	23%	22%	16%	20%	27%
% Female	75%	77%	77%	81%	79%	73%
% Non-Binary	N/A	N/A	N/A	1%	N/A	N/A
% Unknown	1%	N/A	1%	2%	1%	0%

Sources:

UC ethnicity, socioeconomic status: UC Corporate data

Comparison institutions: Comparison institutions are those listed in table in Section 4A The comparison data came from the ASPPH data center. The difference in the percentages is due to there being a mixed race category that is not included in the UC Corporate data hence the comparison numbers do not add up to 100%.

V.b. For established programs, please comment on the trend in enrollment of underrepresented groups in your program over the past three years. How does your program compare with other programs in terms of racial and ethnic diversity, with particular attention to U.S. domestic underrepresented minority students? What are your prior and prospective strategies for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity (that are compliant with Proposition 209) in your program? For new programs, how do you anticipate your program will compare with other programs in terms of racial and ethnic diversity, with particular attention to U.S. domestic underrepresented minority students?

Twenty-nine (29%) of our students self-identify as underrepresented, compared to 16% among our comparator public institutions and 19% among our comparator private institutions. This is the result of a concerted effort to increase the diversity of our student body. Over the past three years, Berkeley SPH has increased enrollment of students from underrepresented groups (URG) from 12% to 29%. Given that our underrepresented minority students represent a growing share of our total enrollment, we continue to be proactively engaged in strengthening our infrastructure to be more responsive to retention and climate issues that emerge throughout the academic year. Examples include:

- Increased tutoring support utilizing the volunteer support of SPH alumni;
- Community support circles facilitated by external licensed mental health practitioners;
- Addressing food insecurity by creating a food pantry and deepening SPH's relationship with the Basic Needs Center; h
- Hiring of a full time Chief of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging;
- Hosting study hall during RRR week inclusive of wellness activities;
- Offering leadership skills workshops for URM students.

Though we have made significant gains, Berkeley SPH and the University are less diverse than the state's URM populations of 47.5% and California's public schools URM population of 60.7%. The most significant enrollment gap is of our Hispanic and Latino students: Berkeley SPH is currently 18%, state of California is 39.4%, and California public schools are 54.9% and nationally 18.4%.

Berkeley SPH seeks to remain in alignment with the University's mission to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of our graduate students to closely reflect the population diversity of the state of California, particularly with respect to Hispanic and Latino students. The DREAM Office continues to lead efforts to bolster the pipeline and increase the pool of qualified applicants from underrepresented and disadvantaged backgrounds by:

- (1) Strengthening outreach to and linkages with external programs and partners** (i.e., Gates Millennium Scholars Program, McNair Scholars Program, Mentoring In Medicine and Science) with high numbers of qualified, prospective students;
- (2) Expanding relationships with community colleges, CSU campuses, historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), Tribal Universities, and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs); and**
- (3) Developing relationships with Bay Area high schools with pre-health or STEM programs.**

During 2021, the DREAM Office began to foster a deeper relationship with the American Indian Graduate Program to provide workshops unique to prospective and current Native students in SPH. Further, we are enhancing our holistic admission review process to ensure and support a comprehensive and equitable evaluation of all applicants and have made the GRE optional for our MPH and DrPH applicants during the last two admissions cycles. Lastly, Berkeley SPH will strengthen outreach and mentorship to admitted students, enhance funding packages (including scholarships, fellowships, GSI/GSRs, etc.) and increase multicultural health curriculum, co-curricular offerings centered on the social and structural determinants of health, and research opportunities in order to increase the matriculation rate of successful URM applicants. We continue to actively fundraise to support these efforts.

V.c. For established programs, please comment on the trend in enrollment of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (e.g., students who received Pell Grants as undergraduates). What are your strategies for promoting access for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds?

The trend for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds has fluctuated, from 30% receiving Pell Grant in 2018-19, to 41% in 2019-20, and a decrease occurring in 2020-21, which coincided with the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite this fluctuation, Berkeley SPH has refocused its efforts to assess and enhance our approach by building long-term relationships with prospective and enrolled students from low socioeconomic backgrounds and increase their awareness of application fee waivers options as well as funding opportunities that are available to them once they enroll into our programs (GSA, GSI, GSR, work study, fellowships, and more). To date we have established a small stipend for low socioeconomic applicants who may still require financial assistance for their application and we have continued fundraising strategies focused on this population, including a recent proposal to the Blue Shield Foundation that prioritizes building a more diverse healthcare administration workforce. In addition, the Graduate Division recently approved our request to reduce the UCB Graduate Application fee for all of our professional degree students to a flat fee of \$100. Some specific examples of outreach to low SES students include: sending targeted email messages; designed application workshops; facilitated online webinars; and implemented social media campaigns for students participating in the Gates Millennium Scholars Program, McNair Scholars Program, Upward Bound, Project IMHOTEP, MESA program, and those enrolled in community colleges, CSU campuses, HBCUs, Tribal Universities, and HSIs (since many of them have historically been eligible for Pell grants and are from low socioeconomic backgrounds). Currently, SPH has decreased the number of academic divisions that rely on the GRE and hosted a training on utilization of non-cognitive variables, experiences, and attributes to assess a candidates' readiness for SPH. Our admissions and recruitment team also pivoted to a series of online events to engage as many of these students in early stages of the recruitment process during events such as graduate recruitment fairs, and pre-health and STEM specific events.

Berkeley SPH has also begun to address the basic needs of students such as creating a community refrigerator, supplying snacks in SPH community spaces, connecting students with community partners for health care needs and emergency support, providing group counseling services, increased academic support, and hotspots for those with limited or poor access to internet services, and more. The addition of these services will demonstrate to students from low socioeconomic backgrounds that they can thrive socially, psychologically, and academically in Berkeley SPH.

V.d. For established programs, how does your program compare with other programs in terms of gender parity? What is your strategy for promoting gender parity (that is compliant with Proposition 209) in your program? For new programs, how do you anticipate your program will compare with other programs in terms of gender parity, and why? What will be your strategy for promoting gender parity in your program?

Our program is comparable to other programs as it relates to gender parity. We have noticed historical trends of more female applicants than male applicants, which typically lead to a higher percentage of female admitted students and matriculates than male admitted students do and matriculates across the various concentrations in our programs. National data also show that males are typically more highly represented in other STEM fields like molecular and cellular biology, neuroscience, chemistry, physics, engineering, computer science, and math rather than in applied disciplines like public health and occupational health. Also, our fall 2021 data show that 1% of our population identifies as non-binary.

We plan to implement more targeted outreach in future admission cycles and we will use many of the same strategies we outlined for creating a more robust level of racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic diversity for promoting gender parity among our applicants, admitted students, and matriculates. Some examples include strengthening the linkages and pipeline to all-male institutions like Morehouse College, which is nationally recognized as a top feeder HBCU for top medical and dental schools and schools of public health. Building connections to pre-college and pre-health initiatives designed for boys and young men like the African American Male Pipeline Project (AAMPP) at the University, 100 Black Men Collegiate Collective at the University, and the Striving Black Brothers Coalition (SBBC) at Chabot College. Our DREAM Office will seek to confer with our other URM student organizations to development partnerships that will increase male and non-binary student enrollment over the next three years.

V.e. In the final year of your multi-year plan, how do you expect the composition of students in your program to compare with the composition identified in the table above with respect to underrepresented minority students, Pell Grant recipients, and gender? Explain your reasoning.

In the final year of the multi-year plan (FY24), we hope to see increases in URG applicants, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., students who received Pell Grants as undergraduates), and greater gender diversity due to targeted outreach and linkages outlined above. We believe that implementing these strategies, in addition to more substantial financial aid awards, will have a positive impact on recruitment and diversity outcomes.

V.f. In the tables below, please provide details about the faculty diversity of the school or department that houses your program. (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. If the program draws faculty from multiple schools or departments, please include two tables for each school/department.) The figures provided should align with the most recent three years for which data are available.

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.

All Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Black/ African/ African American	Domestic	7.8%	7.2%	6.3%
	International			
Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Domestic	7.1%	7.2%	8.5%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Native Hawaiian	Domestic			
Asian/ Pacific Islander	Domestic	12.1%	10.1%	12.7%
	International			
White	Domestic	66.0%	64.7%	63.4%
	International			
Two or More Races	Domestic	1.4%	2.9%	2.8%
	International			
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	5.7%	7.9%	6.3%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Female		57.4%	52.5%	52.1%
Male		42.6%	39.6%	35.2%
Non-Binary/Unknown		N/A	7.9%	12.7%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Black/ African/ African American	Domestic	11.6%	8.5%	8.3%
	International			
Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Domestic	7.0%	4.3%	4.2%
	International			
American Indian	Domestic			
Native Hawaiian	Domestic			
Asian/ Pacific Islander	Domestic	7.0%	8.5%	10.4%
	International			
White	Domestic	72.1%	72.3%	72.9%
	International			
Two or More Races	Domestic	2.3%	4.3%	4.2%
	International			
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
	International			
Percentage by Gender		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Female		48.8%	48.9%	45.8%
Male		51.2%	48.9%	39.6%
Non-Binary/Unknown		N/A	2.1%	14.6%

Source: UC Corporate data

V.g. What are your campus efforts and, specifically, your program's current and proposed efforts (that are compliant with Proposition 209) to advance the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty?

Diversity, equity, and inclusion are core values of Berkeley Public Health. Overall, our LR faculty is 12.5% URM and 52% women, with several faculty who are openly LGBTQ. Among the 12 Senate faculty hires over the past five years (since 2016), 2 self-identify as African American, 1 as Latinx, and 3 were women. While our faculty diversity compares favorably with the rest of campus (11% URM and 33% women) and surpasses the racial and ethnic diversity of other schools of public health (average for schools and programs of public health nationwide = 12%), we strive to do even better. We are employing a number of strategies to improve diversity and promote equity, inclusion, and belonging among our faculty. Three particularly noteworthy efforts over the past year include:

- 1) Improving our faculty hiring practices,
- 2) Building an antiracist culture within the SPH, and
- 3) Improving faculty climate, particularly with respect to equity across our diverse faculty titles.

Faculty Hiring Practices

In an effort to introduce more DEI best practices in faculty hiring, assure consistency across the SPH, and improve efficiency, we created standard SPH search committee guidance and a new standard SPH search plan template that sets minimum requirements for all faculty searches in the SPH. The guidance document and search plan template draw on best practices from the literature on recruiting and hiring a diverse faculty as well as the successes of searches in other academic units on the UC Berkeley campus (Engineering and Life Sciences, College of Natural Resources), lessons learned from other universities, and the expertise of our experienced faculty; and is designed to recruit a broad and diverse candidate pool for all faculty searches. Our new standardized search process has been vetted with our Academic Personnel Committee and our Faculty Council and is currently being piloted for our two ongoing searches, after which we will determine any needed modifications and/or flexibilities.

Our new faculty hiring process includes, among other things:

- Composition of the search committee: The search committee is required to reflect diversity along a number of dimensions including, but not limited to, race and ethnicity, sexual and gender identity, first generation status and disability status to enhance the recruitment, review, and selection process by ensuring that diverse perspectives are taken into account. This will also help identify DEIB issues for discussion early on that may surface in broader departmental deliberations at later stages of the search process.
- Required DEI training for all search committee chairs
- Required DEI training of all search committees

- Creation of a standard SPH outreach activities protocol and list of standard advertising outlets, and expanding our paid targeted URM recruitment (the protocol and list can be tailored to specific searches but must meet minimum standards)
- Personal outreach by the search committee
- Working closely with the PFPF office to conduct targeted outreach
- Blinded review of DEI statements and DEI calibration exercise among the search committee (reliability/usability)
- Evaluation of the DEI statement during phase I of the search process and weighing the DEI statement equally with research and teaching
- Requiring a DEI talk as part of the campus visit
- Close partnership of the Equity Adviser (EA) and requirement of the EA to approve the long, medium, and short list candidates as well as other clearly stated EA responsibilities
- Clearly stated responsibilities of the search committee chair, including upholding the integrity of the search and monitoring and addressing power imbalances and bias
- Creation of an online resource library of DEI best practices in faculty hiring (e.g., search committee composition, letters of reference, use of standard evaluation criteria and rubrics)

Building an Antiracist Culture with BPH.

Our Antiracist Community 4 Justice and Social Transformative Change Program launched in summer 2020. The program is still in its early stages but includes various strategies intended to transform institutional culture and climate. This includes:

1. Centering antiracism and racial equity praxis in the SPH education mission, thereby improving our ability to recruit, retain and graduate a highly qualified and diverse student body for addressing long-standing racial and ethnic health inequities locally and globally.
2. Investing in continuous faculty and workforce development, enhancing the overall sense of community, and belonging within SPH as we work collectively toward the common goal of becoming an antiracist institution.
3. Advancing the SPH and UCB's DEI mission among all SPH constituencies (faculty, staff, students, non-faculty academics, alumni association, Dean's external Advisory Board)
4. Becoming an exemplar for other Schools of Public Health.

Activities during the current academic year have included:

- Foundational antiracism training for all faculty (90% participation rate), staff, graduate student instructors, non-faculty academics, and incoming students

- Development of an advanced antiracism and racial justice graduate elective course that addresses racialized policies, practices, principles, and propulsion; and a myriad of divisional-level activities including an antiracist book club in Biostatistics and an elective course in EHS.

We are also conducting strategic planning to develop short, medium, and long-term goals to help sustain our efforts over the next many years, as well as developing metrics and collecting data to measure progress toward these goals.

Improving Faculty Climate.

Since Dean Michael Lu's arrival we've taken a number steps to improve equity and inclusion for all faculty, including implementation of new initiatives to provide supports and mentoring for junior faculty, addressing workload inequities (teaching and service), and improving school climate (e.g., UCOP-funded project to improve climate for URM faculty, comprehensive sexual harassment prevention strategy, Beyond Diversity training for faculty and staff on equity and inclusion which has included participants from the SPH and from across campus). Additionally, BPH has focused particular attention on inequities across faculty titles (ladder, professors in residence, adjunct) which had become a pain point prior to Dean Lu's arrival. The Junior Faculty Mentoring Program has served as a continual source of communication and support between junior faculty, senior faculty mentors/allies/sponsors, and the Dean's office; enabling community building, identification of pain points, and collective problem solving and decision-making. Other efforts include piloting financial support for soft-money faculty (e.g., bridge funding program) and assuring consistency and equity in recruitment, teaching and service expectations, and other support for junior and soft-money faculty across the SPH.

VI. FINANCIAL AID STRATEGY AND PROGRAM AFFORDABILITY

VI.a. What are your financial aid/affordability goals for your program? How do you measure your success in meeting them? How will your financial aid strategies (e.g., eligibility criteria, packaging policy) help achieve these goals?

Our financial aid and affordability goals align with our goals for increasing the diversity of our student body. In querying students who declined our offer of admission to BPH during the last admissions cycle, we learned that two main reasons students declined our offer were the lack of financial aid resources, and the high cost of living in the Bay Area. In order to address these issues of affordability, we are working hard to attract more fundraising for financial aid, and to review how we distribute existing gifts/endowments, PDST, and university grants to ensure financial aid is available to students who are not able to cover the high cost of attendance on their own. In addition to the current funding streams that we employ, SPH is currently working with foundations in California to fund or endow a postgraduate public health residency and loan repayment program to create a pathway for URG students into governmental public health service in local health departments. This sort of program could help students reduce their overall indebtedness so that they can comfortably choose a career in public service without the impact of crushing student loan

debt. The flexibility of the PDST funds along with philanthropy also allows us to also offer financial assistance to undocumented students. These students are often high achieving exceptional students who are not eligible for federal aid or loans making the dream of getting an MPH or DrPH from BPH out of reach. We utilize PDST funds to provide funding opportunities to these students.

We continue to have increased applications from and enrollment of highly qualified and diverse students. In 2021 we recruited our largest and most diverse class ever with 72 URG students accepting our offer of admission (previously, the highest number was 56 URG students in 2019 - see table below). We continue to have a strong track record with matriculation rates of accepted students over the last several years and we continue to track the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic demographics of our students. The data show that we are making our programs increasingly accessible to applicants from low-income and diverse backgrounds but there is room for more growth. This will continue to be an area of focus for us during the next PDST cycle.

	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Admit Headcount	Admit Headcount	Admit Headcount	Admit Headcount	Admit Headcount	Yield Headcount	Yield Headcount	Yield Headcount	Yield Headcount	Yield Headcount
Year	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
TOTAL	913	1280	961	878	1368	405	477	480	485	556	124	191	188	179	227
TOTAL URG	148	218	200	158	292	66	82	113	93	136	24	35	56	39	72
TOTAL Asian	126	298	180	218	315	69	126	112	127	142	24	63	50	57	52
TOTAL Students of Color (URG + Asian)	274	516	380	376	607	135	208	225	220	278	48	98	106	96	124
% URM	16%	17%	21%	18%	21%	16%	17%	24%	19%	24%	19%	18%	30%	22%	32%

	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Applied Headcount	Admit Rate	Admit Rate	Admit Rate	Admit Rate	Admit Rate	Yield Rate	Yield Rate	Yield Rate	Yield Rate	Yield Rate
Year	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
TOTAL	913	1280	961	878	1368	44%	37%	50%	55%	41%	31%	40%	39%	37%	41%
TOTAL URG	148	218	200	158	292	45%	38%	57%	59%	47%	36%	43%	50%	42%	53%
TOTAL Asian	126	298	180	218	315	55%	42%	62%	58%	45%	35%	50%	45%	45%	37%
TOTAL Students of Color (URG + Asian)	274	516	380	376	607	49%	40%	59%	59%	46%	36%	47%	47%	44%	45%

Source: CalAnswers (Grad Apps by Multiple Fields). Counts include MPH, DrPH, and Concurrent Degree Programs. URG is defined as Black, Hispanic/Latinx, American-Indian or Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Numbers may be slightly off due to rounding due headcount extrapolations.

Over the last 3 years, BPH has enhanced our financial aid strategy and worked toward implementing best practices. Some examples:

- Bundling smaller scholarships and fellowships to offer larger scholarship packages at the \$15-20K range for top recruits.
- For 2021 admissions, we topped off student awards awards to align funding packages with offers from our competitors.
- We offered \$2000 - \$5000 travel stipends to students who were moving from outside of the Bay Area (including from out of state) to help with the costs associated with relocating to the Bay Area.

Graduating Class		2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Percent with Debt	African American	44.0%	55.0%	40.0%	86.0%	64.0%	100.0%
	American Indian	N/A	0.0%	100.0%	N/A	100.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	75.0%	67.0%	67.0%	75.0%	71.0%	71.0%
	Asian/Pacific Islander	27.0%	50.0%	29.0%	43.0%	46.0%	29.0%
	White	53.0%	49.0%	44.0%	59.0%	54.0%	32.0%
	Domestic Unknown	20.0%	38.0%	33.0%	41.0%	40.0%	56.0%
	International	0.0%	17.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	8.0%
	All	38.0%	48.0%	40.0%	54.0%	47.0%	40.0%
Cumulative Debt among Students with Debt	African American	\$66,913	\$27,621	\$43,714	\$59,354	\$37,415	\$57,456
	American Indian	N/A	\$0	\$30,314	N/A	\$37,741	\$0
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	\$30,457	\$37,079	\$31,693	\$37,344	\$51,837	\$48,971
	Asian/Pacific Islander	\$45,254	\$35,018	\$39,940	\$33,983	\$28,018	\$36,961
	White	\$38,754	\$42,504	\$37,039	\$50,258	\$56,611	\$49,099
	Domestic Unknown	\$39,452	\$24,926	\$56,487	\$48,409	\$41,276	\$39,786
	International	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$65,281	\$18,000
	All	\$41,156	\$36,854	\$38,471	\$44,027	\$46,049	\$46,143

Source: UCOP Corporate data

VI.b. For established programs, please comment on the trend in the indebtedness of students in your program. What impact do you expect your proposed Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition levels and financial aid plan to have on this trend?

The cumulative debt load for our students has fluctuated over the last 5 years but has held relatively steady the past two fiscal years at \$46K. We expect that by holding the PDST rate steady for the next two years the student debt burden will decrease or at least hold student debt steady over the next two years.

	Graduates with Debt	2019-20 Average Debt at Graduation among Students with Debt	Median Salary at Graduation	Est. Debt Payment as % of Median Salary
This program	40%	\$46,143	\$70,000	9%
Public comparisons	63%	\$53,852	\$57,500	13%
Private comparisons	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Sources: [ASPPH Data Center](#) (MPH and DrPH degrees)

UC: Corporate data

Comparison institutions: [All institutions reporting to ASPPH](#). Data are not available disaggregated by institution type.

VI.c. Please describe your program's perspective on the manageability of student loan debt for your graduates in light of their typical salaries, the availability of Loan Repayment Assistance Programs, loan repayment plans, and/or any other relevant factors.

Compared to other ASPPH reporting institutions, fewer percent of our students graduate with debt (40% vs 63%), and they graduate with, on average, \$7,709 less debt. The estimated average debt of \$46,143 is less than the median salary for our graduates - among graduates in 2019 and 2020 the median salary was \$70,000 and the estimated debt payments represent 9% of median salaries. This is compared to \$57,500 for our comparator schools with estimated debt payments representing 13% of median salaries. This level has remained consistent over the last 3 years and we feel it is a manageable level of student debt.

Our Coordinator of Financial Aid and Admissions and our Director of Career Services make graduates aware of Loan Repayment Assistance Programs as well as income-driven repayment plans for federal loans (e.g., the Income-Based Repayment Plan, the Revised Pay as You Earn Plan, etc.) and the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program as they enter their graduate program and again as they prepare to leave and pursue job opportunities. However, the School of Public Health does not operate its own LRAP program.

VI.d. Please describe any resources available to students in your program, while enrolled or following graduation, to promote lower-paying public interest careers or provide services to underserved populations. Examples may include targeted scholarships, fellowships, summer or academic-year internships, and Loan Repayment Assistance Plans.

The Student Services Core, including the D.R.E.A.M Office and the Center for Public Health Practice and Leadership (CPHPL), organize various programs for students to participate in career and leadership development with the goal of developing leaders for our various communities, including the most vulnerable populations. The CPHPL team provides our students with high touch support as they navigate their required summer field work and later as they near graduation and begin to look for work. The services our

Student Services Core provide include: annual networking events, alumni panels, meet and greets with prospective employers, and individualized career counseling such as help with resume writing and interview preparation. These tools help to prepare our graduates to be competitive for both internships and job opportunities upon graduation; including for first-generation college/graduate students and other underserved populations. Additionally, CPHPL manages philanthropic funds geared towards supporting students in unpaid or underpaid summer internships in settings focused on solving pressing public health concerns, especially for our most vulnerable populations, specifically in the nonprofit and public sectors. These funds are critical in supporting students to pursue internships at public interest organizations that often face fiscal challenges but are otherwise able to offer students meaningful learning experiences and mentorship at an important juncture in their Public Health career.

Starting in 2020 the BPH CPHPL team began using an online platform/database to make job opportunities available to our students and graduates. The platform is called PHLEX (Public Health Leadership and Experience Exchange) and hosts hundreds of postings each year, including internships and fellowships, in the Public Health field. The platform also facilitates registration for Career Services workshops and appointments. These resources prove to be invaluable to our students and are available to BPH alumni for life. This lifetime support helps to ensure that our graduates are able to find gainful employment opportunities throughout their careers. This sort of support helps students to be able to graduate from BPH with confidence that they will be able to find employment opportunities that will allow them to make an impact, sustain themselves, and manage their student loan debt.

VI.e. Do graduates of your program who pursue public interest careers (as defined by your discipline) typically earn substantially less upon graduation than students who enter the private sector? If so, what steps does your program take to ensure that these careers are viable in light of students' debt at graduation?

Approximately 27% of our graduates in 2019 chose to pursue public interest careers upon graduation. This was defined as working in a government organization (15%) or non-profit organization (12%). These students often do earn substantially less than students who enter the private sector or healthcare systems. Our Career Services team, housed within CPHPL, makes graduates aware of loan repayment programs and encourages students to consider the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program as they prepare to graduate and look for job opportunities. More broadly, Career Services provides training and individualized consultations to students on salary negotiation, including sharing resources and strategies to ensure they are well informed about salary trends and well prepared for this stage of their job search.

VI.f. Please describe your marketing and outreach plan to prospective students to explain your financial aid programs.

Before the pandemic, prospective and admitted students would come to campus for Admitted Students Day or for our Fall Conference for prospective students. During these activities, we shared information about financial aid opportunities. Prospective and admitted students are also able to reach out by email, zoom or phone to our Coordinator of Financial Aid and Admissions to discuss and learn more about possible funding opportunities.

Our outreach strategies changed during COVID as all of our outreach, recruitment took place online so all financial aid advising, and information was shared via email, Zoom, or by phone. In addition, once students commit to coming to BPH, the Coordinator of Financial Aid and Admissions shares GSI and GSR opportunities with incoming students as well as resources to find affordable housing in the Bay Area.

The Admissions Team and the DREAM Office have a special focus on recruiting students from underrepresented minority and first-generation backgrounds. Our teams partner to conduct outreach with prospective students attending minority serving institutions and/or involved in clubs or organizations that have a specific focus on supporting historically underserved populations (i.e. Mentoring in Medicine and Science, UC Berkeley Biology Scholars Program, AmeriCorps, Health Career Connection, etc.).

Our outreach presentations and workshops typically include information about funding opportunities, including application fee waivers, costs of attendance, how to finance their graduate education, and different fellowship/scholarship opportunities. The BPH Funding Coordinator also hosts multiple funding workshops each year to provide a comprehensive overview of tuition and fees, scholarship availability, and eligibility requirements, and on-campus employment.

After students are admitted to the programs, the DREAM Office conducts individualized outreach to URM and first-generation students via phone calls, emails, and postcards. DREAM staff and current students in the GRADS Ambassador program conduct calls to answer any questions that prospective students may have and address concerns related to funding and housing. Automated emails with funding and housing information are sent to all admitted students, and the BPH Funding Coordinator is available by appointment. We host funding information sessions during our annual spring visit day for all admitted students and sometimes host special information sessions for funding nominees. We also have a partnership with the Office for Graduate Diversity at the Graduate Division to provide additional support and resources to students from marginalized backgrounds (such as undocumented students).

VI.g. Does your program make information available to prospective students regarding the average debt and median salary of program graduates? If so, how does your program approach sharing this information? If not, why not?

This information is available to students if they ask for it, but it is not included in our admissions and recruitment materials. Our Admissions and Recruitment team share information about funding opportunities during graduate school at recruiting events. This is an area where we as a school can work toward more transparency so that prospective students know what to expect with regard to debt from graduate school. Towards this aim, Career Services is currently preparing to launch a new online resource to students via the online platform PHLEX, whereby students' post-graduation outcomes (including salary) will be collected from graduates (individual-level data) and shared with students (aggregate-level data) as an educational tool in their career exploration/decision-making and salary negotiation processes.

VII. OTHER

VII.a. Please describe any other factors that may be relevant to your multi-year plan (such as additional measures relating to your program's affordability, measures that assess the quality of your program, etc.).

The COVID-19 pandemic has reinforced the need for building a strong public health workforce. BPH noticed an increased interest in our programs and saw a 20% increase in the number of applicants for the 2020-21 academic cycle. In addition, the school was affected by and responded to COVID in the following ways:

- We transitioned all of our learning to online education within a two-week period in March 2020. This meant that all of our students, staff, and faculty had to work remotely and all course instruction took place online. In order to do this, we relied on additional GSI student support and help from our education operations team to help instructors navigate the new remote learning environment.
- We hosted a number of student-focused community events online to help students remain connected and reduce isolation.
- We worked with campus programs to provide students in need access to mobile hotspots and laptop computers that could support online learning.
- We developed a student emergency fund to help students in need of funding for temporary housing (rent support), technology upgrades to support online learning, access to food pantries, and other basic needs.
- We developed and facilitated support circles for students in need of social and emotional support. These circles have continued into the current academic year.

- Many of our students had their planned practicum placements interrupted due to the shelter in place mandates. Our Center for Public Health Practice and Leadership team helped students identify alternative placements and helped provide financial support to students who lost their paid practicum placements.

Throughout the pandemic, we have worked to ensure that our students have what they need in order to succeed at BPH. As we navigate this most recent wave of Omicron, we continue to remain committed to supporting our students, staff, and faculty to remain healthy and safe.

PART B

IX. STUDENT AND FACULTY CONSULTATION

The Regents' Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition requires each plan to include information about the views of the program's student body and faculty on the proposed multi-year plan, which may be obtained in a variety of ways. Campuses are expected to have engaged in substantive consultation with students and faculty primarily in the year in which a new multi-year plan is prepared. At the program level, consultation should include information on (a) proposed new or increased PDSTs for 2022-23 and multi-year plans for any proposed increases thereafter, (b) uses of PDST revenue, (c) PDST levels/increases in the context of total charges, (d) issues of affordability and financial aid, (e) opportunities and support to pursue lower-paying public interest careers, (f) selection of comparator institutions, (g) diversity, and (h) outcomes for graduates of the program (e.g., career placement of graduates, average earnings, indebtedness levels).

Consultation with students in the program (or likely to be in the program)

IX.a. How did you consult with students about the PDST levels proposed in your multi-year plan? Check all that apply and elaborate in Section IX.b.

- ☐ (For proposed new PDST programs and one year programs) A good faith effort was made to discuss the plan and solicit feedback from prospective students and/or students from a related program (please describe): Text
- ☒ Scheduled in-person or virtual town-hall style meetings with students in the program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- ☐ Convened in-person or virtual focus groups of students in the program to discuss the plan and solicited feedback
- ☐ Convened in-person or virtual focus group with students representing underrepresented populations in your program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- ☒ Described the plan to students in the program via email, solicited their feedback, and reviewed the comments received
- ☐ Other (please describe):

IX.b. Below, please elaborate on all student consultation undertaken as part of this proposal - for each consultation effort, provide the date, the number of participants, how participants were chosen, description of consultation method, etc. - and provide a summary of student feedback acquired during the opportunities for consultation selected above. If students provided written feedback, please also attach that feedback to this document. Lastly, please describe below any proposal changes that resulted from this feedback.

Our initial plan was to request an annual increase in the PDST. In our first town hall meeting, we shared what the PDST is used for and suggested an up to 5% increase per year over the next three years. Students were extremely vocal about their concerns about increasing their financial burden. The DrPH students in particular felt that the incremental increases posed undue hardship for them as they were here for up to five years. They felt that they did not receive the same level of support as their PhD colleagues who do not have to pay the PDST. Given that the administration is new and some of the feedback was new to us, we regrouped and reconsidered the increase especially in light of the impacts of COVID-19. We suggested a three-year flat PDST; after additional discussion, a two-year proposal was developed that would allow the program to revisit its plan sooner. The survey that was conducted explained that we were planning to request no increases to PDST. We asked students to provide responses to the following:

- 1) Their program (DrPH or MPH)
- 2) Please share any feedback you have related to a potential PDST increase. ** When the initial survey was sent out we were considering an annual increase. Based on survey and townhall feedback we revised our request. Due to time restraint we did not resend the survey to students, but did share the information with them that we were requesting no increase for the next 2 years.

We received 32 responses, 21 MPH students, and 11 DrPH students. Some of the representative feedback from the survey is below:

- Financial hardship has been a problem for me and my family throughout my entire life, not just because of covid-19.
- I believe there should be no increase. GSI and GSR do not cover this fee and it is unacceptable. Students who already have to work to pay for their degree should not have to pay an additional 10k for a professional degree fee especially when we make less than 30k annually. You would add the fee to increase diversity but by doing so cause a huge financial burden.
- It's hypocritical that this PDST aims to serve underserved communities, but as a result, targets current students who may in fact be members of the underrepresented and underserved. I also find it extremely frustrating that the PDST is separate from, but just as costly, as general tuition. It puts a lot of pressure on low-income students to find jobs as GSI's to pay for tuition, but also have to find an appointment that is high enough to even cover the PDST.
- I would not be in support of a PDST increase at this time. I think that the burden would fall on already impacted URM students. The compounding impact of the pandemic also makes this burden difficult to bear. I would like other funding

streams to be explored to support the KP scholars.

The above sentiments demonstrate why we are proposing to keep the PDST flat for these next two years. We are committed to working with our students and trying to build a culture of transparency and trust between our administration and our students. In order to do that we believe we need to not only listen to the student input, but when possible move to act in new ways to find ways to identify diverse funding streams. While these next two years will test us to be able to identify and provide adequate student aid resources, we feel that the pandemic has called upon us to think and act differently. We may in the future need to request an increase in PDST but hope to do so only when necessary.

IX.c. In addition to consultation with program students and faculty, please confirm that this multi-year plan has been provided to the campus graduate student organization leadership and, if applicable, the program graduate student organization leadership. *Each program is also encouraged to engage campus graduate student organization leadership (i.e., your GSA president) in the program's student consultation opportunities.* The program should provide graduate student leadership with an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposals. Full comments or a summary of those comments should be provided by the program.

☒ Plan shared with Maria Pettis, Graduate Assembly President on January 7, 2022 .
Campus graduate student organization (i.e., your campus' GSA president)

☐ Comments or feedback was provided.

☒ Comments or feedback was not provided.

Nature of feedback or full comments:

☒ If applicable, plan shared with BPH Student Government on January 7, 2022 .
Program graduate student organization (i.e., your program council or department GSA)

☐ Comments or feedback was provided.

☒ Comments or feedback was not provided.

Nature of feedback or full comments:

Consultation with faculty

IX.d. How did you consult with faculty about the PDST levels proposed in your multi-year plan? Check all that apply and elaborate in Section IX.e.

☒ Agenda item at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting

- ☐ Scheduled in-person or virtual town-hall style meetings of faculty to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- ☐ Convened in-person or virtual focus groups of faculty in the program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- ☐ Convened in-person or virtual focus group with faculty representing underrepresented populations in your program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- ☒ Described the plan to faculty in the program via email, solicited their feedback, and reviewed the comments received
- ☐ Other (please describe):

IX.e. Below, please elaborate on all faculty consultation undertaken as part of this proposal - for each consultation effort, provide the date, the number of participants, how participants were chosen, description of consultation method, etc. - and provide a summary of faculty feedback acquired during the opportunities for consultation selected above. If faculty provided written feedback, please also attach that feedback to this document. Lastly, please describe below any proposal changes that resulted from this feedback.

Faculty were consulted through a presentation of the PDST proposal at the regularly scheduled faculty meeting on 10/12/21, and were then asked to complete a survey requesting that they rate agreement with the proposal using a scale of 1-5, with 1 being “strongly agree” with the proposal and 5 being “strongly disagree”. 30 faculty members responded, with an average score of 1.8/5, indicating strong agreement with the proposal to hold PDST flat for 2 years. Comments shared by faculty included:

- Reflects well on our values!
- The quality and rigor of our top professional programs are rising quickly, and I would regret shrinking the resources that would otherwise sustain that momentum (given current inflationary pressures)
- Thank you for carefully considering whether or not an increase is necessary, rather than proceeding with a "default" increase.
- Agree with decision to pause increases in PDST for two years

IX.f. Please confirm that this multi-year plan template was provided to the campus Graduate Dean and endorsed by the Chancellor.

- ☒ Plan shared with Lisa Garcia Bedolla on October 13, 2021 .
Graduate Dean
- ☒ Plan endorsed by Carol T. Christ on November 8, 2021 .
Chancellor¹

¹ Per the *Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition* Section 4, found at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/3103.html>