

**Multi-Year Plan for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Levels
Effective Beginning Summer or Fall 2024**

PART A

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

Table 1: Projected Fees

	Actual	New Proposed Fee Levels					Increases/Decreases									
		2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2024-25		2025-26		2026-27		2027-28		2028-29
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (CA resident)	\$30,411	\$31,620	\$32,880	\$34,200	\$35,580	\$36,990	4.0%	\$1,209	4.0%	\$1,260	4.0%	\$1,320	4.0%	\$1,380	4.0%	\$1,410
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (Nonresident)	\$30,411	\$31,620	\$32,880	\$34,200	\$35,580	\$36,990	4.0%	\$1,209	4.0%	\$1,260	4.0%	\$1,320	4.0%	\$1,380	4.0%	\$1,410
Mandatory Systemwide Fees*	\$13,470	\$14,016	\$14,430	\$14,856	\$15,294	\$15,744	4.1%	\$546	3.0%	\$414	3.0%	\$426	2.9%	\$438	2.9%	\$450
Campus-based Fees**	\$1,090	\$1,128	\$1,164	\$1,200	\$1,236	\$1,278	3.5%	\$38	3.2%	\$36	3.1%	\$36	3.0%	\$36	3.4%	\$42
Nonresident Suppl. Tuition	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Other (explain below)***	\$2,636	\$2,741	\$2,822	\$2,907	\$2,994	\$3,083	4.0%	\$105	2.9%	\$81	3.0%	\$86	3.0%	\$87	3.0%	\$89
Est. First-Year Fees (CA resident)	\$47,607	\$49,505	\$51,296	\$53,163	\$55,104	\$57,095	4.0%	\$1,898	3.6%	\$1,791	3.6%	\$1,868	3.7%	\$1,941	3.6%	\$1,991
Est. First-Year Fees (Nonresident)	\$59,852	\$61,750	\$63,541	\$65,408	\$67,349	\$69,340	3.2%	\$1,898	2.9%	\$1,791	2.9%	\$1,868	3.0%	\$1,941	3.0%	\$1,991

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

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

*** Includes summer fees (Tuition, the SSF, and campus-based fees). Does not include voluntary fees like the UCGPC Fee and one-time fees like the “Document Fee.”

Additional comments:

The UC Davis Graduate School of Management (GSM) is proposing annual increases of 4% in Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) in each of the five years of this proposal to maintain the quality and current services of the full time MBA program.

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

Davis's full-time two-year Master of Business Administration program, established in 1981, prepares students to serve as collaborative, ethical and impactful leaders wherever excellent managers are required. The MBA program has averaged approximately 80 students during the past five years. The program provides core education in necessary skills for management, including organizational behavior, strategy, accounting for managers, finance, economics, marketing, operations, quantitative analysis, articulation and critical thinking. A broad selection of electives allows MBA students to delve deeper into fields of interest such as business analytics, technology management, entrepreneurship and financial management. The UC Davis GSM seeks to attract a diverse student body and deliver a curriculum that teaches and encourages leaders who value diversity, equity and inclusion. Students in the UC Davis MBA also have access to the riches of the rest of campus where world-class research occurs in food and agriculture, renewable and sustainable energy, biotechnology and the practice and provision of health care, among other subjects. The UC Davis Graduate School of Management (GSM) taps directly into these resources for MBA students through industry immersions where corporate executives present on the latest in their fields and challenge mixed teams of MBA and other graduate students with cases to solve.

Students go on to a broad variety of management careers in business, including product management, financial analysis, strategic consulting, human resources, sales and marketing and operations management. UC Davis MBA graduates are found in a broad variety of industries including health care, food and agriculture, financial services, energy, and information and communications technology.

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 planned to charge proposed PDST levels, 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. As appropriate, please describe your efforts to achieve your affordability and diversity goals in the context of your admissions data (up to the past five years).

The full time MBA program's last multi-year PDST plan pertained to 2019-20 through 2023-24 and was approved with annual 4% PDST increases. Due to lower enrollments than projected in our last plan, the shortfall between plan revenue and actuals in 2023-24

is estimated at approximately \$475,000, or 17%. This affected the total dollars allocated and influenced the allocation percentages of those funds. The prior plan proposed to use PDST to accomplish the following goals:

1. Enhance program affordability:

- a. The MBA program provided at least 33% of PDST as financial aid each year of the last multi-year plan. In the most recent three years, financial aid has exceeded 40% of PDST and will be approximately 45% of all PDST revenues this academic year. In a challenging MBA market, this has been an essential factor in attracting diverse cohorts of high-quality students. The increase in funds to this goal has reduced funds available however, both in absolute and relative terms, for the other goals.
- b. For the incoming class in Fall 2023, all students received some financial aid. Individual awards ranged from \$9,000 to \$70,000 for the two years of the program. The average two-year award is slightly more than \$39,000. PDST will fund 79% of all financial aid for MBA students, with 19% of all financial aid allocated from system-wide tuition return to aid, and the remaining 2% supported by philanthropic gifts.
- c. The previous UC Davis MBA multi-year plan described the goal for affordability as follows: “to provide financial aid to students based on merit and to make the program affordable to all qualified students.” To date, all financial aid has been allocated nominally as merit-based aid. The affordability discussion with each admitted candidate has sometimes caused MBA Admissions to increase that aid to increase affordability, but these adjustments have not been tracked. We estimate that 10-15% of financial aid would have been allocated as “need-based” if a tracking system had been in place. Plans for a new tracking system will be initiated with the cohort matriculating in Fall 2025.

2. Maintain program quality:

- a. The prior plan included a goal to maintain program quality by allocating approximately 41% of PDST revenue to compensation and benefits for faculty, including both research faculty and Lecturers, and benefits. The allocation of PDST to these purposes in 2023-24 is approximately 30%, which was achieved while increasing the elective offerings to full time MBA students. This reduction in allocation was enabled, in part, by an accounting reallocation that reduced the benefits burden on PDST by nearly \$200,000, or half of the planned amount. Despite the balance of the reduction in allocation to this purpose, the GSM has been able to maintain and increase its elective offerings to full time MBA students by including them in weekend intensive courses in Davis and Sacramento. This has added 8-12 courses per year in management topics of high student interest such as personal branding, innovation and entrepreneurship, and technology platforms.

3. Provide new student services:

- a. The program goal for the prior plan period proposed to use 24% of PDST revenue towards “additional student services”, principally in the areas of enhanced career development services, soft skills development and student-led

co-curricular activities. This was incorrectly labeled “New Student Services” since these additional, enhanced services already existed from previous plan periods. The fees increase was necessary to maintain these services, but they did not represent new student services during the most recent plan period. The GSM has maintained these services and the staff that deliver them despite a shortfall of approximately 5% in funds available compared to the plan.

4. Enhance program diversity:

- a. In the prior multi-year plan, the GSM outlined a series of planned activities to recruit a diverse student body for the full time MBA program. During the plan period, the GSM participated in recruiting events sponsored by organizations that focus on members from underrepresented groups such as the National Society of Hispanic MBAs, the National Black MBA Association, the National Black Pre-MBA Association, and the Forte Foundation. The GSM remained very active in the UC consortium that sponsors the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders, which brings together exceptional undergraduate students from historically black colleges and universities and Hispanic-serving institutions to learn about MBA programs and the opportunities available at UC business schools. The GSM also implemented the UC-wide Native American Opportunity Plan. These activities were supported by PDST funding, which is the source for most of the recruiting budget for the MBA program. Outreach activities intended to enhance program diversity were not tracked separately in the financial system, although estimates of the annual budget specific to this purpose would be in the range of \$30,000. The results of these efforts were favorable, increasing students from underrepresented groups from 7.8% in the last year of the prior period to a high-water mark of 18% in 2021-22. In the final year of this plan period, however, this fell again to 9% in 2023-24. This decrease occurred despite continued attention to the activities that had met with success previously. The table below details applications, admissions, and enrollments over the past five years:

	Applicants			Admits			Admit Rate		Enrollment			Yield Rate	
	URG	All	%URG	URG	All	%URG	URG	All	URG	All	%URG	URG	All
2019-20	10	270	3.7%	0	121	0.0%	0.0%	44.8%	0	34	0.0%	0.0%	28.1%
2020-21	31	293	10.6%	13	126	10.3%	41.9%	43.0%	9	46	19.6%	69.2%	36.5%
2021-22	24	361	6.6%	7	115	6.1%	29.2%	31.9%	6	42	14.3%	85.7%	36.5%
2022-23	23	382	6.0%	9	87	10.3%	39.1%	22.8%	5	40	12.5%	55.6%	46.0%
2023-24	19	364	5.2%	6	97	6.2%	31.6%	26.6%	1	38	2.6%	16.7%	39.2%

The challenge in this most recent year was all along the pipeline, reflecting the generally tough market for the full time MBA, but most pronounced in yield. Of six admitted students from underrepresented groups, only one accepted enrollment. Of the five who did not yield this year:

- One deferred admission in the UC Davis MBA program to Fall 2024
- One, who had recently graduated with a BS, elected to work rather than pursue an MBA
- Two went to higher ranked schools
- One went to a lower ranked school that offered a position on their football team

The GSM is committed to continuing and improving upon our efforts to recruit a diverse student body in the proposed plan period. Notably, the percentage of Pell recipients has increased substantially over the prior period, with an average of nearly 40% in the cohorts from academic years 2021-23, compared to an average of 20% in the cohorts from AY 2016 to 2018.

Consequences of COVID-19 on Multi-Year Program Goals:

COVID-19 had significant consequences for the GSM MBA program, disrupting the modality of instruction in the short term and accelerating the adoption and acceptance of distance learning technologies broadly in business education for the long term. All instruction in the MBA program moved online at the end of winter quarter in 2020 and remained online until fall quarter 2021. This required a small additional outlay of funds for audio-visual equipment, which was offset by lower program costs in areas such as recruiting travel, catering for student events, etc. The GSM endeavored to maintain student engagement during the pandemic through webinars with corporate executives, online career development services and student-led co-curricular activities such as Zoom yoga sessions. The additional expenses associated with moving these activities online was also offset by the reduced on-premises expenses. The longer-term impacts are being felt throughout higher education, and very directly in graduate business education. Programs around the country are reporting that students are less engaged in the classroom, both in terms of attendance and participation, and are oftentimes choosing the convenience of online instruction over the in-person experience when offered the option. It is not yet clear to what extent these effects of the pandemic are temporary, and students will revert to the “norm” of in-person on-premises instruction, and to what extent they represent a fundamental shift to which the GSM and other business schools will be adapting over this next multi-year plan period.

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?

The GSM MBA is proposing 4% annual increases to PDST during the years of this multi-year plan, which is the same rate that was approved in our last plan. Fixed cost increases to salaries and benefits, mandated at the system and campus levels through collective bargaining agreements and annual budgets, will exceed 4% in the first fiscal year of the plan period and are expected to continue to exceed 4% through the remaining years of the plan. The enhanced student services, faculty support and financial aid are important features of the program that keep it attractive to diverse and highly qualified candidates. The requested annual increase is the minimum necessary to maintain this support and financial aid at current levels.

Broadly, the goals for this PDST multi-year plan reflect the goals of the prior plan:

1. Enhance program affordability:

- a. The MBA program will maintain financial aid support at approximately 44.4% of PDST revenue. The goal will be to continue to attract students from low socio-economic backgrounds at the same rate as in the years of the recently concluded plan period, indicated by the average of 40% Pell grant recipients. This allocation will also help the MBA meet its commitment to the Native American Opportunity Plan along with other commitments to a diverse student body, for example to alumni of HBCUs and HSIs who participated in the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders.
- b. Beginning with recruitment of the class entering in summer 2025, admissions recruiters will include a question in the interview process about the candidate's Pell-grant eligibility as undergraduates, as well as a more generic question about the affordability of the program for the candidate. Due to the dynamic and time-bound nature of MBA admissions, the candidate's self-reported socio-economic status will be the basis of any need-based allocation. Financial aid that is allocated based on the results of that discussion will be marked as "need-based," and tracked accordingly. We expect that 10% to 20% of all financial aid will be identified as "need based."
- c. Overall, financial aid will continue to be awarded in an effort to attract the most highly qualified class possible (merit-based) and to make the program affordable for every such qualified candidate (need-based). As a result, one candidate may be awarded financial aid that is a combination of merit- and need-based aid.

2. Maintain program quality:

- a. The MBA program will maintain the allocation to faculty salary and benefits at approximately 28% of PDST revenue as in the current fiscal year. This already represents efficiencies and program innovations that allowed the GSM to maintain and expand curricular offerings in the prior plan period, described above in II.a.2. The GSM will continue to innovate the curriculum to meet the demands of the marketplace within the resources available.

3. Maintain enhanced student services:

- a. The program will maintain the allocation to enhanced student services, especially in the areas of career development and recruitment outreach for a diverse student body. This will include staff and direct operating expenses to which the GSM will allocate approximately 25% of PDST revenue.

4. Enhance program diversity:

- a. The MBA program will continue and enhance efforts to attract a diverse student body. The goal will be to achieve a diverse student population that exceeds the participation by underrepresented groups in our peer business schools, currently at 13.4% of each entering class. Beginning with the recruiting cycle for the class entering 2025, we will tag diversity outreach expenses to improve our ability to report. The strategies to achieve a more diverse student population are detailed in Section V. below.

If the requested increase is not approved, the program will not be able to maintain the balance between program quality and affordability. We would maintain funding for faculty compensation and benefits and student financial aid. Due to fixed cost increases, this would represent approximately a 10% decrease in funding for enhanced student services in the first year. If the increase is not approved for multiple years, the fixed cost increases would cause reductions in staff FTE and related reductions in services to students.

III.b. For established PDST programs, please indicate how you are using total actual Professional Degree Fee revenue in 2023-24 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).

Table 2: PDST Revenue Use

	Proposed Use of Incremental PDST Revenue						Total Projected PDST Revenue in Final Year
	Total 2023-24 PDST Revenue	Incremental 2024-25 PDST revenue	Incremental 2025-26 PDST revenue	Incremental 2026-27 PDST revenue	Incremental 2027-28 PDST revenue	Incremental 2028-29 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$470,000	\$24,816	\$26,126	\$27,506	\$28,958	\$30,487	\$607,893
Benefits/UCRP Cost	\$197,000	\$8,865	\$9,264	\$9,681	\$10,116	\$10,572	\$245,498
Providing Student Services	\$592,497	\$16,126	\$16,613	\$17,634	\$18,495	\$16,873	\$678,238
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$1,040,000	\$41,600	\$43,264	\$44,995	\$46,794	\$48,666	\$1,265,319
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Please explain in the "Additional Comments" below)	\$42,150	\$1,686	\$1,753	\$1,824	\$1,897	\$1,972	\$51,282
Total use/projected use of revenue	\$2,341,647	\$93,093	\$97,020	\$101,640	\$106,260	\$108,570	\$2,848,230

* Benefits costs and UCRP contributions should be reported as a single line item.

Additional comments: The "Other" line item represents required overhead charges that are allocated to the fund source that generates the charge for the purposes of good accounting.

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.

The program team works continuously to operate efficiently and ensure that every expense is considered in the context of its contribution to the student experience in and out of the classroom. Fixed cost increases for salaries and benefits, including the impact of recent collective bargaining agreements, limit what can be achieved by cost-cutting without reducing service levels to students. The program team has been "doing more with less" over the past five years, and expects to maintain this ethos to the extent possible. Examples of innovations to operate efficiently given above (section II.a.2.) included the promotion of full time MBA

students to participate in intensive “Residentials” and the accounting allocation of benefits to limit the impact of these costs on the PDST budget. This allowed the program to maintain curricular and co-curricular services, and increase financial aid, despite a shortfall of approximately \$475,000 against the plan.

The UC Davis GSM engages in intensive fundraising efforts to enhance our annual fund, our business partnerships, and major gift funds to support the MBA program. These fundraising efforts have resulted in more than \$2 million in endowment revenue each year for the past several years, most of which benefits the full-time MBA program directly or indirectly. For example, the alumni-funded MBA endowment is used almost exclusively for support of student-led co-curricular activities. The endowed Deanship will provide additional funding for faculty salary support to attract and retain world-class and diverse faculty.

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

The proposal is for uniform increases during the years of this proposal.

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.”

Table 3: Enrollment

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29
Resident	34	34	34	34	34	34
Domestic Nonresident	5	5	5	5	5	5
International	38	38	38	38	38	38
Total	77	77	77	77	77	77

Additional comments:

Of the international students that enroll in the UC Davis MBA, most seek to remain in California after graduation for employment. For the past three years, more than 70% of international students employed after graduation were working in California. The drivers of PDST revenue for the program are enrollments and the approved tuition rate. The MBA is hopeful that enrollments will increase in the future, but maintaining consistent enrollments with the most recent year are an appropriate program and budgetary expectation. If enrollments during the planning period are consistently and materially greater than the plan, all else being equal, the GSM will consider PDST levels during plan years that are less than those proposed here.

IV. MARKET COMPARISONS: TOTAL CHARGES

IV.a. In the table, identify a *minimum* of 3 comparators, including a minimum of 3 public institutions. If your program only compares to a small number of other programs or only private comparators, please list those. Please indicate the total student tuition and fee charges to degree completion of the comparison institutions in the following table.

Table 4: Market Comparators – Total Charges to Complete Degree by Cohort Start Year

Total <i>Resident</i> Charges to Complete Degree by Cohort Starting in:	Projections						Increases/Decreases									
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2024-25		2025-26		2026-27		2027-28		2028-29	
	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
ASU Carey	62,274	64,142	66,066	68,048	70,089	72,192	3.0%	1,868	3.0%	1,924	3.0%	1,982	3.0%	2,041	3.0%	2,103
U of MN Carlson	93,784	96,598	99,496	102,481	105,555	108,722	3.0%	2,814	3.0%	2,898	3.0%	2,985	3.0%	3,074	3.0%	3,167
Ohio State-Fisher	63,450	65,354	67,315	69,334	71,414	73,556	3.0%	1,904	3.0%	1,961	3.0%	2,019	3.0%	2,080	3.0%	2,142
Michigan State-Broad	70,206	72,312	74,481	76,715	79,016	81,386	3.0%	2,106	3.0%	2,169	3.0%	2,234	3.0%	2,301	3.0%	2,370
UT Dallas	72,914	75,101	77,354	79,675	82,065	84,527	3.0%	2,187	3.0%	2,253	3.0%	2,321	3.0%	2,390	3.0%	2,462
U of MD College Park	100,564	103,581	106,688	109,889	113,186	116,582	3.0%	3,017	3.0%	3,107	3.0%	3,201	3.0%	3,297	3.0%	3,396
USC Marshall	145,617	149,986	154,486	159,121	163,895	168,812	3.0%	4,369	3.0%	4,500	3.0%	4,635	3.0%	4,774	3.0%	4,917
U of Notre Dame	131,260	135,198	139,254	143,432	147,735	152,167	3.0%	3,938	3.0%	4,056	3.0%	4,178	3.0%	4,303	3.0%	4,432
BU Questrom	132,076	136,038	140,119	144,323	148,653	153,113	3.0%	3,962	3.0%	4,081	3.0%	4,204	3.0%	4,330	3.0%	4,460
BC Carroll	126,733	130,535	134,451	138,485	142,640	146,919	3.0%	3,802	3.0%	3,916	3.0%	4,034	3.0%	4,155	3.0%	4,279
SMU Cox	119,348	122,928	126,616	130,414	134,326	138,356	3.0%	3,580	3.0%	3,688	3.0%	3,798	3.0%	3,912	3.0%	4,030
Average public comparison	77,199	79,515	81,900	84,357	86,888	89,494	3.0%	2,316	3.0%	2,385	3.0%	2,457	3.0%	2,531	3.0%	2,607
Average private comparison	130,295	134,203	138,230	142,377	146,648	151,048	3.0%	3,909	3.0%	4,026	3.0%	4,147	3.0%	4,272	3.0%	4,400
Average public and private comparison	103,747	106,859	110,065	113,367	116,768	120,271	3.0%	3,112	3.0%	3,206	3.0%	3,302	3.0%	3,401	3.0%	3,503
Your program	94,371	97,979	101,552	105,273	109,116	112,727	3.8%	3,608	3.6%	3,573	3.7%	3,721	3.7%	3,843	3.3%	3,611

Total <i>Nonresident</i> Charges to Complete Degree by Cohort Starting in:	Projections						Increases/Decreases									
	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2024-25		2025-26		2026-27		2027-28		2028-29	
	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	(\$)	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
ASU Carey	109,542	112,828	116,213	119,699	123,290	126,989	3.0%	3,286	3.0%	3,385	3.0%	3,486	3.0%	3,591	3.0%	3,699
U of MN Carlson	118,631	122,190	125,856	129,632	133,521	137,527	3.0%	3,559	3.0%	3,666	3.0%	3,776	3.0%	3,889	3.0%	4,006
Ohio State-Fisher	119,742	123,334	127,034	130,845	134,770	138,813	3.0%	3,592	3.0%	3,700	3.0%	3,811	3.0%	3,925	3.0%	4,043
Michigan State-Broad	111,508	114,853	118,299	121,848	125,503	129,268	3.0%	3,345	3.0%	3,446	3.0%	3,549	3.0%	3,655	3.0%	3,765
UT Dallas	132,776	136,759	140,862	145,088	149,441	153,924	3.0%	3,983	3.0%	4,103	3.0%	4,226	3.0%	4,353	3.0%	4,483
U of MD College Park	122,352	126,023	129,804	133,698	137,709	141,840	3.0%	3,671	3.0%	3,781	3.0%	3,894	3.0%	4,011	3.0%	4,131
USC Marshall	145,617	149,986	154,486	159,121	163,895	168,812	3.0%	4,369	3.0%	4,500	3.0%	4,635	3.0%	4,774	3.0%	4,917
U of Notre Dame	131,260	135,198	139,254	143,432	147,735	152,167	3.0%	3,938	3.0%	4,056	3.0%	4,178	3.0%	4,303	3.0%	4,432
BU Questrom	132,076	136,038	140,119	144,323	148,653	153,113	3.0%	3,962	3.0%	4,081	3.0%	4,204	3.0%	4,330	3.0%	4,460
BC Carroll	126,733	130,535	134,451	138,485	142,640	146,919	3.0%	3,802	3.0%	3,916	3.0%	4,034	3.0%	4,155	3.0%	4,279
SMU Cox	119,348	122,928	126,616	130,414	134,326	138,356	3.0%	3,580	3.0%	3,688	3.0%	3,798	3.0%	3,912	3.0%	4,030
Average public comparison	119,092	122,665	126,345	130,135	134,039	138,060	3.0%	3,573	3.0%	3,680	3.0%	3,790	3.0%	3,904	3.0%	4,021
Average private comparison	131,007	134,937	138,985	143,155	147,450	151,873	3.0%	3,930	3.0%	4,048	3.0%	4,170	3.0%	4,295	3.0%	4,424
Average public and private comparison	124,508	128,243	132,090	136,053	140,135	144,339	3.0%	3,735	3.0%	3,847	3.0%	3,963	3.0%	4,082	3.0%	4,204
Your program	118,861	122,469	126,042	129,763	133,606	137,585	3.0%	3,608	2.9%	3,573	3.0%	3,721	3.0%	3,843	3.0%	3,979

Source(s):

ASU Carey	Public	https://wpcarey.asu.edu/mba-programs/full-time/cost-financial-aid#cost
U of MN Carlson	Public	https://carlsonschool.umn.edu/graduate/mba/full-time/tuition-aid
Ohio State-Fisher	Public	https://fisher.osu.edu/graduate/ftmba/admissions/tuition-funding
Michigan State-Broad	Public	https://broad.msu.edu/masters/mba/tuition/
UT Dallas	Public	https://mba.utdallas.edu/tuition-aid/
U of MD College Park	Public	https://www.rhsmith.umd.edu/programs/full-time-mba/admissions#financial-aid
USC Marshall	Private	https://www.marshall.usc.edu/programs/graduate-programs/mba-programs/full-time-mba/admissions
U of Notre Dame	Private	https://mendoza.nd.edu/graduate-programs/the-notre-dame-mba/two-year-mba-tuition-aid/
BU Questrom	Private	https://questromworld.bu.edu/grad/essentials/financial-aid/tuition-fees/#toggle-id-1
BC Carroll	Private	https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/schools/carroll-school/graduate/admission/tuition-and-aid.html
SMU Cox	Private	https://www.smu.edu/cox/Degrees-and-Programs/Two-Year-MBA/admissions#chapter-3

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).

These institutions are appropriate comparators because they are similar in terms of admitted student qualifications and competition for faculty, and all except one are ranked from 28 to 51 by US News and World Report (USN&WR). There are six public and five private institutions in the list. Eight of these schools are comparators that the GSM's accrediting body, AACSB, will use in the upcoming continuous improvement review. These include ASU Carey, Ohio State – Fisher, Michigan State – Broad, UT Dallas, Boston University – Questrom, Boston College – Carroll, Southern Methodist University – Cox, and University of Maryland College Park. In terms of market competition, the UC Davis GSM MBA program is most directly compared to other business schools in California ranked in the top 50 by USN&WR, of which there are six including four UCs. The remaining two are Stanford, which UC Davis does not consider a comparator, and USC Marshall ranked at 15, which is aspirational, but provides the only non-UC comparator in California.

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

The MBA program at UC Davis is generally less costly than the average of public and private Universities for both residents and nonresidents, at approximately 10% less than the average for residents and 5% less than the average for nonresidents. The MBA program is more costly than the average for residents attending public programs. There are many variables that could explain this difference, including the cost of living in California and public support relative to tuition. Since none of these public schools are in California, a direct comparison to the cost for residents is not possible. The MBA program for residents is less expensive at UC Davis than the comparator average for private Universities by 28%. For nonresidents, UC Davis is less expensive than the average overall, and for public comparators and private comparators, though the difference with public comparators is negligible at less than 1%.

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

The MBA program's distinctive features are its geography, partnerships on the UC Davis campus, and faculty. The UC Davis GSM is located in the heart of some of the most productive agricultural land on Earth near Silicon Valley's corporate centers, San Francisco's vibrant cultural and financial institutions, and California's capitol in Sacramento. This location provides unique opportunities in entrepreneurship, technology management and innovation, finance and public service, and any combination of the above. The world-class research at UC Davis attracts academics and industry partners that are creating the future on campus. The GSM leverages these strengths with industry immersions in food and agriculture, sustainable energy, bio-technology and preparing corporate finance professionals for the start-up environment. Finally, the GSM faculty are ranked among the best in the world for research productivity and impact. This combination of cross-campus UC Davis partnerships, corporate engagement, and world-class research faculty leveraged in a small-campus format makes us unique among our comparators.

V. ENROLLMENT AND DIVERSITY STRATEGY

V.a. In the table, 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. In the columns shown, programs should provide as many figures for comparison public and private institutions as are available.

Table 5: Demographics

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Comparison (2022-23)
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Fall 2023	Publics & Privates
Ethnicity					
Underrepresented					
African American	4.0%	6.0%	5.0%	3.0%	5.3%
Hispanic/Latino(a)	8.0%	11.0%	5.0%	5.0%	7.7%
American Indian	0.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.3%
Subtotal Underrepresented	12.0%	18.0%	12.0%	9.0%	13.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	14.0%	18.0%	15.0%	14.0%	16.2%
White	17.0%	23.0%	25.0%	23.0%	44.8%
Domestic Unknown	14.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.0%	8.6%
International	43.0%	41.0%	46.0%	53.0%	17.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Socioeconomic					
% Pell recipients	40.0%	28.6%	43.5%		
Gender					
% Male	46.0%	39.0%	35.0%	57.0%	60.3%
% Female	54.0%	60.0%	61.0%	43.0%	39.6%
% Non-Binary	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
% Unknown	0.0%	1.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.1%

Sources:

UC ethnicity, socioeconomic status: UC Corporate data

Comparison institutions: The comparison institutions used for the above figures are the same eleven institutions as used to compare tuition. The data source used was Data Direct of the AACSB business school accreditation body. Due to the small number of institutions, the figures for public and private institutions could not be separated, and are reported together in this table.

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 students from underrepresented groups? What are your prior and prospective strategies for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity 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 students from underrepresented groups?

The efforts of the program during the prior plan period were somewhat successful, with the percentage of students from underrepresented groups increasing from 7.8% in 2018-19 (the final year of the last plan), which was the most diverse student body at UC Davis of the prior four years, to 18% in 2021-22. The average over these four-year periods increased from 6.0% to 12.8%. The average is appropriate to consider because each student represents 2.5 to 3% of the student body at the UC Davis MBA program, so idiosyncratic variances from year to year can have a large impact. Nonetheless, it is concerning that in the most recent year only 9% of the domestic student body is from underrepresented groups, with only one underrepresented minority student joining the program in Fall 2023. This recommends maintaining and reinforcing the program's efforts to attract a diverse and highly qualified student body with current and new strategies.

In the spirit of meeting the candidates where they are at, the program will continue to participate in recruiting events sponsored by organizations that focus on members from underrepresented groups such as the National Society of Hispanic MBAs, the National Black MBA Association, the National Black Pre-MBA Association, and the Forte Foundation. The GSM will remain very active in the UC consortium that sponsors the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders (SIEML) including hosting 40 college students from HBCUs and Hispanic serving institutions in the summer of 2024. The GSM will fully fund the UC-wide Native American Opportunity Plan, which covers Tuition and the Student Services Fee of any registered member of a federally recognized tribe. The program will reach out to new student affinity groups and expand outreach to them accordingly.

The MBA will seek to identify corporate partners with a commitment to diversity to sponsor scholarships. We are in active dialogue with Z by HP to create a program for the MBA that mirrors a program they are funding for students in the UC Davis Business Analytics program. The scholarship recipients are leaders and role models in their communities with a demonstrated commitment to diversity in the field of data analytics or business, and who understand social, cultural, economic and professional barriers faced by different segments of society and are seeking to make a positive change.

The program participates in a new collaboration between UC Business schools to increase access for underrepresented Californians, the California Leadership Institute. The program brings students throughout California together for a free business and leadership bootcamp, and then provides future scholarships to our programs for the program alumni.

The program further will continue to participate in Envision UC Davis, a campus visit program that enables California's most promising graduate school hopefuls to develop an understanding and appreciation of graduate education. The program sponsors California senior undergraduates and recent bachelor's degree graduates for an action-packed weekend on the Davis campus, allowing them to envision their future as a graduate student at UC Davis. The program is open to California residents who hope to apply for graduate school in the next two years and allows them to envision their future as a graduate student at UC Davis. Envision seeks to eliminate the barriers that prevent underrepresented students from successfully entering and completing graduate school, and encourages applications from individuals who have perspectives or experiences of groups who are historically underrepresented in higher education.

Apart from attempting to recruit a diverse student population, the GSM in all of its programs promotes belonging and the skills and mindset for students to appreciate diversity and take advantage of the riches it brings to collaboration. To this end, the GSM sponsors workshops on "Cross-Cultural Communication and Collaboration." The Collaborative Leadership Program (CLP) also emphasizes the appreciation and incorporation of diverse experience and perspectives in its aim to create leaders that build coalitions across stakeholders, accept responsibility and demonstrate values-based leadership.

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 toward increased enrollment of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds is very encouraging. The program will maintain current levels of financial aid at 45% of PDST revenue in hopes of remaining attractive to this population, and keeping the participation of these students at the current levels of approximately 40% of Pell Grant recipients. The GSM will introduce a new interview question with the recruitment of the class entering in 2025 that specifically requests additional information about the affordability of the program for the individual candidate, and will tag financial aid that is allocated on the basis of the discussion as "need-based aid."

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?

The UC Davis GSM has a strong track record of achieving more gender parity than our competitive set. Over the past four years, the GSM has averaged greater than 50% female participation in the program. Even though the ratio was 57% male and 43% female in Fall 2023, this was still more equal than our comparators at 39.6%. This strong track record can be attributed to a relatively equal faculty ratio, at approximately one-third female, with female faculty in leadership roles at the GSM; and a history of clubs such as the “Women in Leadership” club and co-curricular efforts such as the opportunity for students from this club to sit on nonprofit boards and receive mentoring.

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 students from underrepresented groups, Pell Grant recipients, and gender? Explain your reasoning.

The expectation is to achieve or exceed parity with our comparator schools regarding students from underrepresented groups, to maintain Pell Grant recipient participation at 40%, and to maintain the program’s relative advantage in gender parity. All of these are within reach. In a given year, variances will arise, but the program had demonstrated the ability to achieve these goals and it should be repeatable given effort and resources. Examples of efforts that will be made to continue and expand outreach toward these goals include:

- Promoting the Native American Opportunity Plan and the financial aid offer to alumni of the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders.
- Continuing outreach to recruiting events sponsored by organizations that focus on members from underrepresented groups such as the National Society of Hispanic MBAs, the National Black MBA Association, the National Black Pre-MBA Association, and the Forte Foundation.
- Identifying new affinity groups such as those mentioned immediately above, and expanding outreach to them accordingly.
- Seeking additional philanthropic partners such as Z by HP that are aligned to provide support for financial aid for students who are leaders and role models in their communities with a demonstrated commitment to diversity in the field of business, and who understand social, cultural, economic and professional barriers faced by different segments of society and are motivated to make a positive change.

- Participating in UC and campus initiatives like the California Leadership Institute and Envision UC Davis that encourage underrepresented Californians to pursue graduate and professional degrees.
- Reaching out to underrepresented students at UC Davis to promote their participation in the new Aggie MBA Pathways program, which encourages undergraduates to pursue an MBA at UC Davis through career development workshops and guaranteed scholarships.
- Introducing a new interview question that will assess affordability at the point of admission, including Pell grant eligibility during the candidate's undergraduate studies.
- Tagging financial aid that is allocated as a result of a candidate's expressed need as "need-based aid" to better track these allocations and determine their effectiveness at recruiting students from low SES backgrounds.

V.f. In the tables on the following page, 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.

Table 6: Faculty Diversity

All Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Black/ African/ African American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Domestic	5.4%	4.7%	5.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Native Hawaiian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/ Pacific Islander	Domestic	18.3%	19.8%	19.1%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
White	Domestic	41.8%	47.6%	49.5%
	International	1.1%	1.2%	1.1%
Two or More Races	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	32.3%	26.7%	23.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Female		26.9%	27.9%	33.7%
Male		62.3%	65.1%	57.3%
Non-Binary/Unknown		10.8%	7.0%	9.0%

Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Black/ African/ African American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic/ Latino(a)	Domestic	6.7%	6.9%	7.1%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Native Hawaiian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/ Pacific Islander	Domestic	30.0%	27.6%	25.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
White	Domestic	36.6%	37.9%	35.7%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Two or More Races	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/ Unknown	Domestic	26.7%	27.6%	28.6%
	International	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Percentage by Gender		2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Female		33.3%	31.0%	32.1%
Male		56.7%	58.7%	53.6%
Non-Binary/Unknown		10.0%	10.3%	14.3%

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? In the past five years, what opportunities were available to hire new faculty and fill vacancies?

Over the past five years, the GSM has hired eight ladder rank faculty. Four of the faculty members hired were women, and four were men. The GSM has a strong record recruiting and retaining female faculty, and has one of the best gender ratios among the top 50 business schools in the United States.

All ladder faculty and lecturer recruitments are advertised broadly and in specific journals (e.g., The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, Women in Higher Education) and venues (e.g., PhDproject.org) to advance the recruitment of diverse faculty. During the past five years, the GSM participated in the UC Davis program to advance faculty diversity through a search led by the Office of Academic Affairs in collaboration with the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. This program is unique in that the search is not discipline-specific, allowing a broader net than, for example, a search in a single year for a faculty member with a teaching and research focus on Finance. The search was successful and resulted in the hire of an Associate Professor in Organizational Behavior who is a member of an underrepresented group. In addition, there is a universal mandatory eligibility requirement for hiring under this program:

All successful candidates must have previously demonstrated significant commitments to diversity, equity, and/or inclusion first and foremost to African-American, Latino(a)/Chicano(a)/Hispanic, and Native American students or communities. These commitments may be in one or more of the following areas: research, teaching, and/or public service. These commitments must be an inextricably integral part of the applicant's professional career record, and must be clearly and convincingly documented in the mandatory Contributions to Diversity Statement that will be uploaded to UC Recruit as part of the application.

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 goals are to recruit a highly qualified student population, using financial aid to make the program affordable to all qualified students. Financial aid to MBA students has increased substantially over the past five years, reflecting both a commitment to affordability and the challenge of attracting a diverse and highly qualified student population. This plan proposes to maintain that allocation of 45% of all PDST revenue toward financial aid. This plan also proposes to introduce a more systematic process of identifying the portion of financial aid that is allocated based on merit and need. This will include new interview questions and new field values in the admissions CRM to track these allocations. Based on estimates of current practice, need-based aid is expected to be 15% or more of financial aid during this plan period. Plans for a new tracking system on how financial aid is allocated, e.g., based on need or merit, will be initiated with the cohort matriculating in Fall 2025.

As an MBA program, we measure our affordability primarily in terms of return on investment, being a function of the cost of the program and the placement outcomes of the program. The program's ability to cut costs and increase financial aid is naturally limited, but there is considerable scope to improve starting salaries and career outcomes for students and alumni, which would have a substantially larger effect on the affordability of the program.

The program recognizes that there is work to be done on this last. While MBA students achieve significant increases to income, with an average starting salary of more than \$109,000 in 2023, our comparator institutions are outperforming these results. The data available for our comparator institutions include a calculation of first year signing bonuses, which exaggerates the difference between the UC Davis MBA program and comparators on the metric of “Estimated Debt Payment as % of Medial Salary“ on the Affordability table below. But that difference would remain even if we could control for this difference.

The program team is emphasizing the job search and placement for incoming classes to ensure that they are prepared for and can seize the opportunities that are available to them. The career development team was recently reorganized to emphasize more active placement assistance to students, compared to the previous staffing that had emphasized skills development and counseling.

We also measure our affordability in terms of our price-competitiveness with comparator institutions. It is difficult to evaluate the “net tuition” paid by students, since we do not have average scholarships for these competitors, but we are confident that we can continue to attract a diverse and highly qualified student body at the current and proposed rates of tuition and financial aid.

Table 7: Debt

Graduating Class		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Percent with Debt	URG	**	0.0%	100.0%	50.0%		75.0%
	Non-URG	50.0%	54.0%	33.0%	24.0%	31.0%	26.0%
	International	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	15.0%	11.0%	19.0%
	All	32.0%	38.0%	20.0%	22.0%	21.0%	33.0%
Average Debt among Students with Debt*	URG	**	\$0	\$65,243	\$26,500		\$77,653
	Non-URG	\$66,653	\$79,153	\$68,237	\$70,112	\$77,077	\$102,012
	International	\$0	\$15,204	\$0	\$38,336	\$83,546	\$34,918
	All	\$66,324	\$71,630	\$67,571	\$49,829	\$78,925	\$77,195

* Figures in the table do not reflect any existing debt incurred by students out of this program (e.g., undergraduate education).

** Figures for these student are included in the "All" rows but are not shown separately due to the small number of students in this category and the resulting privacy concerns.

Note: Blank cells reflect no data available in the PDST dashboard.

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?

Due to the class size of the program, variability year to year can be substantial without indicating a trend. The program is ending this period approximately where it began in terms of the percent of students with debt and the inflation-adjusted value of that debt. **We expect that the proposed PDST levels and financial aid plan will maintain the status quo.**

Table 8: Affordability

	Graduates with Debt	2021-22 Average Debt at Graduation among Students with Debt	Median Salary at Graduation	Est. Debt Payment as % of Median Salary
This program	33%	\$77,195	\$109,076	10%
Public comparisons	37%	\$55,137	\$134,369	6%
Private comparisons	40%	\$59,985	\$145,895	6%

Sources:

UC: Corporate data

Comparison institutions: The comparator list in this proposal.

Additional comments: The figures above for Median Salary at Graduation include a pro-rated signing bonus for all cases except this program. This exaggerates the difference in estimated debt payments as a percentage of median salary. If the signing bonus for the UC Davis program were factored in, it would reduce the rate to approximately 8%.

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.

The student loan debt of our graduates is generally manageable at the median salary at graduation. The debt payments are, for the median student graduating with debt, approximately what they would pay under the federal government’s income-based repayment plan (i.e., 10% of disposable income). Most MBA students, however, would not be eligible for such assistance in light of their salaries.

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 UCD GSM does not have specific resources to promote public interest careers. The program supports students in their career goals whether they pertain to the public, private, or nonprofit sectors. We do not differentiate in the ways described in this section to support one or another choice.

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?

Graduates of the program who pursue public interest careers typically do earn less than students who enter the private sector. The GSM strives to keep the cost of the program low for all students to allow graduates to pursue their most fulfilling careers. The GSM's Assistant Director of Financial Aid advises students, during office hours and one-on-one appointments, on programs such as income-based repayment options for student loans.

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

GSM recruiters conduct hundreds of information sessions per year, mainly around California, and provide complete information about the MBA degree costs and available financial aid to allow potential applicants to clearly understand all financing options. Attendance at these sessions' ranges from 5-50 potential applicants. These small settings enable our staff to discuss the different types of financial aid available for GSM students in a personalized setting. Later in the process, GSM recruiters work with each admitted student individually to explore financing options. We also explain our financial aid programs in detail on our website where students can apply for the program online.

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?

The GSM website has the most recent placement information including the average salary of program graduates. The GSM does not publicize the average debt of program graduates, as it does not apply equally to all potential candidates considering the program. Admissions counselors work with each candidate to help them understand the costs of the program and their own financial aid options.

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.).

At this point in time, the main effect of the pandemic has been the general trend toward acceptance and adoption of distance learning technologies. Online MBA programs have grown substantially since the pandemic, and are putting additional pressure on

the demand for full time on-premises MBA programs such as the UC Davis MBA. We will continue to highlight the value of in-person, on-premises instruction with respect to building a cohort and network and informal interactions with faculty and staff.

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 2023-24 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): N/A
- 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): N/A

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.

All 77 enrolled MBA students were invited to a presentation of the PDST proposal on November 16th. This was scheduled to follow a general meeting of the students to encourage participation. Fifteen students RSVPd, but only one MBA student showed at the time of the planned meeting. The meeting was therefore rescheduled for the program leadership only.

The MBA program leadership met on November 30, including a dozen MBA students and one representative of the Professional Accountancy self-supporting program who attended out of interest. Specific feedback was solicited regarding:

- The use of PDST revenues to support the student experience: Students at the meeting were primarily interested in the effect of increased enrollments on the amount of PDST revenue, and how that would affect expenditure. We discussed the opportunity that increased enrollments presents to limit future increases in PDST, since it spreads the cost of fixed costs over a larger number of students. Better placement outcomes would generate a virtuous cycle that could encourage a return to greater enrollments, and reduce the pressure on PDST revenues.
- The planning assumptions and the proposal to increase PDST by 4% each year: Students discussed and understood that static enrollments would require 4% increase to keep pace with fixed cost increases, else either financial aid or services might be impacted.
- The comparator list of business schools: Students did not have a reaction, positively or negatively, to the comparator list of business schools. They did not raise concerns about the UC Davis program fees relative to the fees of other comparator institutions.

In response to an email sent to all 77 enrolled MBA students soliciting their feedback on the PDST proposal, one student responded: "Thank you for sharing the details behind the PDST hike! I understand why we have to do this but it would be great if we could increase the class size to reduce the tuition fee hikes for future cohorts."

No proposal changes were made based on the feedback from the leadership meeting or the email response.

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 Ben Ruilin Fong on 1/12/24.
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 _____ on _____.
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): N/A

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.

The budget and student fee expectations are a standing agenda item on the GSM faculty retreat. On September 22nd, 2023, the budget and the expectation of 4% tuition rate increases were presented to 30 members of the faculty and senior leadership. The format was a presentation with Q&A. Faculty raised concerns about the number and quality of students in the MBA program, which has the aforementioned impact of driving PDST revenue (or not, as the case may be).

In response to an email sent to all 30 senate faculty, the following three responses were received:

“Seems reasonable. One could quibble with the comparison institutions, but even if you went down the rankings a bit, any comparison institution you could choose outside of California or New York would not face the costs we do (assuming cost of living generally translates to higher salaries, benefits, and other operational costs) so it's probably a wash at worst; in practice I suspect comparing tuitions directly is too conservative and we would be justified in charging more (though I am not personally suggesting that we do; our students face higher costs as well). This is really all I could think of to say in response and my very best effort to provide some meaningful support beyond "thumbs up" =).”

“I only skimmed to the point where you thanked me for reading, so no thanks are truly earned. But I did read the tables. The request seems justified.”

“This looks great — thanks for sharing! One thing I don't understand is why we can't use other UC MBA Programs as a comparator institution. It seems like a reasonable comparable. Last time I looked, The Full-Time MBA UC Davis looks quite favorable compared to other UC programs — UC Davis did cost a little more than UC Irvine, but more affordable than UC Riverside or UC SD — and much more affordable than UCLA or Berkeley,”

No changes were made to the proposal based on the above feedback.

IX.f. Please confirm that this multi-year plan template was provided to the campus Graduate Dean and Vice Chancellor Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (or equivalent), as well as endorsed by the Chancellor.

Plan shared with Jean-Pierre Delplanque on 1/12/24 .
Graduate Dean

Plan shared with Renetta Tull on 1/12/24 .
Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (or equivalent)

Plan endorsed by Gary S. May on 1/23/24 .
Chancellor