2015-16 Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Proposal
Short Form

Due August 29, 2014 for January 2015 Regents’ Approval

This form should be completed for programs already charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition that wish to increase the PDST from the 2014-15 level up to but not greater than the increase proposed in 2012-13 for 2013-14. This increase was never taken to the Regents for approval, but the work necessary to justify it was done. It is anticipated that much of that work is still relevant. If so, campuses may rely on it. Otherwise, new work should be done in order to be up-to-date. Moreover, some effort ought to be made to consult with program students and student leadership, given the likely turnover in that constituency that has occurred since the proposals were submitted. Program faculty may be consulted again if deemed appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2014-15</th>
<th>Proposed 2013-14</th>
<th>Proposed 2015-16</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (CA resident)</td>
<td>$5,742</td>
<td>$5,886</td>
<td>$5,886</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (Nonresident)</td>
<td>$6,198</td>
<td>$6,354</td>
<td>$6,353</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Systemwide Fees (CA resident)*</td>
<td>$12,192</td>
<td>$12,804</td>
<td>$12,804</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance**</td>
<td>$4,430</td>
<td>$4,430</td>
<td>$4,430</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-based Fees***</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>$917</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Suppl. Tuition</td>
<td>$12,245</td>
<td>$12,245</td>
<td>$12,245</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (explain below)****</td>
<td>$2,064</td>
<td>$2,064</td>
<td>$2,064</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees (CA resident)</td>
<td>$25,345</td>
<td>$26,101</td>
<td>$26,101</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fees (Nonresident)</td>
<td>$38,046</td>
<td>$38,813</td>
<td>$38,813</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mandatory systemwide charges include Tuition and Student Services Fee.
** Include disability insurance fee for medicine and dentistry.
*** Include Course Materials and Services Fees but not health kits.
**** Mandatory summer session.

2013-14 proposed fee levels are provided in the attached fee table.

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 increase, which may be obtained in a variety of ways. Campuses are expected to have consulted with students and faculty. At the program level, consultation should include information on (a) proposed PDST increases and three-year plans for any proposed increases, (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

How did you consult with students about the PDST levels proposed for 2015-16? Check all that apply.

- [ ] Scheduled town-hall style meetings with students in the program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
- [ ] Convened focus groups of students in the program to discuss the plan and solicited feedback
- [ ] Described the plan to students in the program via email, solicited their feedback, and reviewed the comments received
The School of Veterinary Medicine proposes the following consultation plan with faculty and students:

1. Initiate a discussion via email. We will send out a two-page summary of our proposed increases for both the DVM and MPVM programs to the relevant students and all faculty members. The summary will include the proposed professional fee, and the possible system-wide fees, campus-based fees, health insurance fees and course materials fees (for the DVM program). It would also include a break-down of how professional fees are used in the school. Note, our increases are lower (2.5% increase versus the originally proposed 5% increase) than in our original 3-year plan. A sample of what we will prepare from our 2013-14 proposal is attached. We will update the figures in early August 2014.

2. Meet with the Executive Committee chair to discuss her impressions of the increase.

3. Hold a series of office hours for students and faculty to meet with the assistant dean and our student financial aid counselor. We would hold these hours at times convenient for both faculty and staff in our main teaching buildings.

We would summarize all feedback and include original emails if feedback was provided electronically. Attach the feedback written by students during the opportunities for consultation checked above and any proposal changes as a result of this feedback. Also attach a summary of feedback written by designated student leaders in the program. Examples of appropriate leadership include the relevant program or school student association leadership, if one exists, and the campus graduate student association or equivalent.

In addition to consultation with program students and faculty, please confirm that this short-form template has been provided to the program graduate student organization, if applicable, and the campus graduate student organization. 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 each with an opportunity to provide feedback on the proposals. Full comments or a summary of those comments must be provided by the program.

☒ Plan shared with Erica Vonasek, GSA Interim Chair on 8/20/14.

☐ Comments or feedback was provided.
☐ Comments or feedback was not provided.
Nature of feedback or full comments:

☐ If applicable, plan shared with Program graduate student organization (i.e., your program council or department GSA) on .

☐ Comments or feedback was provided.
☐ Comments or feedback was not provided.
Nature of feedback or full comments:

Consultation with faculty (if appropriate)
How did you consult with faculty about the PDST levels proposed for 2015-16? Check all that apply.
☐ Scheduled town-hall style meetings of faculty to discuss the plan and solicit feedback
Convened focus groups of faculty in the 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): Text

Attach the feedback written by faculty during the opportunities for consultation checked above and any proposal changes as a result of this feedback. Also attach a summary of feedback written by designated faculty leaders in the program. Examples of appropriate leadership include other appropriate faculty and affiliated faculty leadership (e.g., faculty executive committee or other faculty leadership).

Please confirm that this short-form template was provided to the campus Graduate Dean and approved by the Chancellor.

Plan shared with Jeffery Gibeling on 7/29/14.

Plan shared with Linda P.B. Katehi on 8/22/14.

Market Comparisons: Total Charges

In their fall 2010 or summer 2012 long-form templates, each program provided a list of comparison institutions, estimates of comparison institutions’ total charges, and projections of comparison institutions’ total charges. The July 2012 Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Regents’ item (as presented at the July 2012 Regents’ meeting, and available at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/jul12/f6.pdf) provides the average estimated total fees at programs’ public comparison institutions as projected for 2012-13, and are used in the companion tables to this template to calculate public comparison fees projected for 2015-16 – i.e., increased by 3% annually over 2012-13 levels. Please choose your program’s average public comparison fee figure from the file and insert it below. This assumes that your program’s public comparators have not changed since your program’s last submission; if they have changed, or if you believe a different average public comparison fee figure should be used, please contact Richard Michaelson at OP (richard.michaelson@ucop.edu) as soon as possible.

Projected 2015-16 total resident fees, public comparison institution average: $27,979

1 Per the Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition section 7(B), found at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/3103.html