Multi-Year Plan for Professional Degree Fee Levels 2011-12 through 2013-14

Planning Assumptions for Development of Professional Degree Fee Levels

- The outcome of the ongoing State budget process this summer will influence decisions about 2011-12 fee increases as well as compensation and benefits cost drivers. UCOP will provide more direction in August 2010. For purposes of this exercise, campuses should use the following assumptions in developing their professional degree fee proposals.
- For 2010-11, assume permanent restoration of the \$305 million in one-time reductions that
 were included in the Governor's vetoes of the Special Session Budget package in February 2009.
 However, programs should be prepared to adjust their proposals if these funds are not included
 in the final 2010-11 budget.
- No decisions have yet been made about mandatory systemwide fee increases for 2011-12 and beyond. For development of professional degree fee proposals, assume that the combined Educational and Registration/Student Services Fees for 2011-12 are 10% higher than 2010-11 fees. For 2012-13 and 2013-14, assume that combined Educational and Registration/Student Services Fees will increase 10% each year.
- For 2011-12, UCOP proposes eliminating Educational Fee differentials that currently exist across student levels and programs. This will result in adjustments to professional degree fee levels. Additional information will be provided to the campuses shortly.
- Assume that the salary reduction/furlough plan approved by the Regents for 2009-10 will not be continued beyond September 1, 2010.
- Assume academic merit increases of 1.78% per year. In addition, while no decisions about compensation increases have yet been made, for purposes of this exercise, assume that no general salary range adjustments of 2% each year will be provided for all employees during 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14. Faculty would receive merit increases in addition to the 2% salary range adjustments.
- In February 2009, the Regents approved the restart of contributions to the UC Retirement Plan in April 2010. The University is currently contributing 4%. While no decisions have yet been made, for this exercise, assume that employer contributions to the UC Retirement Plan will be 7% in 2011-12, 10% in 2012-13 and 12% in 2013-14.
- Assume that the costs of other employee benefits will rise 5-10% annually.
- Assume that other non-salary price increases will be 2.25% annually.
- Assume that there will be no increases in nonresident tuition for graduate professional students for the three-year period.
- Assume continuation of the current policy requiring that financial aid be supplemented by an
 amount equivalent to at least 33 percent of new professional school fee revenue or by an
 amount necessary to ensure that financial aid sources are equivalent to at least 33 percent of
 all professional school fee revenue.

I. PROJECTED PROFESSIONAL DEGREE FEES'

Specify your projected professional degree fees for each of the next three years. Please refer to the planning assumptions for further details about fee increase rates.

		Proposed Last Year		New Proposed Fee Levels			Increases/Decreases		
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Prof. Fee (CA resident)	\$4,280	\$4,580	\$4,900	\$5,742	\$5,970	\$6,204	34%	4%	4%
Prof. Fee (Nonresident)	\$4,280	\$4,580	\$4,900	\$6,198	\$6,426	\$6,660	45%	4%	4%
Mandatory Fees (CA resident)*	\$11,550	\$12,708	\$13,980	\$11,334	\$12,468	\$13,716	-2%	10%	10%
Mandatory Fees (Non res.)*	\$12,006	\$13,212	\$14,538	\$11,334	\$12,468	\$13,716	-6%	10%	10%
Health Insurance**	\$2,046	\$2,841	\$2,983	\$2,148	\$2,256	\$2,369	5%	5%	5%
Campus-based Fees***	\$910	\$1,192	\$1,259	\$921	\$933	\$946	1%	1%	1%
Nonresident Tuition	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	0%	0%	0%
Other (explain below)									
Total Fees (CA resident)	\$18,786	\$21,321	\$23,122	\$20,145	\$21,627	\$23,235	7%	7%	7%
Total Fees (Nonresident)	\$31,487	\$34,070	\$35,925	\$32,846	\$34,328	\$35,936	4%	5%	5%

^{*} Mandatory fees include Educational Fee and Registration/Student Services Fee.

Additional comments, including explanation of any notable changes in 2011-12 or 2012-13 fees from the multi-year plan submitted last year:

Text

II. PROGRAM GOALS AND EXPENDITURE PLANS

Please explain why fee increases are necessary. What goals are you trying to meet and what problems are you trying to solve with fee increases? What are the consequences if proposed fee levels are not approved? What will be the educational benefits for students given the new fee revenue?

These fee increases allow us to fund staff to assist in the teaching of the MPVM programs, particularly in the laboratory classes. The number of faculty available to teach this program have been reduced due to budget reductions, and the program that funded veterinary graduate students (who were available to teach in the MPVM program) has been eliminated due to budget reductions. If we do not receive the requested increase, we will not be able to continue funding these teaching assistants, and the quality of teaching will be significantly diminished, and the workload on faculty will be unreasonably increased. The requested increase simply covers the inflationary increase associated with funding these positions.

Please indicate how you intend to use the revenue generated by the Professional Degree Fee increase.

^{**}Include disability insurance fee for medicine and dentistry.

^{***} Include Course Materials and Services Fees but not health kits.

	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	Total
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
UCRP Contributions	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
Benefits Cost Increases	\$760	\$996	\$1,146	\$2,902
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$1,427	\$1,498	\$1,573	\$4,498
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total projected change in revenue	\$4,280	\$4,494	\$4,719	\$13,493

Additional Comments:

Please describe cost-cutting and/or fundraising efforts related to this program undertaken to avoid fee increases even greater than proposed. Please be as specific as possible.

This program has suffered disproportionately from the reduction in the number of SVM faculty implemented due to budget reductions. Teaching previously done by faculty and VGAP graduate students is now being done by less expensive teaching assistants. Additiona budget reductions include the elimination of the computer teaching laboratory, replaced by laptop computers.

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

No uneven fee increase is proposed

Please provide degrees for which the professional degree fee will be assessed and expected enrollment by degree.

	Enrollment					
Degree	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14		
MPVM	20	20	20	20		
Total	20	20	20	20		

III. MARKET COMPARISONS: TOTAL CHARGES

Please provide the total student tuition and fee charges of comparison institutions. Select a maximum of 8 institutions, including, where possible, a minimum of 3 public institutions. *Please order programs, including your own program, from highest to lowest total cost, and provide an average of the public comparisons.*

	2010-11	2011-12	% Increase
Residents			
UC Davis	\$18,786	\$20,145	7%
University of Washington School of Public Health	\$16,294	\$17,109	5%
University of Iowa College of Public Health	\$13,339	\$14,006	5%
University of Virginia Master of Public Health	\$16,031	\$16,833	5%
Public Average	\$16,113	\$17,023	6%
Nonresidents			
UC Davis	\$31,487	\$32,846	4%
University of Washington School of Public Health	\$29,634	\$31,116	5%
University of Iowa College of Public Health	\$26,401	\$27,721	5%
University of Virginia Master of Public Health	\$26,027	\$27,328	5%
Public Average	\$28,387	\$29,753	5%

Please put your institutions in order of most to least expensive in 2010-11, with your program in the appropriate place in the range.

Source(s):

Why were these institutions chosen as comparators?

There is no program like the MPVM program in the world. Public Health programs are considered to be somewhat similar.

How were the projected fee increases for your comparison institutions determined? Increases of 5% were assumed, because we have no information on projected fee increases.

Please comment on how your program's costs compare with those of the comparison institutions (public and/or private) with which you compete for students.

Because the MPVM program is so unique, we really cannot say that we compete for students with any other program.

IV. ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND DIVERSITY STRATEGY

Note: UCOP will provide campuses with data from the Corporate Student System that should be used to complete the table below for your program. If possible, provide comparable figures for your comparison public and private institutions in the columns shown.

						Comparison (2009-10)	
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Publics	Privates
Ethnicity							
Underrepresented							
African American							
Chicano/Latino	4%	3%	4%	3%	7%		
American Indian		3%					
Subtotal Underrepresented	4%	6%	4%	3%	7%	0%	0%
Asian/East Indian							
White	13%	24%	22%	9%	28%		
Other/ Unknown	35%	31%	26%	35%	34%		
International	48%	39%	48%	53%	31%		
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
Socioeconomic							
% Pell recipients	23%	20%	23%	29%	21%		

Sources:

UC ethnicity, socioeconomic status: UC Corporate data

Comparison institutions: [please indicate]

How does your program compare with other programs in terms of racial and ethnic diversity?

A large portion of our students are international, which meets our objectives for diversity. These international students are from Brazil, Mexico, Romania, Puerto Rico, Iran, Chile, Thailand and India for the current year, so they provide both racial and ethnic diversity. Because the program has just 20 students, a shift of just 2 or 3 students can have a significant impact on the percents shown in the table above.

What is your strategy for increasing the enrollment of students from underrepresented groups in your program? What indicators of success do you monitor?

This program has substantial enrollment from underrepresented minorities, with less that 30% of the student being white. The percentage of *domestic* underrepresented minorities is not high because there are relatively few domestic students compared to other programs.

Please comment on the trend in enrollment of underrepresented groups in your program over the past five years. If necessary, what actions are you implementing to improve diversity in your program?

The trend varies considerably based on percentages, because the number of students is so low.

Please comment on the trend in enrollment of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., students who received Pell Grants as undergraduates).

Because we have primarily international students, this information is not available.

V. FINANCIAL AID STRATEGY AND PROGRAM AFFORDABILITY

What are your financial aid / affordability goals for your program? How do you measure your success in meeting them?

The first priority is to assist all students with financial need. Additionally, funds are set aside for students showing ourstanding promise.

How will your financial aid strategies (e.g., eligibility criteria, packaging policy) help achieve these goals?

The PDF funds are used to provide nee-based gifts to all students with financial need. The SVM has an aggressive and successful development program designed to increase financial aid gifts available to students.

Please describe any programs available to students in your program to promote public service or provide services to underserved populations, such as targeted scholarships, fellowships, summer or academic-year internships, and Loan Repayment Assistance Plans.

The practice of granting gifts to all students with financial need has helped our efforts to improve diversity.

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

The SVM has a comprehensive website that includes links to the campus Financial Aid Office website. One-on-one discussions with a Student Programs representative are readily available to any interested prospective student.

Note: UCOP will provide you with figures from the Corporate Student System that should be used to complete the table below. If possible, provide comparable figures for your comparison public and private institutions in the rows shown.

Graduating Class	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Cumulative Debt	\$ 22,378	\$	\$ 28,226	\$	\$ 18,727	\$ 14,470	\$
Percent with Debt	20%	0%	100%	0%	50%	33%	0%

Please comment on the trend in the indebtedness of students in your program. What impact do you expect your proposed fee and financial aid plan to have on this trend?

Text

Note: UCOP will provide you with figures from the Corporate Student System that should be used to complete a portion of the table below. However, each program is responsible for providing its own estimate of the median (or average, or typical) starting salary for its graduates. If possible, provide comparable figures for your comparison public and private institutions in the rows shown. UCOP will also provide you with a formula for you to use to calculate the last column.

	2008-09 Average	Graduates	Median Salary	Est. Debt Payment as %
	Debt at Graduation	with Debt	at Graduation	
This program	\$	%	\$	#VALUE!
Public comparisons	\$	%	\$	#VALUE!
Private comparisons	\$	%	\$	#VALUE!

Sources:

UC: Corporate data

Comparison institutions: [please indicate]

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.

This information is not available. The MPVM program is a one year program, so the incremental debt associated with this program is not excessive. Student debt continues to be manageable relative to starting salaries, and students continue to consider the education to be well worth the debt incurred. International students, who represent a significant portion of the student body in the MPVM program, must demonstrate that they have the full amount of funding available prior to accepting, and this can be a challenge for those students.

Do graduates of your program who pursue public interest careers (as defined by your discipline) typically earn substantially less upon graduation than other students? If so, what steps does your program take to ensure that these careers are viable in light of students' debt at graduation? Most of our students are international, and we have no information on the relative earnings of public interest careers. We have no programs to mitigate the cost of education for those pursuing public careers.

VI. STUDENT AND FACULTY CONSULTATION

Has your program sought meaningful consultation with its students and faculty about the proposed fee increase for 2011-12? If so, how, and what student/faculty feedback was received? The dean's Council and Executive Committee were consulted and they are supportive of decreasing the requested increase to 5% from the 7% approved last year.

If not, how will you consult and solicit feedback prior to September 17? If your academic calendar does not allow for consultation by September 17, when and how will it occur? Please be specific. (Note that starting next year, OP will ask campuses to begin consultation with students during the spring term prior to fall submission of fee proposals.)

Please confirm that your plan has been shared with the appropriate representative from your campus's graduate student organization before the plan is submitted to UCOP and provide a brief description of the feedback received.

✓ Plan shared with students.

The fees were also discussed with students; because this is a one year program, there was not a great deal of interest expressed regarding future fees.

Please confirm that your plan has been shared with the campus's Graduate Dean before the plan is submitted to UCOP and provide a brief description of the feedback received.

☑ Plan shared with Dean Gibeling on 9/17/10.

The Dean provided no feedback on the proposal.

VII. OTHER

Please describe any other factors that may be relevant to your three-year plan (such as additional measures relating to your program's affordability, etc.).