

Multi-Year Plan for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Levels Effective Beginning Summer or Fall 2019

PART A

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

This approval did not directly rescind the authority delegated to the President by the Regents in November 2014 to approve PDST increases up to 5% through 2019-20. Programs with an approved multi-year plan on file that has not expired may submit requests for increases up to 5% for the President’s approval for PDST levels that become effective summer or fall 2019 (as long as the proposed increase does not exceed the amount previously indicated in the program’s current multi-year plan). Requests from these programs should be submitted using a short form. By fall 2020, the amended Regents Policy 3103 will apply to all PDST programs.

I. PROJECTED PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION AND PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

	Actual	New Proposed Fee Levels					Increases/Decreases									
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24	
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (CA)	\$25,998	\$27,036	\$28,116	\$29,241	\$30,411	\$31,626	4.0%	\$1,038	4.0%	\$1,080	4.0%	\$1,125	4.0%	\$1,170	4.0%	\$1,215
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition	\$25,998	\$27,036	\$28,116	\$29,241	\$30,411	\$31,626	4.0%	\$1,038	4.0%	\$1,080	4.0%	\$1,125	4.0%	\$1,170	4.0%	\$1,215
Mandatory Systemwide Fees (CA resident)*	\$12,570	\$12,966	\$13,368	\$13,788	\$14,220	\$14,670	3.2%	\$396	3.1%	\$402	3.1%	\$420	3.1%	\$432	3.2%	\$450
Campus-based	\$1,000	\$1,030	\$1,061	\$1,093	\$1,126	\$1,160	3.0%	\$30	3.0%	\$31	3.0%	\$32	3.0%	\$33	3.0%	\$34
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)**																
Total Fees (CA resident)	\$39,568	\$41,032	\$42,545	\$44,122	\$45,757	\$47,456	3.7%	\$1,464	3.7%	\$1,513	3.7%	\$1,577	3.7%	\$1,635	3.7%	\$1,699
Total Fees (Nonresident)	\$51,813	\$53,277	\$54,790	\$56,367	\$58,002	\$59,701	2.8%	\$1,464	2.8%	\$1,513	2.9%	\$1,577	2.9%	\$1,635	2.9%	\$1,699

* Mandatory systemwide charges include Tuition and Student Services Fee.

**Do not include the Student Health Insurance Program (SHIP) premium, since this may be waived for students with qualifying coverage under another program.

*** Include Course Materials and Services Fees but not health kits. Include disability insurance fee for medicine and dentistry.

Additional comments:

New proposed fee levels for Mandatory Systemwide Fees, Campus-based Fees and Nonresident Supplemental Tuition are based on the direction and assumptions given by the UCOP budget office. 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 state-supported 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 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. 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.

II. PROGRAM GOAL EVALUATION

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

The full time MBA program's last multi-year PDST plan pertained to 2016-17 through 2018-19. During that time period, PDST supported 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.

2. Maintain program quality:

- a. Our program covered mandatory cost increases in order to maintain program quality. Beginning in 2017-18, UC Davis reduced state funding for the full time program by approximately \$140,000, while the planned increase in PDST revenue that year totaled \$103,572, of which 33% was destined for financial aid. Due to these changes, all remaining available incremental PDST was used to mitigate this reduction as much as possible. The MBA managed to maintain program services through a combination of cost-efficiency and philanthropy. New programs, such as the industry immersions that combine MBA and other graduate students on campus in case study classes led by industry leaders, were added on the basis of increased philanthropic giving and using surplus funds from self-supporting degree programs.

3. Provide new student services:

- a. The MBA program proposed to use 8.5% of incremental PDST revenue towards new student services. Incremental PDST revenue was ultimately not available for new student services, however, for the reasons given above. The GSM implemented all planned activities from the previous multi-year plan, and thereby maintained affordability and program quality.

4. Enhance program diversity:

- a. In the prior multi-year plan, the MBA outlined a series of planned activities to recruit a diverse student body. Specifically, the MBA 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 MBA also 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 MBA implemented these activities in an effort to seek out and encourage members of underrepresented groups to apply for and attend the MBA program.

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 MBA is proposing a 4% annual increase to PDST during the years of this multi-year plan. The proposed 4% increase falls just shy of covering expected increases in current expenses. The MBA will attempt to make up the remaining small difference through philanthropy. The enhanced student services, academic electives and faculty quality are important features of the program that have contributed to the successful rise in rankings and student performance. If the requested increase is not approved, the program will not be able to maintain this essential balance between program quality and affordability.

We plan to continue advancing the same goals as our last multi-year plan. Our goals, along with our plans to advance them through PDST, are as follows:

1. Enhance program affordability:

- a. At least 33% of the MBA program's PDST revenue will be used to support student financial aid. This proportion will be maintained for any increases in PDST revenue.

2. Maintain program quality:

- a. Approximately 14% of the MBA program's PDST revenue will be used to support regular compensation for research faculty.
- b. Approximately 13% of the MBA program's PDST revenue will be used to support benefits.
- c. Approximately 14% of the MBA program's PDST revenue will be used to support additional Lecturer hires to enhance the student-faculty ratio and expand the elective offerings in the program.

3. Provide new student services:

- a. Approximately 24% of the MBA program's PDST revenue will be used to support additional student services, principally in enhanced career development services, soft skills development and student-led co-curricular activities. This includes both staff and other direct operating expenses.

We also intend to use approximately 1.7% of the MBA program's PDST revenue to cover the campus assessment on all expenditures. At the GSM, we allocate the campus assessment to each fund source that generates the cost. This assessment is planned to increase

at irregular intervals due to the introduction of a UC Path assessment on all funds, rising to 2.15% of revenue by the final year of this proposal. (UC Path is the systemwide HR/Payroll system.)

This proposal addresses the GSM’s enrollment and diversity strategies in Section V below. To name a couple examples of our strategies, admissions staff participate in recruiting events sponsored by organizations that focus on members from underrepresented groups, and the GSM, as mentioned in Section II, participates in the UC consortium that sponsors the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders. To the extent that staff positions and other operating expenditures are related to our diversity strategy, they are supported from all sources of funding in our full time MBA program: state support, graduate student tuition, and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition.

III.b. For established PDST programs, please indicate how you are using total actual Professional Degree Fee revenue in 2018-19 in the first column of the table below. In the remaining columns, please indicate how you intend to use the revenue generated by the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition increase (if specified years in the table do not apply to your multi-year plan, please leave those columns blank).

	Total 2018-19 PDST Revenue	Proposed Use of Incremental PDST Revenue					Total Projected PDST Revenue in Final Year
		Incremental 2019-20 PDST revenue	Incremental 2020-21 PDST revenue	Incremental 2021-22 PDST revenue	Incremental 2022-23 PDST revenue	Incremental 2023-24 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$313,000	\$14,961	\$15,677	\$16,426	\$17,211	\$18,034	\$395,309
Benefits/UCRP Cost	\$300,000	\$15,000	\$15,750	\$16,538	\$17,364	\$18,233	\$382,884
Providing Student Services	\$559,000	\$14,584	\$14,308	\$12,633	\$12,640	\$12,625	\$625,790
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$318,000	\$14,310	\$14,954	\$15,627	\$16,330	\$17,065	\$396,286
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	\$783,822	\$31,353	\$32,607	\$33,911	\$35,268	\$36,678	\$953,639
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)	\$40,000	\$2,345	\$2,959	\$4,971	\$5,296	\$5,639	\$61,210
Total use/projected use of revenue	\$2,313,822	\$92,553	\$96,255	\$100,105	\$104,109	\$108,273	\$2,815,118

Additional Comments: The PDST revenue that we propose to use to cover the campus assessment is listed in the “Other” row. All expenditures are assessed a campus assessment that will increase from 1.74% to an expected 2.15% during the plan years, with the increase due to the costs of implementing the new systemwide HR/payroll system, UC Path.

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 MBA program continuously works to operate efficiently. The structure of the budget and mandated increases for salaries and benefits limits what can be achieved by cost-cutting without reducing service levels to students. The MBA program also aims to sustain and expand our self-funded programs to support the overall cost structure of the school. We engage in intensive fundraising efforts to enhance our annual fund, our business partnerships, and major gift funds to support the MBA programs. These fundraising efforts have resulted in more than \$1.5 million in revenue each year for the past several years, most of which benefits the full-time MBA program directly or indirectly. For example, the recent President’s Chair was established using a gift from an alumnus. One way the program operates with cost-efficiency in mind is that it purchases event furniture and supplies, stores these items onsite, and avoids the cost of campus central services providing such furniture and services.

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.

	Enrollment					
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Resident	46	46	46	46	46	46
Domestic Nonresident	2	2	2	2	2	2
International	41	41	41	41	41	41
Total	89	89	89	89	89	89

Additional Comments: From a planning perspective, maintaining consistent enrollments is an appropriate program and budgetary expectation. If enrollments end up being 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 following table, identify a *minimum* of 3 and *up to* 12 institutions that your program considers to be comparators, including a minimum of 3 public institutions. If it is the case that your program only compares to a small number of programs or only private comparators, please list those.

If the box is checked, the program has provided for each comparator the total charges to degree completion in the following table; otherwise, amounts for first year annual charges were provided by the program for each comparator.

UC Davis/Graduate School of Management/Master of Business Administration
Established program
Established PDST

	Actuals	Projections					Increases/Decreases									
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24	
Residents							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
ASU Carey - Public	\$29,350	\$30,231	\$31,137	\$32,072	\$33,034	\$34,025	3%	\$881	3%	\$907	3%	\$934	3%	\$962	3%	\$991
U of MN Carlson - Public	\$40,484	\$41,698	\$42,949	\$44,238	\$45,565	\$46,932	3%	\$1,215	3%	\$1,251	3%	\$1,288	3%	\$1,327	3%	\$1,367
Ohio State - Fisher - Public	\$31,139	\$32,073	\$33,035	\$34,026	\$35,047	\$36,099	3%	\$934	3%	\$962	3%	\$991	3%	\$1,021	3%	\$1,051
Michigan State - Broad - Public	\$31,867	\$32,823	\$33,808	\$34,822	\$35,867	\$36,943	3%	\$956	3%	\$985	3%	\$1,014	3%	\$1,045	3%	\$1,076
UT Dallas - Public	\$33,436	\$34,439	\$35,472	\$36,536	\$37,633	\$38,761	3%	\$1,003	3%	\$1,033	3%	\$1,064	3%	\$1,096	3%	\$1,129
U of MD College Park - Public	\$46,376	\$47,767	\$49,200	\$50,676	\$52,197	\$53,762	3%	\$1,391	3%	\$1,433	3%	\$1,476	3%	\$1,520	3%	\$1,566
USC Marshall - Private - Private	\$62,934	\$64,822	\$66,767	\$68,770	\$70,833	\$72,958	3%	\$1,888	3%	\$1,945	3%	\$2,003	3%	\$2,063	3%	\$2,125
U of Notre Dame Mendoza - Private	\$54,120	\$55,744	\$57,416	\$59,138	\$60,913	\$62,740	3%	\$1,624	3%	\$1,672	3%	\$1,722	3%	\$1,774	3%	\$1,827
BU Questrom - Private	\$54,900	\$56,547	\$58,243	\$59,991	\$61,790	\$63,644	3%	\$1,647	3%	\$1,696	3%	\$1,747	3%	\$1,800	3%	\$1,854
BC Carroll - Private	\$51,200	\$52,736	\$54,318	\$55,948	\$57,626	\$59,355	3%	\$1,536	3%	\$1,582	3%	\$1,630	3%	\$1,678	3%	\$1,729
SMU Cox - Private	\$53,103	\$54,696	\$56,337	\$58,027	\$59,768	\$61,561	3%	\$1,593	3%	\$1,641	3%	\$1,690	3%	\$1,741	3%	\$1,793
Public Average	\$35,442	\$36,505	\$37,600	\$38,728	\$39,890	\$41,087	3%	\$1,063	3%	\$1,095	3%	\$1,128	3%	\$1,162	3%	\$1,197
Private Average	\$55,251	\$56,909	\$58,616	\$60,375	\$62,186	\$64,052	3%	\$1,658	3%	\$1,707	3%	\$1,758	3%	\$1,811	3%	\$1,866
Public and Private Average	\$44,446	\$45,780	\$47,153	\$48,568	\$50,025	\$51,525	3%	\$1,333	3%	\$1,373	3%	\$1,415	3%	\$1,457	3%	\$1,501
Your program - UC Davis	\$39,568	\$41,032	\$42,545	\$44,122	\$45,757	\$47,456	4%	\$1,464	4%	\$1,513	4%	\$1,577	4%	\$1,635	4%	\$1,699
	Actuals	Projections					Increases/Decreases									
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23		2023-24	
Nonresidents																
ASU Carey - Public	\$50,550	\$52,067	\$53,628	\$55,237	\$56,894	\$58,601	3%	\$1,517	3%	\$1,562	3%	\$1,609	3%	\$1,657	3%	\$1,707
U of MN Carlson - Public	\$51,212	\$52,748	\$54,331	\$55,961	\$57,640	\$59,369	3%	\$1,536	3%	\$1,582	3%	\$1,630	3%	\$1,679	3%	\$1,729
Ohio State - Fisher - Public	\$53,642	\$55,251	\$56,909	\$58,616	\$60,375	\$62,186	3%	\$1,609	3%	\$1,658	3%	\$1,707	3%	\$1,758	3%	\$1,811
Michigan State - Broad - Public	\$50,483	\$51,997	\$53,557	\$55,164	\$56,819	\$58,524	3%	\$1,514	3%	\$1,560	3%	\$1,607	3%	\$1,655	3%	\$1,705
UT Dallas - Public	\$62,299	\$64,168	\$66,093	\$68,076	\$70,118	\$72,222	3%	\$1,869	3%	\$1,925	3%	\$1,983	3%	\$2,042	3%	\$2,104
U of MD College Park - Public	\$55,556	\$57,223	\$58,939	\$60,708	\$62,529	\$64,405	3%	\$1,667	3%	\$1,717	3%	\$1,768	3%	\$1,821	3%	\$1,876
USC Marshall - Private - Private	\$62,934	\$64,822	\$66,767	\$68,770	\$70,833	\$72,958	3%	\$1,888	3%	\$1,945	3%	\$2,003	3%	\$2,063	3%	\$2,125
U of Notre Dame Mendoza - Private	\$54,120	\$55,744	\$57,416	\$59,138	\$60,913	\$62,740	3%	\$1,624	3%	\$1,672	3%	\$1,722	3%	\$1,774	3%	\$1,827
BU Questrom - Private	\$54,900	\$56,547	\$58,243	\$59,991	\$61,790	\$63,644	3%	\$1,647	3%	\$1,696	3%	\$1,747	3%	\$1,800	3%	\$1,854
BC Carroll - Private	\$51,200	\$52,736	\$54,318	\$55,948	\$57,626	\$59,355	3%	\$1,536	3%	\$1,582	3%	\$1,630	3%	\$1,678	3%	\$1,729
SMU Cox - Private	\$53,103	\$54,696	\$56,337	\$58,027	\$59,768	\$61,561	3%	\$1,593	3%	\$1,641	3%	\$1,690	3%	\$1,741	3%	\$1,793
Public Average	\$53,957	\$55,576	\$57,243	\$58,960	\$60,729	\$62,551	3%	\$1,619	3%	\$1,667	3%	\$1,717	3%	\$1,769	3%	\$1,822
Private Average	\$55,251	\$56,909	\$58,616	\$60,375	\$62,186	\$64,052	3%	\$1,658	3%	\$1,707	3%	\$1,758	3%	\$1,811	3%	\$1,866
Public and Private Average	\$54,545	\$56,182	\$57,867	\$59,603	\$61,391	\$63,233	3%	\$1,636	3%	\$1,685	3%	\$1,736	3%	\$1,788	3%	\$1,842
Your Program - UC Davis	\$51,813	\$53,277	\$54,790	\$56,367	\$58,002	\$59,701	3%	\$1,464	3%	\$1,513	3%	\$1,577	3%	\$1,635	3%	\$1,699

Source(s): Comparator fees are based on each institution's public website posting of their 2018-19 tuition and fees charged.

Additional Comments: Used University's recommended escalation factor of 3% annually for comparator year over year increases. Health insurance is not included.

ASY Carey - <https://wpcarey.asu.edu/mba-programs/full-time/program-cost>

U of MN Carlson - <https://carlonschool.umn.edu/degrees/master-business-administration/full-time-mba/admissions/full-time-mba-tuition>

Ohio State - Fisher - <https://fisher.osu.edu/graduate/ftmba/admissions/tuition-funding>

Michigan State - Broad - <https://mba.broad.msu.edu/cost/tuition/>

UT Dallas - <https://jindal.utdallas.edu/admission-requirements/mba/#01-full-time-mba>

U of MD College Park - <https://www.rhsmith.umd.edu/programs/full-time-mba/admissions/tuition-fees>

USC Marshall - <https://www.marshall.usc.edu/programs/mba-programs/full-time-mba/admissions/financial-aid>

U of Notre Dame Mendoza - <https://mendoza.nd.edu/programs/mba-programs/two-year-mba/tuition-financial-aid/>

BU Questrom - <https://www.bu.edu/questrom/admissions/graduate-programs/full-time-mba/tuition-financial-aid/>

BC Carroll - <https://www.bc.edu/bc-web/schools/carroll-school/graduate/admission/tuition-and-aid.html>

SMU Cox - <https://www.smu.edu/cox/Degrees-and-Programs/Two-Year-MBA/admissions/tuition-and-financing>

IV.b. Why was each of these institutions chosen as a comparator? 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 5 years. Be specific (and if a program is unlikely to achieve comparability to an aspirational program within 5 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 29 to 48 by *US News and World Report* (USN&WR). Five have rankings better than the GSM's place this year, five have rankings that are lower, and MSU Broad and the GSM are tied at 37th. There are six public and five private institutions in the list. Seven of these schools are comparators that the GSM's accrediting body, AACSB, will use in the upcoming continuous improvement review. These include Ohio State – Fisher, Michigan State – Broad, UT Dallas, Boston University – Questrom, Boston College – Carroll, Southern Methodist University – Cox, and University of Maryland College Park. Three of the remaining four are considered aspirational, and are within eight places of the GSM in the rankings. These include ASU Carey, University of Minnesota – Carlson, and University of Notre Dame – Mendoza. The GSM has improved by eleven ranks in the past two years, and expects to be in competitive ranks with these three schools within the next five years by continuing to focus on enhanced career services and attracting a strong and diverse pool of students with industry immersions and corporate connections. USC

Marshall was selected for comparison since it is the only non-UC business school in California that is ranked by *US News and World Report* within 25 ranks of the GSM (at 20th).

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

For California residents, the MBA program is approximately 12% more expensive than the average public MBA program, approximately 28% less expensive than the average private MBA program, and approximately 11% less expensive than the average overall. For nonresidents, the GSM is approximately 4% less expensive than the average public MBA program, 6% less than the average private MBA programs, and 5% less than the average overall. The reasons for these differences are likely due to the relatively expensive cost of living in California and the differences in public support for MBA programs at public universities. The curious inversion of the cost of programs, with better ranked programs generally being less expensive than lesser ranked programs, is likely due to the greater availability of philanthropic support for better ranked programs.

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 in the top 10 world-wide in productivity per capita according to the UT Dallas business research database, and, as mentioned earlier, the GSM has improved by eleven ranks in the past two years. 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 following table, please provide details about enrollment in your program and in your comparison public and private institutions. For established programs, provide data for academic years 2015-16 to 2017-18 and include estimated fall 2018 data

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

	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Comparison (2016-17)	
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Fall 2018	Public	Private
Ethnicity						
Underrepresented						
African American	0.0%	1.1%	2.2%	1.1%	4.6%	3.3%
Chicanx/Latinx	7.2%	2.3%	3.3%	6.7%	5.4%	7.3%
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%
<i>Subtotal Underrepresented</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>3.4%</i>	<i>5.5%</i>	<i>7.8%</i>	<i>10.8%</i>	<i>10.8%</i>
Asian/East Indian	13.6%	15.8%	15.6%	15.6%	9.9%	17.6%
White	39.6%	46.4%	36.7%	28.9%	55.1%	50.8%
Other/ Unknown	37.2%	33.2%	30.9%	20.0%	9.2%	4.8%
International	2.4%	1.1%	11.3%	27.8%	15.0%	16%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Socioeconomic						
% Pell recipients	14.8%	24.2%	20.8%	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gender						
% Male	73.6%	66.7%	56.3%	60.7%	64.2%	65%
% Female	26.4%	33.3%	43.8%	39.3%	35.8%	35%

Sources:

Ethnicity and Gender Fall 2018: UCD Budget and Institutional Analysis

UC socioeconomic status and Gender: UC Corporate data

Comparison institutions: AACSB Data Direct, BSQ Report on Generalist MBA Enrollment by Ethnicity and Gender

V.b. For established programs, please comment on the trend in enrollment of underrepresented groups in your program over the past three years. How does your program compare with other programs in terms of racial and ethnic diversity, with particular attention to U.S. domestic underrepresented minority students? What is your strategy 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 underrepresented minority students? What will be your strategy for creating a robust level of racial and ethnic diversity in your program?

The UC Davis GSM's full time MBA program has slightly lower enrollments of underrepresented groups in the program compared to the average of other top 50 MBA programs.

One of the GSM's strategies for creating a robust level of diversity is to participate in the UC consortium that sponsors the Summer Institute for Emerging Managers and Leaders (SIEML). As mentioned in Part II, SIEML brings together exceptional undergraduates from Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-serving Institutions to learn about MBA programs and the opportunities available at UC business schools. The location of the summer program rotates each year, and the GSM was the host of the Summer Institute in 2014. The program was recently recognized by the state and funds were appropriated to sustain it. The GSM is part of the consortium that is working to expand this program.

The GSM Admissions team also works diligently to reach out to underrepresented groups and will continue to do so. Admissions staff participate in recruiting events sponsored by organizations that focus on members from underrepresented groups. The forums are arranged by organizations such as the National Society of Hispanic MBAs, the National Black MBA Association, the National Black Pre-MBA Association, and the Forte Foundation. We have the opportunity to address the admissions and financial aid processes with participants and to meet in small groups for more individualized attention.

Unfortunately, these efforts have not achieved the goals of the GSM with respect to racial and ethnic diversity in the program, suggesting that they are necessary but not sufficient. During the past year, the GSM administration focused on this effort with the goal of additional personalized focus on domestic underrepresented minority (URM) candidates to improve the percentage that accept an offer of admissions (i.e., yield). The Dean identified several companies with which the GSM has strong relationships and brokered agreements that would guarantee internships to URM students upon admission. This revealed, however, that the problem is at the very beginning of the process since there were very few URM candidates in the pool.

GSM is actively working to improve in this area by reaching out to other business schools such as Rice University, Boston University and Georgetown that have more diverse student bodies to learn about strategies and best practices that have been successful in those programs. The GSM also recently hired a new Admissions Director, who worked in Admissions and Recruiting at Babson College, which was recently recognized for efforts at improving diversity and inclusion in undergraduate business education. We are also planning an evaluation of our student yield and financial aid strategies to determine how we might do a better job of attracting students from diverse backgrounds to UC Davis.

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 rate of enrollment of students who received Pell Grants as undergraduates has been fairly consistent at the GSM, varying from 13% to 24% during the past eight years. The highest rates were in the last two years. The GSM strives to make the MBA program affordable to all qualified students by offering financial aid and by holding down the cost of the program overall.

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 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 GSM's full-time MBA program compares favorably with other top 50 MBA programs in terms of gender parity. The GSM will continue to promote gender parity through recruiting and retaining excellent female faculty, by recruiting and admitting qualified female MBA candidates, and by providing co-curricular activities to promote gender parity such as the Women in Leadership club. Currently, trends in GSM enrollments show increased levels of female student representation.

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

We expect that there will be a larger Hispanic student population proportionally because of the continuing outreach and the expected designation of UC Davis as a Hispanic-serving Institution, which may improve our ability to market UC Davis to prospective Latinx students. In addition, since we are planning an evaluation of our student yield and financial aid strategies to determine how we might do a better job of attracting students from diverse backgrounds, we expect enrollment of students from other underrepresented racial/ethnic backgrounds to increase over the course of this multi-year plan. We also expect to maintain the favorable gender ratio as compared to peer business schools, at approximately the rates of these past two years. We do not expect a significant change in the proportion of Pell Grant recipients.

V.f. In the tables below, please provide details about the faculty diversity of the school or department that houses your program. (If the program is offered primarily by a single department, please provide data for that department. If the program is offered by a school, please provide school-level data instead. If the program draws faculty from multiple schools or departments, please include two tables for each school/department.)

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

All Faculty (School or Department)**					Ladder Rank and Equivalent Faculty (School or Department)				
Ethnicity		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Ethnicity		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Black/Afr-American	Domestic	2.0%	2.3%	1.9%	Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	International								
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	2.0%	2.3%	1.9%	Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
	International								
American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	American Indian	Domestic	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	24.0%	27.3%	24.1%	Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	32.1%	33.3%	33.3%
	International								
White	Domestic	44.0%	43.2%	40.7%	White	Domestic	46.4%	40.7%	40.7%
	International								
Other/Unknown	Domestic	28.0%	25.0%	31.5%	Other/Unknown	Domestic	17.9%	22.2%	22.2%
	International								
<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	<i>Percentage by Gender</i>		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Female		30.0%	25.0%	29.6%	Female		35.7%	33.3%	33.3%
Male		70.0%	75.0%	70.4%	Male		63.3%	66.7%	66.7%

Sources:
UCD Academic Affairs

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

V.g. What are your program's current and proposed efforts to advance the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty?

All ladder faculty and lecturer recruitments are advertised broadly and in specific academic 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. This year, the GSM is participating 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. 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.*

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.

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 **provide financial aid to students based on merit** and to **make the program affordable to all qualified students**. For the incoming class in Fall 2018, 75% received merit-based financial aid. Individual awards ranged from \$3,000 to \$39,000 for the two years of the program.

One of our methods of measuring success in meeting the affordability goals is to review the percentage of Pell recipients in each class provided by the campus. This percentage was 15% on average between 2012 and 2015 and increased to 20% on average between 2015 and 2018. Due to the small class size, a few students can shift this ratio, but the upward trend is encouraging and suggests that the program is achieving its affordability goals.

As mentioned earlier, we are also planning an evaluation of our financial aid strategies to determine how we might do a better job of attracting students from diverse backgrounds to UC Davis.

Graduating Class	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Percent with Debt	70%	56%	37%	33%	41%	26%	32%
Cumulative Debt among Students with Debt	\$46,225	\$59,511	\$40,544	\$73,845	\$69,273	\$48,939	\$66,324

Sources: UC Corporate data

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

The long term trend appears to be that an increasingly smaller percentage of students have debt, but have greater cumulative debt per student. Small numbers have large impacts in our cohorts, however, which explains some of the swings year over year. We do not expect the proposed increases to have a material impact on these trends in indebtedness. All else being equal, this proposal would increase the indebtedness of some students by the rate of the increase (approximately 2.6% per year, which is 4% less return to aid), but larger forces than these adjustments appear to be driving the overall trend.

	Graduates with Debt	2016-17 Average Debt at Graduation among Students with Debt	Mean Salary at Graduation	Est. Debt Payment as % of Median Salary
This program	32%	\$66,324	\$95,603	10%
Public comparisons	%	\$	\$99,121	N/A
Private comparisons	%	\$	\$105,894	N/A

Sources: UC - Corporate data & comparator school web sites
Comparison institutions - Same list as for fees.

Additional Comments: Cumulative debt figures are not available for comparator institutions. The data above were pieced together from public MBA program websites, and are not an apples to apples comparison since they reflect a mixture of 2017 and 2018 data

and not all information was consistently reported as base median. Some of the figures for individual schools include a signing bonus factored in, for example, which is excluded from the UC Davis GSM figure.

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.

More than two-thirds of GSM MBA students graduated without debt in 2017. For the remaining third, the GSM MBA is an excellent investment given typical salaries. The average pre-MBA salary for GSM students graduating in 2017 was \$54,127, and the average (mean) post-MBA salary was \$95,603 with an average starting bonus greater than \$14,000. With these results, we consider student loan debt at the GSM to be reasonable and manageable for our alumni.

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 does not specifically inform students of income-driven repayment plans for federal loans, but the campus financial aid office does.

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.).

N/A

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 only 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 2018-19 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.

- (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):
- 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
- Other (please describe):

IX.b. Below, please 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 full time MBA students received an email with a link to the proposal and an invite to a town hall on October 17, 2018. There were no written replies to the email.

Approximately 15 students attended the Town Hall discussion in fall 2018. Please find a summary of the questions and comments students raised during the meeting below:

- Cost Increases: Since the rates of increase are mandatory, some students suggested that these increases should be paid by increases to the general fund allocation to the GSM.
- Cost Increases: Students asked if the GSM works to control costs, and commented on the “amazing” experience the first year students had just had during orientation.
- Total Fees and Comparators: One student asked about the difference between the median and average of fees at comparator schools, and found it interesting that there is no obvious relationship between fees and rankings within this range.
- Total Fees and Comparators: Students asked if California schools were included, leading to an explanation that the only business school in California ranking within 25 places of the GSM that is not a UC is USC Marshall, which is why it is included in the comparator list.
- Total Fees: Students asked clarifying questions regarding what was covered by the increase. Some first year students expressed concern about the cost of textbooks and required software purchases.
- Rate of Increase: Students were interested in the decision-making process that led to a 4% year over year increase for five years.
- Rate of Increase: Students discussed the opportunity to increase enrollments and how this would affect the financial support for the full time program.
- Rate of Increase: In discussions of the total portfolio of GSM programs and budget, students asked about the growth of specialized one-year master programs and the strategy with respect to cannibalization.
- Affordability: For some international students, changes in exchange rates make UCD more expensive.
- Affordability: One student was unhappy that the PDST was changing between the first and second year, feeling that the first year fee was a “contract” that was being changed.
- Affordability: Students asked if there was a way to mitigate the increase, either by “working it off” or pursuing development opportunities for the school.
- Affordability: First year students asked if they could be protected from the increase if enrollments or philanthropy improve next year to cover the funds required. It was explained that this was not possible since the tuition increase is set well before enrollments and philanthropy are known for the year.
- Financial Aid: One student asked about the process by which merit financial awards are made and if more transparency could be introduced. The process by which merit financial awards are made was explained, though further transparency cannot be provided without violating rules around individual student information.
- Student Borrowing: Students were interested in why the GSM was seeing fewer students borrowing, but in some years those fewer students were borrowing more.

Staff members present engaged in the dialogue with the students to answer their questions and concerns. In conclusion, funds to cover mandatory and expected cost increases are necessary to maintain the current program quality. The proposal has not been changed as a result of student feedback.

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 must be provided by the program.

Plan shared with Jonathan Minnick on 11/09/2018.
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 _____.
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.

- Agenda item at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting
 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):

IX.e. Below, please 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.

Two faculty members replied to the email with the proposal.

- Nice Job. Very convincing.
- Overall, it looks reasonable. One confusing thing is that you mention closing the gap with some enrollment increases below, but the form attached shows steady enrollment over the 5 years.
 - **Response:** In response to the Professor, it was explained that steady enrollments over the next 5 years are a reasonable planning assumption to build the financial model to predict needed PDST increases. The total gap between expected cost increases (according to guidance provided by the systemwide budget office) and the proposed rate is approximately \$90,000 over the five years. Some combination of incremental enrollment, philanthropy and/or cost-efficiency will be necessary to make up this gap, and may be achieved without any incremental enrollment despite that being one possible source. Please note that in subsequent revisions of the proposal, the mention of incremental enrollment increases was removed.

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

Plan shared with Jean-Pierre Delplanque on November 08, 2018.
Graduate Dean

Plan endorsed by Gary S. May on November 26, 2018.
Chancellor¹

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