

## 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		Increases/Decreases			
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		2019-20		2020-21	
					%	\$	%	\$
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (CA resident)	\$6,060	\$6,060	\$6,060		0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Prof. Degr. Suppl. Tuition (Nonresident)	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$6,540		0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Mandatory Systemwide Fees (CA resident)*	\$12,570	\$12,966	\$13,368		3.2%	\$396	3.1%	\$402
Campus-based Fees**	\$1,000	\$1,030	\$1,061		3.0%	\$30	3.0%	\$31
Nonresident Suppl. Tuition	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245		0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Other (explain below)	\$0	\$0	\$0		0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
<b>Total Fees (CA resident)</b>	<b>\$19,630</b>	<b>\$20,056</b>	<b>\$20,489</b>		2.2%	\$426	2.2%	\$433
<b>Total Fees (Nonresident)</b>	<b>\$32,355</b>	<b>\$32,781</b>	<b>\$33,214</b>		1.3%	\$426	1.3%	\$433

\* 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.

**Additional comments:**

The MPVM leadership is undertaking a strategic planning effort in 2018-19, so we propose two years of no fee increases in the MPVM program while we work on curricular and programmatic design. We may return in 2019-20 with an updated multi-year plan.

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

**Our school's primary goal is to: educate world leaders in academic veterinary medicine, veterinary medical practice, and public and environmental health.** Through outstanding MS, MPVM, and PhD graduate studies, we provide top quality educational experiences to support our students and colleagues as leaders in veterinary medicine. We specifically engage our collective community in the advancement of the profession through the broad spectrum of career opportunities in academia, private practice, and in public health. The MPVM/environmental health piece of our profession is a unique and growing area of veterinary medicine, which bridges animal and human ecosystems and their dependence upon the same environment. Our strategies are: (1) attract, mentor, and support the best and the brightest students and trainees; (2) design curriculum and training programs to meet current future societal needs; and (3) lead the field of veterinary medicine by sharing educational expertise and best practices locally, nationally, and internationally.

Using state-of-the-art methods in epidemiology, the MPVM program prepares veterinarians to investigate and evaluate disease and production problems in animal populations and to design, evaluate, and implement disease control or other veterinary services programs. Our program is an applied epidemiology program established in 1967 targeted to health professionals including practicing veterinarians. Our program is designed for those with a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree (DVM). Graduates often choose careers in: (1) public service taking positions in state, federal, and international public health and international development agencies; and (2) non-governmental international health organizations. Our program is somewhat similar to a Master of Public Health (MPH) program – though the level of preparation and knowledge required for our program is higher than for a typical MPH degree which requires a BA/BS as preparation – but has a different target audience (veterinarians or practicing health professionals) and has a very rigorous epidemiological focus to the curriculum. The program is a three quarter program (1 academic year). At times, students may take an extra quarter to finish their capstone research project.

## 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.**

Last year, we submitted a new plan and it was approved for one year, AY 2018-19. In alignment with our plan, new PDST funds have been budgeted this year **to maintain instructional and student service support levels**, specifically paying for inflationary increases in the salaries and benefits of our graduate coordinator and teaching assistants. Students will continue to benefit from the graduate coordinator's expertise to navigate the program. Students also will continue to benefit from the academic support of teaching assistants, as they provide insight on in-depth data intensive assignments and projects in our applied epidemiology program

Prior to the plan that was approved for one-year, the primary goal from our prior multi-year plan, which covered the period from 2011-12 through 2013-14, was to fund staff to assist in the teaching of the MPVM program, particularly the laboratory classes. The requested increase only covered the inflationary increase associated with funding these positions. Due to budget cuts, the number of faculty available to teach this program has been reduced. If we had not received the requested increase, we would not have been able **to continue funding these teaching assistants, the quality of teaching would have been significantly diminished, and the workload on faculty would have been unreasonably high**. With the additional PDST funds, we accomplished our goal. Teaching assistants have been integral to the program to assist students on their coursework throughout the 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?**

We propose to keep our PDST levels flat for the next two years while we undertake a strategic planning process. A primary goal of our planning process is to capitalize on our strength as a rigorous, evidence-based veterinary science program while exploring

student demand for veterinary science and public health programs. It's still early in the process, but we know our faculty are considering updates to the curriculum and revisions to the admission requirements. We plan to use our current fees for the same purposes as described in Section II.a.: to **maintain instructional and student service support levels** by funding Teaching Assistants and a portion of our program coordinator's salary and benefits.

**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).**

	Proposed Use of Incremental PDST Revenue			Total Projected PDST Revenue in Final Year
	Total 2018-19 PDST Revenue	Incremental 2019-20 PDST revenue	Incremental 2020-21 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Benefits/UCRP Cost	\$8,837	\$2,634	\$2,629	\$14,100
Providing Student Services	\$15,757	\$5,165	\$5,113	\$26,035
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$26,700	\$0	\$700	\$27,400
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$25,266	\$3,841	\$4,158	\$33,265
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Please explain in the "Additional Comments" below)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total use/projected use of revenue</b>	<b>\$76,560</b>	<b>\$11,640</b>	<b>\$12,600</b>	<b>\$100,800</b>

**Additional Comments:**

The proposal is for a two-year plan. This is a small program and the PDST is allocated to financial aid, student services and instructional support salaries and benefits. Any increases in expenditures for 2019-20 and 2020-21 are associated with enrollment growth only and not PDST increases (which remain flat at currently approved levels for both years).

**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.**

We have aimed to keep the PDST low over the past seven years and have only increased it twice in 2015-16 by 2.5% and in 2018-19 by 3%. We have not kept pace with fixed cost increases associated with the salaries and benefits for staff who provide student services and instructional support. We have established four endowments for the MPVM program over the past several years that yield about \$25,000 annually. The SVM has three endowments that are for joint DVM/MPVM students that yield approximately \$30,000 per year. Our school continues to fundraise for the MPVM program. Fundraising for student scholarships is one of the highest priorities for our advancement team.

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

Our proposal is for no PDST increase for two years.

**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	4	7	8			
Domestic Nonresident						
International	8	7	8			
Total	12	14	16	0	0	0

**Additional Comments**

We often have more international students than domestic students. Our program has a long history of attracting international professionals. We are aiming to attract more domestic applicants in future years.

### 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.

	First Year Annual Charges						
	Actuals	Projections		Increases/Decreases			
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2019-20		2020-21	
				%	\$	%	\$
<b>Residents</b>							
Colorado School of Public Health/CSU	\$25,237	\$25,994	\$26,774	3%	\$757	3%	\$780
Ohio State University	\$26,514	\$27,309	\$28,129	3%	\$795	3%	\$819
University of North Carolina	\$37,146	\$38,260	\$39,408	3%	\$1,114	3%	\$1,148
Virginia Tech/VA-MD College of Vet Med	\$32,070	\$33,032	\$34,023	3%	\$962	3%	\$991
Public Average	\$30,242	\$31,149	\$32,083	3%	\$907	3%	\$934
Private Average	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public and Private Average	\$30,242	\$31,149	\$32,083	3%	\$907	3%	\$934
Your program - UC Davis	\$19,630	\$20,056	\$20,489	2%	\$426	2%	\$433
<b>Nonresidents</b>							
Colorado School of Public Health/CSU	\$54,891	\$56,538	\$58,234	3%	\$1,647	3%	\$1,696
Ohio State University	\$71,522	\$73,668	\$75,878	3%	\$2,146	3%	\$2,210
University of North Carolina	\$70,054	\$72,156	\$74,320	3%	\$2,102	3%	\$2,165
Virginia Tech/VA-MD College of Vet Med	\$60,308	\$62,117	\$63,981	3%	\$1,809	3%	\$1,864
Public Average	\$64,194	\$66,120	\$68,103	3%	\$1,926	3%	\$1,984
Private Average	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public and Private Average	\$64,194	\$66,120	\$68,103	3%	\$1,926	3%	\$1,984
Your Program - UC Davis	\$32,355	\$32,781	\$33,214	1%	\$426	1%	\$433

Source(s): Websites from the respective schools and colleges:

[Colorado School of Public Health](#)

[Ohio State University](#)

[University of North Carolina](#)

[Virginia Tech/VA-MD College of Vet Med](#)

Additional Comments: Used University's recommended escalation factor of 3% annually for comparator year over year increases.

**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).**

The following four programs have been chosen as comparators for our MPVM program:

Colorado State University MPH with focus area in Animals, People, and the Environment;

Ohio State University MPH with Veterinary Public Health concentration;

University of North Carolina MPH with Veterinary Epidemiology concentration; and

Virginia Tech MPH with Infectious Disease concentration.

It has been difficult to find close comparators; our Director of the UC Davis MPVM program has chosen these comparators because they have either an epidemiological, infectious disease, global health, or veterinary public health emphasis. Our program is designed for those with a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree (DVM), so the level of preparation and knowledge required for our program is higher than for a typical MPH degree which requires a BA/BS as preparation. Also, our program is designed for students who want careers in research, the health sciences including public health, or as a practicing veterinarian. So, while similar to MPH programs in some ways, our program could be considered targeted to an audience with a more rigorous educational expectation. These four programs were, according to our faculty, closest to our program; they did not believe there were private programs that were fair and appropriate comparators.

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

Both the resident and non-resident MPVM are less expensive than the comparison institutions.

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

QS World University ranked UC Davis number one in veterinary science for the last three years. The MPVM program is part of the veterinary sciences offerings in our school in addition to the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program. Our MPVM program has been internationally recognized for the last 50+ years since its inception in 1967. Our program is distinguishable from its comparators given that it is designed for students with a DVM degree. Students enter the program with more advanced training and typically pursue careers in leadership in the areas of clinical veterinary medicine or epidemiology. Students in MPH programs would more likely pursue careers in management or in the public policy arena in human health. MPVM students would be characterized as typically more technical or clinical, and MPH students would be typically public human health generalists. As mentioned above, our program is designed for those with a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree (DVM), so the level of preparation and knowledge required for our program is higher than for a typical MPH degree which requires a BA/BS as preparation.

## 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	Publics	Privates
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
<b>Underrepresented</b>						
African American	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Chicanx/Latinx	13.0%	0.0%	11.1%	29.4%	N/A	N/A
American Indian	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
<i>Subtotal Underrepresented</i>	<i>13%</i>	<i>8%</i>	<i>11%</i>	<i>29%</i>	<i>0%</i>	<i>0%</i>
Asian/East Indian	4.3%	7.7%	11.1%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
White	65.2%	17.9%	14.8%	17.6%	N/A	N/A
Other/ Unknown	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
International	17.4%	66.7%	63.0%	52.9%	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Socioeconomic</b>						
% Pell recipients	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Gender</b>						
% Male	33.3%	50.0%	30.0%	35.3%	N/A	N/A
% Female	66.7%	50.0%	70.0%	64.7%	N/A	N/A

Sources: Ethnicity and Gender (fall 2018 only): UCD Academic Affairs  
 UC socioeconomic status and gender: UC Corporate data  
 Comparison institutions: No data available publicly.

**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 MPVM program is unique, with total enrollment of only 12 students currently but ranging from 7-14 students in recent years, including a fairly significant number of international students. While URM enrollments have improved particularly with our fall 2018 class, the size of our program means that the composition of each cohort is subject to significant fluctuation, making it difficult to comment on trends. Nonetheless, we are concerned about overall enrollment, and are conducting recruitment outreach to attract domestic students including domestic students with diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds. Note, comparison figures regarding racial and ethnic diversity for our comparator schools were not available publicly.

We recruit at other veterinary schools around the US, at State and Federal agencies, through our alumni network, at professional conferences, and through the American Veterinary Medical Association website. New for this year, we also advertised our program in journals with diverse readership. We have established four endowments for the MPVM program over the past several years that yield approximately \$25,000 annually for fellowships. The SVM has three endowments that are for joint DVM/MPVM students that yield approximately \$30,000 per annually for fellowships. We will use these endowments in a more targeted way to attract students from under-served populations.

One thing to note is that our students are drawn from the population of individuals with Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degrees. Because our MPVM program also draws students with international backgrounds, we are able to capture diversity in international experience which has proven valuable for our program. We have over 900 alumni and they have gone on to work in 74 countries around the world often returning to their home country to work for their government or an international agency.

We are continuing ambitious efforts to diversify our DVM student population (the pipeline for MPVM students) and expect in the future for this to impact the diversity of our MPVM program's domestic student diversity. In order to diversify our DVM Program, which serves as a pipeline to our MPVM Program, we employ a variety of approaches.

A diversity officer works with our admissions office to conduct outreach to under-represented individuals for our DVM program. In addition, we recently added an outreach program to enhance the pipeline of diverse and socioeconomically disadvantaged potential

students: our SMASH program (Summer Math And Science Honors) is a college preparation program we offer at UC Davis for thirty 8th grade students from underrepresented groups and disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. In addition to our fairly new SMASH program, we offer our Summer Enrichment Program (SEP) which began over 25 years ago and has welcomed college students from around the world. It is designed to provide disadvantaged students with activities that will enhance their preparation to veterinary school. This is a five-week intensive summer program designed for college level students. The program accommodates 12 students each summer. We usually receive between 30-40 applicants to the SEP. Our admissions and diversity officer estimates that approximately 2-4 of the 10-12 students that enroll in the program each year ultimately attend veterinary school. The school has had several SEP graduates obtain a DVM degree from UC Davis.

Students have the opportunity to obtain some veterinary experience through rotations at the UC Davis Veterinary Medicine Teaching Hospital. Some of the rotations previously featured in SEP rotations include Community Medicine, Small Animal Surgery, Equine Medicine, Equine Surgery, CAPE (Exotics), Behavior, Dermatology, Ophthalmology, and more. The SEP students shadow the faculty and veterinary students. Students will be required to make presentations, participate in mock MMI situations, and come to all lectures provided. All students are expected to complete the entire five weeks (Monday through Friday) and all components of the program. The day begins with clinical rotations and ends with lectures/labs/field trips.

**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?**

Based on the data, it is difficult to discern a trend in the percentage of our students who received Pell grants as undergraduates. Given the size of the program (currently 12 students, but ranging from 7-14 in recent years) and our enrollment of international students who are not eligible for Pell grants as undergraduates, we expect variation in the Pell %. The small size of our program can lead to variances in data over time and make trend analysis difficult. Nonetheless, we include financial aid information in our outreach efforts. We also allocate our return-to-aid funding and our USAP funding to all students who are admitted to the program in an effort to be equitable. We know that affordability is key to attracting students to our program. As we mentioned above, we have established four endowments for the MPVM program over the past several years that yield approximately \$25,000 annually for fellowships. The SVM has three endowments that are for joint DVM/MPVM students that yield approximately \$30,000 per year. We will use these endowments in a more targeted way to attract a more diverse applicant pool.

**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?**

As mentioned above our population is somewhat similar to the DVM population, largely female. Given the extremely small size of the program (currently 12 students but ranging from 7-14 in recent years) we do have variations. The program fluctuates between a 50/50 split between males and females to a 30/70 split. With a larger population, we would aim for a more even split. Since our program is designed for students with a DVM, the gender composition of our program may reflect gender proportions typically found in DVM programs. Currently, our DVM program is 85% female. We suspect that our comparators that are Master in Public Health programs in the US do not largely attract from the DVM population in the same way that our program does. In our outreach efforts and online presence, we include perspectives from both women and men in our program. We must state that veterinary science is in fact a STEM field and the fact that there are more women than men in the profession is not a poor outcome. STEM fields are noted for their underrepresentation of women.

**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.**

Our goal is to have increased gender parity approaching an even split; increased URM students of between 30-40% of our student population; and to have at least 25% of our students as Pell Grant recipients. This year we experienced an uptick in enrollment to 12 students. Our target is to get to 20 students annually in this program, and sixteen within the next two years. We are working to increase underrepresented minority students, and have taken active measures as described above in our advertising and recruitment efforts to do so. We have a unique situation regarding gender parity with a largely female student population that largely reflects the DVM population. As reflected in the [2017 CVMA Economic Survey](#) (also cited below in VI.b.), industry-wide about 70% of DVMs are female. While we expect the student population to increase in the next two years to sixteen students, that is still a small enough number to be subject to annual variability in gender, URM, and Pell Grant percentages.

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	2.2%	2.1%	2.7%	Black/Afr-American	Domestic	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
	International					International			
Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	7.1%	6.9%	5.9%	Chicano(a)/Latino(a)	Domestic	6.2%	6.0%	6.0%
	International					International			
American Indian	Domestic	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	American Indian	Domestic	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	3.8%	4.8%	4.8%	Asian/Pac Is	Domestic	3.5%	3.4%	3.4%
	International					International			
White	Domestic	83.6%	82.4%	82.4%	White	Domestic	85.0%	85.3%	84.5%
	International					International			
Other/Unknown	Domestic	2.2%	2.2%	3.2%	Other/Unknown	Domestic	3.5%	3.4%	4.3%
	International					International			
<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>Percentage by Gender</b>		<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
Female		45.9%	47.3%	48.9%	Female		40.0%	40.7%	42.0%
Male		54.1%	52.7%	51.1%	Male		60.0%	59.3%	58.0%

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?**

The School of Veterinary Medicine works with our campus to diversify our faculty. Chancellor May has released the campus strategic plan in 2018 and Goal 3 of the plan is to: embrace diversity, practice inclusive excellence, and strive for equity. Our campus appreciates that diversity in all its dimensions ensures that our faculty will bring a full range of backgrounds and perspectives to its teaching, research, and service responsibilities.

The campus Office of Academic Affairs helps our school in setting diversity goals for our faculty recruitments in accordance with our Affirmative Action plans. To further continue to diversify our faculty, our school is partnering currently with our campus Office of Academic Affairs in a centralized recruitment of eight faculty (one of whom would be selected for our school) with the aim to create a diverse applicant pool. The program is [Advancing Faculty Diversity 2018-19](#). UC Davis' Office of Academic Affairs is receiving funding from UC Office of the President for this pilot program. This is a new program to expand diverse faculty in the ladder ranks at UC Davis. Our school is considered an early adopter of this novel approach.

Our Dean has made diversity among faculty a high priority as evidenced by the SVM's Goal Five of our recently adopted Strategic Plan for 2018-2023: promote a vibrant and diverse community of faculty, staff and students to advance the mission of the school in an engaged and respectful community. Note, we recruit for faculty at the school level, not specifically for a particular degree program. When our school recruits, we consider the school's research, teaching, service, and clinical needs and we aim to create the most diverse applicant pools consistent with the campus' and school's strategic plan. We require all faculty search committees to take unconscious bias training as part of the STEAD training program offered by UC Davis. Our school has participated in hiring faculty through the Center for the Advancement of Multicultural Perspectives on Science (CAMPOS) program. Our clinical faculty tend to be slightly more diverse than our ladder rank faculty members. There has been a slight uptick in our clinical faculty diversity over the last three years. We have a significant population of faculty with international backgrounds that teach in our program, which adds a diverse perspective. We have annual Calvin Schwabe Lectureships and Dyar Memorial Lectureships (<https://www2.vetmed.ucdavis.edu/mpvm/about/mpvm50.cfm>) that emphasize the diverse international nature of our program.

**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 goal is to provide financial aid and scholarship support to ensure the program is affordable to all our students.** We believe our program is affordable and is reasonably priced compared to our comparators. Our students generally have not accumulated a large amount of debt. They do have debt; however, as can be seen from the table below, over the last five years our student debt load has been fairly low. Because the program is extremely small, it is inherently subject to some volatility and the percentage fluctuates from year-to-year. Those with debt have less than \$50,000 in cumulative debt for the last six years. We draw largely from an international student population and have less ability to track starting salaries than our DVM program. We do allocate 33% of our PDST revenue to Return-to-Aid to all students in our program and 33% of our USAP funds to all of our students. We allocate financial aid funds to all students enrolled for a total of \$5,796 per student in 2018-19 (combined USAP and RTA allocations). We also have teaching assistantship opportunities given that several of our classes in the program are epidemiology courses requiring TAs to support our faculty. Our low student debt load is a strong indicator of the affordability of our program.

Graduating Class	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Percent with Debt	43%	33%	14%	27%	20%	0%	100%
Cumulative Debt among Students with Debt	\$84,986	\$43,747	\$36,509	\$29,145	\$18,500	\$0	\$27,333

**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?**

Our student population in this program is fairly low, ranging from 7-14 students per year in recent years, so the student debt numbers may vary significantly year over year. Since we are not planning any increases, we do not expect any changes to this trend.

	Graduates with Debt	2016-17 Average Debt at Graduation among Students with Debt	Median Salary at Graduation	Est. Debt Payment as % of Median Salary
This program	100%	\$27,333	\$100,000	4%
Public comparisons	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Private comparisons	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Sources: UC: Corporate data

Comparison institutions: Data were not available for comparison institutions. Our program's starting salary source is the [CVMA Economic Survey Report 2017](#).

**Additional Comments:** N/A

**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.**

While we are definitely concerned about the pricing of our program we are not as concerned about our student's debt load for this program. As can be seen from the tables above, debt load is very low over the past few years. We expect indebtedness to remain relatively low among our MPVM student population who are sensitive to the cost of the program. Additionally, we admit health professionals into the program and not typically recent graduates from an undergraduate program, so student debt tends to be relatively low. We draw students typically from a group of working health professionals. The debt payment as a percentage of median starting salary is fairly low and, accordingly, we believe debt levels are manageable in light of our graduates starting salaries at graduation.

**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.**

We believe that since our program cost is reasonable and our student population are largely health professionals that our graduates would be able to take public service positions without the burden of a large student debt load. Many of our graduates are employed in public agencies within the US and abroad. As mentioned above, our school provides significant financial aid, including scholarships from endowment earnings, to support our students so that debt is not a significant issue.

**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?**

Our students often work for state, federal, and international agencies serving the public and they typically earn similar salaries than students who enter the private sector. We estimate that much like our DVM professional positions, there is not much difference in median average salary for public (agency positions) versus private sector careers. In light of our students' indebtedness levels, either careers paths are available to our graduates.

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

As mentioned above we recruit through our alumni network, professional conferences, state and federal agencies, and the American Veterinary Medical Association website. Our school allocates recruitment funds to the MPVM program staff and affiliated faculty to attend conferences to promote the program. At these events we explain the entrance requirements, career opportunities, and financial aid and tuition and fees information to prospective students. We refer students to our website which describes our financial aid program (and how all students receive financial aid from the professional fees and USAP funds), federal loan programs, and the fellowship application process.

**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?**

Student debt and median salaries have not been a focus of our communications with our students. Students that graduate from our program pursue a variety of different careers including practicing veterinarian; state, federal, and international health agency professional work; or research positions at Universities. We do not track data on salaries because our students' professions span the globe and it has been difficult to do so. If prospective students were to inquire about student debt in our program, we would state that it's moderate and provide more information on the financial aid and fellowships available to students admitted to our program.

## 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.).**

We think of our program as an applied epidemiology program that is targeted to health professionals. This program is not quite the same as a Master of Public Health program, but we want to emphasize that those programs are approximately comparable to ours, but not a complete match. Our MPVM program serves a niche and has for the last 50 years.

## 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): N/A

**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.**

This year we emailed our students that we are proposing no fee increases while we undergo strategic planning process for the MPVM program. No feedback was provided.

**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 Tara Marie Urbano on 10/1/2018.  
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): N/A

**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.**

Our graduate group faculty are involved in a strategic planning process for this program and are aware that we are proposing no fee increases. The faculty were told at the strategic planning retreat on September 6, 2018 that there would be no professional fee increases for the next two years, and the feedback was favorable.

**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.  
Chancellor<sup>1</sup>

---

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