COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
Wednesday, January 15, 2014
10:00 – 11:30 am
KL 362
Documents found at **UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources**

AGENDA

I.   **Chair's Report –** *Ruth Mostern*
    A. Update from January 13 UCORP meeting

II. **Consent Calendar**
    A. Approval of the agenda
    B. Approval of the December 4 meeting minutes   **Pg. 1-5**

III. **ORU Policy –** *Chair Mostern*
    Prior to this meeting, Vice Chair Marcia drafted a table of ORU, CRU, and MRU
    definitions to serve as the foundation for a first draft of the revised ORU policy. A
    fourth category for Core Facilities has been added to the table.
    Action requested: COR members will review and discuss the table.

IV. **Senate Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment Grants Criteria –** *David Noelle*
    COR member Noelle will lead the discussion on potential changes needed to the
    grants criteria. The criteria of other UC campuses are available at
    UCMCROPS/COR1314/Resources/Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment
    grants   **Pg. 6-9**

V.   **Campuswide Review Item**   **Pg. 10-17**
    A. WASC Core Competency. UGC is the lead reviewer.
        Action requested: COR will review the proposal. Comments are due to the
        Senate Chair by Wednesday, January 22.

VI.   **Systemwide Review Item**   Pg. 18-31

     A. Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. Graduate Council and CAPRA are the lead reviewers.

     Action requested: COR will review the proposed policy changes. Comments are due to the Senate Chair by Monday, February 10.

VII.   **Other Business**

Ongoing Business

Lab Safety – *Jason Hein*

ORU Policy – *Roummel Marcia*

Faculty Research/Travel/Shared Equipment Grants – *David Noelle*

Indirect Cost Return – *YangQuan Chen*

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
December 4, 2013

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 10:00 am on December 4, 2013, in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Ruth Mostern presiding.

  I.   Chair's Report

         Chair Mostern updated COR members on the December 3 Division Council meeting: meeting from December 3:

         -- Start up funds. Provost Peterson and VP for Budget and Planning Feitelberg are discussing changing the extension policy on faculty start up.

         --Provost's revised course buyout policy. Division Council members agreed the revised policy is problematic and all Senate committees were asked to submit comments.

         --ORU policy. When Chair Mostern informed Division Council members of COR's upcoming revised ORU policy, Council members pointed out that the importance of not groups of faculty who want to form their own research entity but prefer not to seek formal Senate-Administrative approval. These include Centers, Institutes, and Laboratories. Council members also inquired how core facilities will be incorporated into the new ORU policy. COR will take this under consideration when drafting the policy. The Office of Research should be encouraged to develop their policies parallel to those of the Senate.

  II.   Consent Calendar

         ACTION: Today's agenda and the minutes from the November 20 meeting were approved as presented.

III.   ORU Policy

COR members briefly reiterated their previous discussion of the draft ORU table which will serve as the foundation of the new policy.   COR members discussed how core facilities should be recognized in the new policy.

ACTION: The ORU table will be revised to add core facilities as a fourth category.   COR members will submit suggested language to Chair Mostern and Vice Chair Marcia for inclusion into the policy. Committee analyst will research the review process for core facilities on other UC campuses.

IV.   Start Up Funds Memo

Prior to the meeting, a draft memo was circulated among the committee which outlined the committee's concerns over the tightening of the parameters around the extension of faculty start up funds.   COR members briefly discussed the memo and agreed to forward it to Division Council.

ACTION: Committee analyst will transmit the memo to Division Council

V.   Course Buyout Policy

Provost Peterson recently submitted a revised course buyout policy in response to the Senate's concerns over the original version. COR members expressed concern over various aspects of the revised policy: 1) it disincentivizes research in favor of teaching thereby hindering the overall research mission of the University; 2) it creates a sliding scale as it unnecessarily ties faculty members' salary to the cost of buyout; the policy should contain a transparent accounting of the actual cost of replacing a faculty member's teaching, and 3) it places too much power in the hands of the Deans by imposing a hidden indirect cost on faculty grants.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo detailing COR's concerns and will circulate among the committee for review and approval before transmitting to Division Council before the December 13 deadline.

VI.   Conflict of Interest Policy

In response to Division Council's suggestion that each Senate standing committee adopt its own conflict of interest policy, COR reviewed the policies of other UC campus CORs.   The issue most relevant to COR is that faculty members cannot vote on their own grant proposals or those of relatives. COR members inquired whether it would be more efficient to institute one policy that covers the whole Merced Division and should be drafted by the Committee on Rules & Elections as such a policy is under its purview.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo stating that COR chooses not to adopt its own conflict of interest policy at this time; rather, the committee believes that only one policy should exist for the entire Division.

VII.   Systemwide Review Item

--Self-supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs Policy (SSGPDPP).

COR members discussed SSGPDPPs in general terms. Self-supporting programs are ostensibly dependent on tuition to sustain themselves. As such, COR members expressed concern for the research and teaching enterprise mission of the University, as faculty would be recruited not for their contributions to research and teaching, but on their ability to recruit students in order to generate more tuition. COR is also wary of situations in which a state-funded program is combined with a private, self-supporting program. This could create a cross-cannibalization effect whereby one program overpowers the other. COR advises that self-supporting programs be tied to a regulatory structure and subject to Senate oversight. COR members agreed that further review of the specific, proposed policy changes is needed.

ACTION: Committee analyst will draft a memo that details COR's general concerns with SSGPDPPs and circulate among the committee. The committee members will add their comments about the proposed policy changes

suggested by systemwide.   Committee analyst will then transmit the final memo from COR to Division Council by the deadline of January 13.

VIII.   Research/Travel/Shared Equipment Grants

The COR member tasked with leading the discussion began by summarizing the past difficulties in reviewing these grants. There was a lack of expertise which made it difficult to adequately assess the quality of the proposals. There was also no mechanism in place to track whether the reviewers made good choices in allocating funds to faculty members. The COR member related that he previously reviewed the grants criteria at other UC campuses: some are need-based, some are geared toward inter-disciplinary proposals, some are for new research projects only, some are for funding-gap relief (for faculty who need bridge funding in between larger, extramural awards), and some focus only on junior faculty eligibility (rank-based criteria).

COR members held a lengthy discussion on the options for AY 13-14. To what degree can we assess quality of proposals across disciplines and Schools? Could we engage in a partnership with the Schools to assist in the ranking process but still retain authority over disbursing the funds? There was also a discussion about establishing more than one pot of money for more than one criterion versus a cost-sharing model. COR members also discussed the role of graduate groups in helping COR assess the quality of the proposals.

COR members generally agreed that the first draft of a revised policy will be a hybrid model with the Schools/ORUs/graduate groups that will be need-based, prioritized for untenured faculty or tenured faculty who are changing their research focus, and include provisions for separate pots of money for separate criteria.

ACTION: The COR member tasked with revising the policy will construct a draft to be circulated among the committee before the next meeting in mid-

January 2014.   The final call will be distributed to the campus at the end of January.

IX.   Mechanical Engineering CCGA Proposal

COR members discussed the lead reviewer's comments and agreed with his points.

ACTION: COR voted to move the proposal forward in the process. Committee analyst will transmit a memo containing the COR lead reviewer's comments to Division Council by the deadline of December 9.

X.   Other Business
--December 18 meeting is cancelled.
--Committee analyst will send the proposed spring meeting schedule to committee members.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30

Attest: Ruth Mostern, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst

GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL (GRC)
ACADEMIC SENATE DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

CALL FOR FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

Deadline for Submission: April 30, 2013

PURPOSE

Faculty research grants are designed to support specific research activities of UC Merced faculty, and provide seed funds for developing and submitting extramural proposals to support research and education at UC Merced.

GRANT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

1. Each full-time member of the Academic Senate, including emeritus members, is eligible to submit one grant proposal.
2. Each faculty member may request up to $5000 in research funds. Funds may be requested for most research costs (see Allowable and Unallowable Expenses), with some exceptions (i.e. excluding faculty salaries, most notably).
3. Faculty members may collaborate to submit a joint proposal, in which case the collaborators may NOT submit individual proposals, because each faculty member may submit only one proposal. Each joint proposal may request a multiple of $5000 in funds equal to the number of collaborators.
4. Faculty on sabbatical leave, or leave of absence (in residence or elsewhere), may apply for research funds. Except under special circumstances, requests for travel funds from (to) the Merced campus to (from) the sabbatical locale will not be funded. Research expenses, including travel connected with research and/or associated with research at the sabbatical locale, are fundable. Subsistence is not fundable. Grants will not be awarded without assurance that the faculty awardee will return to UC Merced after the leave of absence.
5. Graduate students are not eligible to submit proposals, but faculty members may request funds to support graduate research activities, provided that such activities are part of the faculty member's research program.
6. Newly-appointed faculty members, and non-tenured faculty members with no extramural support, are particularly encouraged to apply.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND GUIDELINES

Proposals must include all of the following:

1. Cover Sheet: Must include name, title, school, email address, proposal title, and abstract (350 word maximum).
2. Project Description (3 page maximum, 1 inch margins, 11 point font, single-spaced): Should include background and context helpful for an academic but non-expert reader,

and may include figures and tables as needed. Descriptions should also include as many project specifics as possible, given space limitations and the reader's presumed lack of expertise in the proposer's specific area of research. Descriptions should explain the potential impact they will have on the faculty research program(s), group(s), and career(s). If the funds are for equipment or other infrastructure, as opposed to a specific research project, then the description must include an equipment management plan.

3. Reference list (1 page maximum).
4. Human Subjects and/or Animal Use approval information.
5. Budget and justification for each line item. Most line items need only name the expense and amount, but some items require more information (see Allowable Expenses).
6. Pending and awarded grants during the last five years, including the date, amount, and title of each grant. For any prior GRC faculty research awards, include a one-paragraph report on the results of the award.
7. A statement noting whether funds will be used in lieu of available support, and/or whether funds will be used as seed money to pursue external funding. If the latter, include a list recent or ongoing attempts to secure external funding in the last three years (do not submit copies of external grant proposals or cover sheets).
8. CV listing publications, presentations, exhibits, or performances over the last three years, as well as earlier most important works (2 pages maximum).

CRITERIA

Proposals will be reviewed by GRC on the basis of the following three criteria:

1. Quality of the proposal and research project to be funded.
2. Evidence of recent research productivity in terms of quantity and quality of publications, presentations, exhibitions, and performances.
3. Evidence of funding need, and/or efforts and potential to secure external funding from government, private, or foundation sources.

At least two GRC members will rate each proposal on each of the three criteria (written reviews will not be included). Ratings will be averaged and weighted equally, and proposals will be ranked by averaged rating. Rankings will be given to DivCo and the VCR and EVC, and the administration will make awards. Special consideration will be given to proposals from newly-appointed faculty, and non-tenured faculty with no external funding. It is anticipated that available funds will be insufficient to fully fund all recommended proposals. Budgets may be reduced in order to fund as many recommended proposals as possible.

ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of allowable expenses are as follows (note that some require additional information in the budget justification):

Research Assistance
Proposals requesting support for assistants must contain a statement of their exact duties, number of hours, and rate of pay. For graduate student support, identification of the graduate student is required. Salary support for postdoctoral fellows or other appointments in academic series is not fundable.

Supplies and Equipment
Funds may be used to purchase research equipment and supplies. Equipment/items requested are subject to the policies outlined in UC Business and Finance Bulletin BUS 29. Equipment purchased with Faculty Research Grant funds becomes the property of the University. Books, journals, videos, recordings, and similar research materials may be purchased if they are listed by title and specifically justified in the application for research funding.

Computer equipment/software is an allowable expense provided that it is an essential element of the research project. Applicants must indicate what kind of computer equipment they currently use. Funding is not justified for equipment used for routine duties (e.g., printers) or for general productivity purposes (e.g., cell phones/cell phone service, PDAs, or calculators). Miscellaneous costs such as phone, copying, fax, or postage must be justified and project-specific.

Travel for Research Purposes
Faculty's use of research funds for field and travel expenses may be allowed when appropriate, as in the collection of research data or inspection of materials that cannot be procured through email, loans, microfilms, or photocopies. Such requests for travel must be justified in the application. Funding for graduate student travel is allowable in the service of the project to be funded.

Recharge Fees
Research funds may be used to pay for recharge fees associated with using core research facilities or another institution's research equipment or facilities. The recharge payment for the use of the equipment or facilities must be project-specific.

Dissemination of Research Findings
Grant funds may be used to present research findings at meetings or conferences of academic societies and organized conferences where important research results are presented and discussed. The meeting may be either in the United States or abroad. Attending a meeting without presenting research findings will not justify funding. A faculty member may apply for funds to send undergraduate or graduate students to present research that is part of the faculty member's research portfolio. Grants may be awarded for travel to present works of art or to present other forms of creative expression, but only for the initial presentation of such work. Grants may be used to pay publication costs associated with disseminating one's research findings to the academic community.

UNALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Funds cannot be used for: faculty salary support; curricular, administrative, and teaching aids; individual subscriptions or periodicals; professional society dues; reprints; office furniture; minor office and computer supplies (e.g., paper, pens, pencils, flash drives); maintenance and repair of equipment; preparation of textbooks; expenses associated with editorial duties; equipment maintenance and operation.

USE OF FUNDS

1. Justification of each item requested in the budget is essential. Funds support specific research projects, not researchers. Expenditures of research grant funds should in general conform to budgeted allocations by category and purpose. However, the grantee may

request the GRC's approval prior to a change in the use for which funds were allocated. Reasonable requests within the scope of the specific research project will typically be granted.

2. Funds will not be provided for expenses incurred prior to the submission deadline date. The grantee is responsible for the administration of the grant, including overdrafts, and must review the budget and promptly return any funds that will not be spent before the grant expires.

3. Any unexpended funds remaining on the expiration date will automatically revert to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for redistribution.

4. Any equipment purchased with funds from a research grant becomes the property of the University upon acquisition and is retained by the University upon completion of the project for which the funds were awarded.

5. All expenditures are subject to applicable University of California regulations.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL SUBJECTS

1. Research involving the use of human subjects must be approved by the Institutional Review Board before funds can be allocated. A copy of the approval or protocol number and date must be provided to the GRC prior to award. Application forms are available in the Sponsored Programs Office.

2. Research involving the use of animals must be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. A copy of the approval or protocol number and date must be provided to the GRC prior to award. Animal Use Protocol forms are available from the Sponsored Programs Office.

HOW TO APPLY

All grant applications should be submitted electronically in pdf format. Label your pdf submission "GRC_last name.pdf." Email completed document to the Academic Senate Office c/o Mayra Chavez: mchavez@ucmerced.edu. The deadline for submitting grants is **April 30, 2013**, and submissions must include all of the components required herein. The document can be continuous (i.e., a new page is not needed for each section), but each section should be clearly labeled.

If an award is made, funds will be immediately available.

All award monies are to be spent before June 1st, 2014.

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

December 4, 2013

To: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Academic Senate
From: Laura Martin, Accreditation Liaison Officer & Coordinator for Institutional Assessment
       Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education

Re: New WASC Core Competency Expectation

As you know, WASC's recent redesign of the reaccreditation process changed both the substance of the review and the review process itself. Among several new accreditation expectations is that institutions must ensure the development of the following "five core competencies" in all baccalaureate programs:

- Written communication
- Oral communication
- Quantitative reasoning
- Information literacy
- Critical thinking

A summary of these efforts will be provided in the institution's self-study for reaccreditation through an essay that

1. describes how the undergraduate curriculum addresses each of the five core competencies,
2. explains its learning outcomes in relation to those core competencies, and
3. demonstrates, through *evidence of student performance*, the extent to which those outcomes are achieved *at or near the time of graduation*.[1]

WASC has put in place a schedule for phasing in this requirement, and UC Merced is in the first set of institutions to meet these expectations for all five competencies. Therefore, by spring 2017, the time of UC Merced's Off-Site Review for reaccreditation, WASC expects UC Merced to have assessed four of the five competencies. By the time of our Accreditation Visit in spring 2018, all five competencies will have been assessed.

Appended to this memo for the Senate's review, comment, and support is a proposal for meeting this new expectation. As described in more detail in Section IV of the appended document, we propose to integrate this work as seamlessly as possible into the ongoing annual assessment activities of the undergraduate majors, thereby taking maximum advantage of the work faculty are already doing and avoiding any duplication of effort in campus assessment activities. Indeed, as the following table suggests, many majors are already addressing the competencies in their learning outcomes and as part of annual program assessment activities.

---

[1] For additional descriptions of this new expectation, please see *Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies and Standards of Performance at Graduation* on p. 30 of the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*.

Table 1: Assessment of competencies by majors.

Competency	% of majors* that have assessed the competency to some extent** within last 4 years	% of majors that <u>explicitly</u> <u>name</u> the competency in the language of a PLO	% of majors with PLOs that could be interpreted to address the competency together with majors that explicitly name the competency in the PLO***
Oral Communication	29%	47%	82%
Written Communication	76%	59%	94%
Quantitative Reasoning	47%	12%	88%
Information Literacy	29%	0%	41%
Critical Thinking	76%	6%	100%

* Of the 17 majors submitting PLO Reports in last four years.
** According to rubric criteria.
*** Based on inclusive interpretation of PLO.

In developing this proposal, we considered several possible models, but in the end concluded that the proposed approach is the simplest and most sustainable because it integrates the new expectations into existing assessment efforts. We would be happy meet with Undergraduate Council, Divisional Council or any other interested Senate committees to discuss our thinking and to answer any questions.

Given the timeline established by the WASC Commission, we will need to begin our efforts to address the core competency requirement this coming spring semester, and so ask that the Senate provide comments by the end of January.

We look forward to the Senate's thoughts. Thank you for your help.

Encl(1)

CC: Tom Peterson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Susan Sims, Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Addressing the WASC Core Competency Requirement

Laura Martin, UCM ALO & Coordinator for Institutional Assessment
Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost & Dean for Undergraduate Education

I.   **Background: The New WASC Core Competency Requirement**

WASC's recent redesign of the reaccreditation process changed both the substance of the review and the review process itself. One new expectation is that institutions must ensure the development of the following "five core competencies" in all baccalaureate programs.

- Written communication
- Oral communication
- Quantitative reasoning
- Information literacy
- Critical thinking

As part of the institutional review process for reaccreditation, the institution must provide an essay that

1. describes how the undergraduate curriculum addresses each of the five core competencies,
2. explains its learning outcomes in relation to those core competencies, and
3. demonstrates, through *evidence of student performance*, the extent to which those outcomes are achieved *at or near the time of graduation*.

For additional descriptions of this new expectation, please see *Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies and Standards of Performance at Graduation* on p. 30 of the *2013 Handbook of Accreditation*.

II. **Timeline**

By spring 2017, the time of UC Merced's Off-Site Review for reaccreditation, UC Merced will need to have assessed four of the five competencies. By the time of our Accreditation Visit in spring 2018, we will need to have assessed all five competencies.

III. **Further Detail**

What do we need to do?
The core competency requirement applies to all undergraduates regardless of their major. Faculty expectations for student achievement at or near the time of graduation, however, may differ among students in keeping with their majors.

To meet WASC's expectations, *very generally* we will need to

1. Establish expectations[1] for aggregate student performance at or near the time of graduation for each of these five competencies.
2. Ensure the curricula support development and achievement of these expectations.
3. Identify *sustainable* methods for assessing student achievement of each competency; we expect that this will be an ongoing accreditation expectation.

---

[1] i.e. *criteria* the specific skills or abilities to be demonstrated that describe the key abilities that comprise each competency, and related standards (levels) of performance.

1

4. Assess student performance in relation to each competency at least one time before the 2018 reaccreditation site visit, consistent with the timeline above.
5. Ensure that actions are taken to improve student achievement, as warranted by the evidence.

It's important to note that we can approach this work in a manner that builds on existing practices. Below, we suggest this work be integrated into existing program-level assessment activities.

IV. Proposed Strategy to Address the Competency Expectation

Guiding Principles
Any strategy to define and assess the WASC Five Core Competencies must

1. be supported and implemented by the faculty, with appropriate administrative support, consistent with the faculty's ownership of curriculum.
2. acknowledge that the competencies outline a core set of abilities that are essential to, but not sufficient for, the high quality, intellectual work expected of a bachelor's degree graduate from the University of California.
3. recognize that although there may be broad agreement on the general attributes of these competencies[2], their expression is likely to differ by discipline in keeping with field-specific intellectual conventions.
4. add value to faculty goals for student learning.
5. generate actionable insights into student learning at institutional level(s) (e.g., program, school, campus) at which responsive action will have meaning and impact.
6. use and build on existing assessment support and activities, so as to be sustainable.
7. evaluate student learning in relation to the competencies in keeping with the accreditation timeline established above.

These principles underpin the strategy we propose for addressing the competencies.

Proposed Approach: Assessment in the Majors
There appear to be two complementary institutional avenues to support both development and assessment of these competencies – the majors and general education. For several reasons, the majors seem to be a more practical route for assessing the competencies.

First, annual assessments are conducted for each major at UC Merced, whereas we are only in the beginning stages of developing an assessment plan for general education. The latter is anticipated to take some time to develop, and is unlikely to proceed at a pace sufficient to generate evidence in keeping with the timeline outlined above. Second, the existing school-based, distributed model for general education does not seem easily amenable to systematic, representative assessment of the competencies *at or near graduation*. Third, evidence suggests that the competencies are already being assessed in some way as part of annual program assessment activities (or could be easily; Table 1). Finally, assessment results are more likely to be used and have impact on student learning if student achievement is evaluated within the major, rather than at a broader institutional level.

---

[2] As represented, for example, in the [AAC&U's VALUE Rubrics](#) associated with these skills.

Table 1: Assessment of competencies by majors.

Competency	% of majors* that have assessed the competency to some extent** within last 4 years	% of majors that <u>explicitly</u> <u>name</u> the competency in the language of a PLO	% of majors with PLOs that could be interpreted to address the competency together with majors that explicitly name the competency in the PLO***
Oral Communication	29%	47%	82%
Written Communication	76%	59%	94%
Quantitative Reasoning	47%	12%	88%
Information Literacy	29%	0%	41%
Critical Thinking	76%	6%	100%

* Of the 17 majors submitting PLO Reports in last four years; recognizing that most programs have only assessed a subset of their PLOs (mode = 3 PLOs assessed typically of 5 PLOs).
** According to rubric criteria.
*** Based on inclusive interpretation of PLO.

Proposed Strategy and Timeline for Implementation within the Majors
For the reasons outlined above, we propose that assessment of the competencies be integrated into each program's ongoing program learning outcome assessment activities. The underlying assumption is that, with support, most programs will be able to integrate assessment of each competency into the assessment of existing PLOs in some way.[3] In other words, student achievement of the competencies would be assessed as part of the work of assessing a PLO, with results used to inform program curriculum and pedagogy as usual.

With this approach, programs would not necessarily have to change the schedule for the review of PLOs, but rather would be sure to flag and report PLO-related findings and actions that address one or more competencies. Criteria defining each competency could also be developed to address discipline specific intellectual conventions, consistent with the understanding that the competencies are skills that are engaged in discipline-specific ways.

To pursue this plan, we propose the following timeline of activities (see appended table for additional details):

AY2013-2014

Products: By the conclusion of this academic year, FAOs for each *major*[4], with the support of the school assessment specialist, will have completed the following:

1. Submitted a brief assessment plan addressing all five competencies[5]. In addition to providing a road map for assessing the competencies, these plans will form the foundation of the institutional essay we must include in our next accreditation report that describes how the undergraduate curriculum addresses each of the five core competencies as well as the relationship of our learning outcomes to the core competencies. (See Section 1, bullets 1 and 2.)

---

[3] An exception may be quantitative reasoning in humanities majors. This could be the focus of a separate working group of humanities faculty.
[4] Majors only, not standalone minors.
[5] Again, an exception may be quantitative reasoning in humanities majors, which may need special consideration.

3

2. Reviewed and identified existing program rubrics or other descriptions of criteria and or/standards that they feel reflect expectations related to one or more competencies.

Activities: To develop the brief assessment plan (bullet 1 immediately above), a program would need to

a. align the competencies to existing PLOs to identify which competencies are already addressed or could easily be addressed under the umbrella of an existing PLO.
b. identify at least one substantive source of direct evidence[6] *for each competency* to be *collected at or near graduation*, recognizing that a rich source of evidence could support more than one PLO and competency. For example, a program might assess critical thinking, information literacy, and written communication through a single significant assignment such as a research paper completed at or near graduation. The evidence should be collected through one or more required courses to ensure that the findings are representative of all students in the major.
c. identify how student work will be archived for future use, with archiving initiated in AY2014-15.
d. identify the year each competency (and corresponding PLO) will be assessed, with the expectation that all five competencies must be assessed by spring 2018 for programs with a March PLO Report date (with four of the five completed by spring 2017), and fall 2018 for programs with an October PLO Report date (with four of the five completed by fall 2017).

Institutional Input: By the start of spring semester, a working group of assessment staff and interested faculty will identify some basic definitions of each competency, examples of useful sources of evidence, and one or more mechanisms to store student work.

Summer 2014

- Building on collected in spring 2014 and other institutional resources, the working group further refines institutional definitions of each of the five competencies to provide programs with basic guidelines for assessing each competency for adoption and adaptation within the majors. Draft materials for three of the competencies developed by conclusion of summer.

AY2014-15

- Programs begin archiving student work in support of assessing PLOs and the related competencies.
- Programs begin assessing competencies as per assessment plan.

AY 2015-16 – AY 2017-2018

- Programs assess PLOs and competencies, completing all five by spring 2018 for programs with a March PLO Report date, and fall 2018 for programs with an October PLO Report date.

Other considerations: Links to Undergraduate Writing Task Force.

V. **Draft Detailed Time Table for Competency Assessment**
The proposed process takes a sampling approach to meeting WASC's expectations to have assessed four of the five competencies by the spring 2017 Off-Site Review and all five by the spring 2018 Accreditation Visit.

---

[6] Ex. a major research paper, lab report, presentation, design project, etc.

4

If implemented as proposed,

- by the Off-Site Review in spring 2017, ~ 50% of the majors would have assessed four of the five competencies, with 50% having assessed three.[7]
- by the Accreditation Visit in spring 2018, ~50% of the majors would have assessed all five competencies, with 50% having assessed four.

As outlined in the table below (shaded cells), this schedule would ask programs with March 1 annual reporting dates to assess and report results for four competencies within the next three annual reporting periods, starting with spring 2015 (i.e. spring 2015, 2016, and 2017). Programs with October 1 reporting dates would be asked to assess and report results for four competencies within their next three annual reporting periods (i.e. fall 2015, 2016, and 2017).

AY			Work Plan	Who?
Fall	**Spring**	**Summer**		
2013			• Plan for addressing competencies approved. • Basic definitions of competencies in development.	Senate approves approach.
	2014		• Basic definitions developed by mid- February to support assessment plan development by conclusion of spring. • Program assessment plans developed by conclusion of semester. • One competency, ex. oral communication[8], elaborated to support assessment beginning in fall 2014.	• Small working group of staff and faculty led by VPDUE and CoIA to work on competency definition. • FAOs and Assessment Staff develop assessment plans
		2014	Working with materials submitted in spring, staff drafts basic definitions and guidelines for another two competencies for review in fall (1 per month).	Staff
2014			• Complete elaboration of final two competencies by October for review by conclusion of fall. (1 per month) • By conclusion of fall semester, basic definitions and guidelines developed for all five competencies so that programs can begin adopting and adapting materials to program specific purposes.	Basic definitions and elaboration of one competency, small working group of staff and faculty led by VPDUE?
	2015		Programs with March 1 reporting dates: First report of competency assessment data based on assessment conducted in fall 2014. (~50% of majors)	
2015			Programs with Oct 1 reporting dates: First report of competency assessment data based on assessment conducted in spring/summer 2015. (~50% of majors)	
	2016		Programs with March 1 reporting dates: Second report of competency assessment data. (~50% of majors)	
2016			• Programs with Oct 1 reporting dates: Second report of competency assessment data. (~50% of majors)	

---

[7] Currently, there are 20 undergraduate majors, eight of which are scheduled to submit reports on October 1st annually, the remainder submit annual reports on March 1.

[8] Suggested, because will want to assess this as students give presentations, to avoid having to archive work.

5

AY			Work Plan	Who?
Fall	Spring	Summer		
			• **UCM Accreditation Report** due, includes description of process and progress assessing competencies, existing conclusions.	
	2017		• Programs with March 1 reporting dates: Third report of competency assessment data. (~50% of majors) • By this report, these programs will have assessed and reported on four of five competencies. • **Off-Site Accreditation Review**: Prior to or as part of Off-Site Review Teleconference, provide update on competency progress, including additional findings, actions etc.	
2017			• Programs with Oct 1 reporting dates: Third report of competency assessment data. • By this report, these programs will have assessed and reported on four of five competencies. (~50% of majors)	
	2018		• Programs with March 1 reporting dates: Fourth report of competency assessment data. (~50% of majors) • By this report, these programs will have assessed and reported on all five competencies. • **Accreditation Visit:** Provide update and additional evidence of all five competencies for majors with March 1 report due date, and for four of the competencies for majors with Oct 1 due dates.	
2018			• Programs with Oct 1 reporting dates: Fourth report of competency assessment data based on assessment conducted in spring/summer 2018. • By this report, these programs will have assessed and reported on all five competencies.	
Continue competency assessment as part of routine PLO assessment activities.				

6

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, California 94607-5200

December 20, 2013

ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR JACOB

Dear Bill:

As you know, in October 2012 the University formed a Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Task Force to consider issues related to PDST, including the policy governing PDST and the process through which campuses propose new PDST charges and changes to existing PDST levels.

Dr. Ahnika Kline, a joint MD/PhD student at UC San Francisco who graduated last spring, and I co-chair the Task Force, which includes four faculty leaders in the Academic Senate (including former Academic Senate Chair Bob Powell), five other students (including former Regent Jonathan Stein and Regent Cinthia Flores), and eight administrators from the campuses and the Office of the President who have substantial expertise related to professional degree programs. A roster of members is attached for your reference.

The Task Force has concluded a comprehensive and thoughtful phase of deliberations and has prepared two draft documents for review and feedback by appropriate University stakeholders prior to finalizing their recommendations at a March 2014 Task Force meeting. The proposed policy revisions are intended to be presented to the Regents at the May 2014 meeting of the Board. At that time, I will also recommend policy implementation protocols to President Napolitano for her approval.

I write to request your facilitation of Academic Senate review of the draft documents. In order to provide feedback to the Task Force for consideration at their March meeting, comments should be submitted no later than March 3, 2014. This should allow the Academic Council to consider comments from committees and divisions at their February 26 meeting.

For reference, the current policy, *Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition*, is available at
http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3103.html. In addition, the Task Force has incorporated *Regents Policy 3104: Principles Underlying the Determination of Fees for Students of Professional Degree Programs* into its draft PDST policy and therefore recommends eliminating the *Principles*, which are available at
http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/3104.html.

If you and/or other members of the Academic Senate have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me, other members of the Task Force, Interim Director David Alcocer (David.Alcocer@ucop.edu) in Student Affairs, or Coordinator Elisabeth Willoughby (Elisabeth.Willoughby@ucop.edu) in Budget and Capital Resources. Thank you in advance for your assistance in facilitating this consultation period.

Cordially,

Aimée Dorr
Provost and Executive Vice President

Attachments:
Draft PDST Policy
Draft PDST Policy Implementation Protocols
PDST Task Force Roster

Cc: Associate Vice President Obley
Executive Director Winnacker
Chief of Staff Ellison Crockett
Interim Director Alcocer
Coordinator Willoughby

<p style="color:red; font-weight:bold; text-align:center;">DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION</p>

Presidential Policy Implementation Protocols for *Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition*

I.   Introduction

The President issues the following policy implementation protocols to provide interpretation and detail to help translate *Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition* (the Policy) into appropriate program, campus, and Office of the President practices that will achieve the Policy's goals and principles. The intent of the protocols is to ensure effective and appropriate practices for preparing proposals for PDST levels for consideration of approval by The Regents.

A) The President or his/her designee will consider PDST level proposals which sufficiently adhere to these protocols and will more likely submit for Regental approval those PDST level proposals supported by program students and faculty.

B) Per the Policy, changes in these protocols can be made at the discretion of the President or his/her designee and only after consultation with students, faculty, and administrative leadership per the following: (1) For substantive changes, the convening of a systemwide and representative task force is needed; and (2) Minor or technical changes can be made at the discretion of the President or his/her designee with notification to student, faculty, and administrative leadership.

II.   Multi-year Proposals and Approvals (Policy Clause 2)

A) The President or his/her designee shall require each program proposing PDST to submit a multi-year PDST plan, endorsed by the Chancellor, proposing annual PDST levels for three years.

B) Any proposed increases above the approved PDST level within the three-year plan requires the submission of a new three-year PDST plan and adherence to provisions in these protocols for the submission of a new three-year PDST plan submission.

B) Programs remaining within approved three-year PDST plans have minimal annual requirements, which are specified in these protocols.

C) Chancellors will review PDST proposals and supporting plans concerning financial aid, loan forgiveness, outreach, diversity, evaluation, and use of any corrective measures (such as a PDST rollback, freeze, limit on future increases, or other financial and/or non-financial measures), and submit proposals as revised to the Office of the President.

III.   Establishing a Set of Peer Institutions (Policy Clause 3)

The Policy requires that programs establish and justify a set of peer institutions to be used for comparison in all elements of the planning and evaluation process, including academic quality, total charges, financial aid, and diversity, among other factors. The following implementation protocols are offered for the establishment of a set of peer institutions.

A) A selection of at least three (and no more than six) comparators is needed for each PDST proposal; if at least three similar programs do not exist, the maximum number of comparators possible should be included.

B) Comparators should be selected based on a range of criteria, where publicly available, including academic quality, program ranking, average student debt, faculty compensation, diversity, and other factors.

C) Programs must use one set of comparators for all measures when determining PDST levels. Where such data are publicly available, measures may include total charges, cost for delivery of education, quality of the academic program, national academic rankings, student-faculty ratios, student diversity, the availability of program-sponsored loan repayment options and other financial aid programs, average income and indebtedness of program graduates, and other factors.

D) Where possible, the three-year PDST plans of programs should report on comparators' most recently available total charges, net cost of attendance, and student debt levels.

E) Programs should review and consult with program faculty and students on comparators every time a three-year plan is developed. Program faculty and students, as well as the campus graduate dean, are encouraged to assess a program's choice of comparison institutions. Student and faculty feedback and comments on the selection of comparators should be included in PDST proposal.

F) Comparators can be both public and private, if applicable; however, most should be public. Private comparators may be used only if the relevant data measures are publicly available. In fields or disciplines with few high quality public programs, at least one-third of all comparators should be programs from other public institutions. In the rare instance in which no public comparator can be identified, the program must provide additional justification, including why other public programs are not appropriate comparators.

G) The selection of aspirational comparators should be rare. If selected comparators are aspirational, the program must provide a rationale for the selection including the program's plan and a reasonable timeline for meeting goals that provide the basis for the selection.

H) Programs selecting mostly private or aspirational comparators will be subjected to greater scrutiny during proposal review by the President and/or his designee. If adequate justification is not provided, the program may be required to select new

2

comparators and/or the proposals' PDST levels may not be recommended by the President or his/her designee to the Regents.

I) Different professional programs on a single campus may or may not have the same comparators; the same degree program on different campuses may or may not have the same comparators provided there is reasonable justification.

IV.   Inclusion and Diversity (Policy Clause 4a)

The Policy states that "the University is committed to ensuring the inclusion of diverse populations in its programs, including its graduate professional degree programs charging PDST." Along these lines, the President or his/her designee expects that programs will adhere to the following guidelines intended to support the University's interest in advancing graduate professional degree program opportunities for educationally and economically disadvantaged groups in a manner consistent with applicable non-discrimination laws.

A) The following should be included in each program's three-year plan in order to permit evaluation of the "impact of institutional climate within programs" as required by the Policy: (1) Diversity-related data and trends over a six-year period including: (a) gender, (b) race and ethnicity, disaggregated for U.S. domestic and international students, (c) residency status of domestic students at the time of entry, and (d) socioeconomic status (including, but not limited to, education and economic disadvantage) when data is available. If these data are not available, programs should make preparations to collect them. If other demographic indicators are collected, programs should also include these in program plans. (2) If possible, analysis or description of diversity data and efforts of programs at selected peer institutions. (3) Indicators for diversity measures and monitoring, such as admissions, yield, graduation, and retention rates of students, and analysis of such data by diversity indicators. (4) Comprehensive and metrics-based strategies for the inclusion of underrepresented groups. Where appropriate, programs should seek the input and feedback of campus diversity officers or offices on such strategies and report independent feedback. Noteworthy strategic plans use data on indicators such as admissions, yield, graduation, and retention rates of students by a range of diversity indicators.

B) Programs must include information for the following areas, if applicable, in three-year proposals: (1) new approaches to creating a diverse student body for programs with no or minimal progress in this area; (2) successful efforts to diversify student populations based upon the inclusion of educationally and economically disadvantaged groups, when measured against comparable programs, disciplines, or fields; (3) program-specific success to diversify student populations over time, including evidence of meaningful efforts; and/or (4) self-imposed accountability measures.

C) While considering the context of the professional field or discipline, progress within each specific program and representation of diverse groups at UC and within California, the President or his/her designee has the responsibility to address PDST programs which do not demonstrate a commitment to the guidelines outlined above

3

and principles and goals articulated in Regents' policy concerning the inclusion of educationally and economically disadvantaged groups. For such PDST programs, after an initial review of a three-year plan, in subsequent three-year plans: (a) If progress on diversity indicators is not made within three years, the program will then be required to submit with their plan a strategic plan for diversity and inclusion, although all programs are encouraged to develop such plans in concert with campus diversity officers/offices and any existing campus-wide diversity framework. (b) If progress on diversity indicators is not made within six years, programs will be required to provide dedicated funding to support strategic diversity and inclusion initiatives before the President or his/her designee submits proposed PDST levels to the Regents.

V.   Affordability and Financial Aid (Policy Clause 4b)

The Policy vests responsibility with the President or his/her designee for ensuring that each campus complements its proposed multi-year plans for professional degree programs with financial aid measures, including scholarships, grants, and loan repayment assistance programs, to meet these goals adequately. Along these lines, the President or his/her designee expects that programs adhere to the following guidelines related to student affordability and financial aid.

A) Each program must submit a financial aid strategy when proposing three-year PDST plans. Financial aid strategies and resources should include and/or address: (1) front-end financial aid that ensures needy students are able to pursue their academic interests; (2) loan forgiveness programs (or equivalent alternative programs) for students interested in pursuing lower-paying public interest careers, and others, such that debt from professional school does not unduly restrict career decisions; (3) financial strategies for the inclusion of students from educationally and/or economically disadvantaged groups; and (4) detailed marketing and outreach plans to explain the program's financial aid strategy and student options.

B) Programs should demonstrate that total charges (Tuition, Nonresident Supplemental Tuition, PDST, the Student Services Fee, campus-based fees, etc.) have been considered when proposing PDST levels and assessing affordability.

C) Programs should develop and maintain strategies and resources that will enable graduates to pursue lower-paying public interest careers.

D) Programs should demonstrate that PDST-setting decisions have taken place within the context of considerations of student debt after graduation and expected average earnings. Programs should, to the extent possible, collect data on student debt levels upon graduation and periodically after graduation, and utilize such data in financial aid plans.

E) The President or his/her designee may refuse to recommend proposed PDST levels to the Regents for programs which do not take action in the face of, or demonstrate good faith efforts to address, high levels of student debt relative to potential earnings after graduation, which may unduly restrict student career and life choices. Such efforts include, but are not limited to, conducting a review and analysis of student debt levels upon graduation and periodically after graduation, providing adequate front-end financial aid or loan forgiveness options, programmatic cost reductions to offset PDST increases, among others.

4

F) Financial aid planning should be discussed during student and faculty consultation. Program faculty and students, as well as the campus graduate dean, are encouraged to assess a program's financial aid strategy. Student and faculty feedback on financial aid and the accessibility to pursue lower-paying public interest careers should be included in the three-year PDST plan.

G) Approved three-year PDST levels and best estimates of total charges should be posted by programs on websites easily accessible to potential applicants.

VI. Student and Faculty Consultation (Policy Clause 5)

The Policy requires that PDST programs consult with students and faculty when determining proposed PDST levels. Consultation serves as an opportunity for the engagement of students and faculty in program development and decision-making, provides an opportunity for understanding the impact of revenue increases or shortages on program quality and excellence, and fosters open communication and transparency with administrative leadership. The following provides implementation protocols for consultation for (A) programs on cycle to submit three-year PDST plans, (B) programs proposing increases for PDST levels previously approved by the Regents, (C) programs proposing to charge PDST for the first time, either existing programs or new programs, and (D) programs remaining within the approved levels set forth in three-year PDST plans (off-cycle years). The broadest possible consultation with students and faculty in programs directly impacted by PDST charges is desirable.

A) *Consultation Protocols for Programs Submitting on Cycle Three-Year PDST Plans*

(1) Consultation should include obtaining the viewpoints of: (a) Students and faculty in the program for which the PDST is proposed through: (i) holding town-hall style meetings with appropriate faculty and students in the program to discuss the plan and solicit feedback; (ii) convening focus groups of appropriate faculty and students in the program to discuss the plan and solicited feedback; (iii) sharing the plan with faculty and students in the program via email, soliciting their feedback, and reviewing the comments received; or (iv) other means determined and explained by the program; (b) The relevant program or school student association leadership, if one exists, and the campus graduate student association, or equivalent; and (c) Other appropriate faculty and affiliated faculty leadership (e.g., faculty executive committee or other faculty leadership).

(2) At the program level, consultation should include information on: (a) proposed PDST increases and three-year plans for any proposed increases; (b) uses of PDST revenue; (c) PDST levels/increases in the context of total charges; (d) issues of affordability and financial aid; (e) opportunities and support to pursue lower-paying public interest careers; (f) selection of comparator institutions; (g) diversity; and (h) outcomes for graduates of the program (e.g., career placement of graduates, average earnings, indebtedness levels).

5

(3) Three-year PDST plans should include direct feedback from students and faculty including: (a) who was consulted; (b) what was consulted on; (c) how and when consultation took place; and (d) summary statements of opinions expressed, including the range of viewpoints and feedback (e.g., percentages consulted and percentages holding specific views).

(4) Three-year PDST plans should also include: (a) a description of how consultation occurred; (b) the nature of the impact or influence of faculty and student views on PDST-setting; (c) verification of consultation with the relevant program or school student association leadership, if one exists; (d) verification of an opportunity to provide feedback for the campus graduate student association, or equivalent; (e) verification of notification of to the campus graduate dean; and (f) an endorsement by the campus Chancellor.

B) *Consultation Protocols for Programs Proposing Increases for PDST Levels Previously Approved by the Regents:* As indicated in Section II-B of these protocols, any proposed increase for an approved PDST level within the three-year plan requires the submission of a new proposed three-year PDST plan. Along these lines, changes to a PDST level within the three-year PDST plan requires consultation enumerated in Section VI-A above.

C) *Consultation Protocols for Programs Proposing to Charge PDST for the First Time, Including Existing Programs or New Programs*

(1) Consultation protocols enumerated in Section VI-A above apply.

(2) New programs or programs charging PDST for the first time may not have apparent direct or obvious student or faculty cohort to provide consultation. In these cases, programs should seek consultation with graduate academic and professional students and faculty in closely related established programs or groups who are reasonable approximations of the program student and faculty population. Additional stakeholders, such as future employers, should also be consulted.

D) *Consultation Protocols for Off-Years of Programs Remaining within Approved Three-Year PDST Levels of a Plan*

(1) Additional consultation is not required for programs implementing approved PDST levels for the duration of the three-year PDST plan.

(2) Three-year plans should be shared each year during the period of the plan with the campus graduate student association president, or equivalent, president and the program or school student association leadership, if one exists, for notification purposes. Program administrative leadership may also offer an opportunity for

6

discussion with student leadership. Any feedback obtained during off-cycle years should be included in the program's next three-year PDST plan, either at the end of the three-year cycle or in connection with a proposed increase in PDST levels during an already approved three-year PDST level period.

(3) Programs should provide program students and faculty with at least one opportunity annually to be updated on uses of PDST revenue and issues of affordability, financial aid, and diversity. Any feedback obtained during off-cycle years should be included in the program's next three-year PDSTplan.

E) *Consultation Protocols for Programs Requesting a Decrease in an Approved PDST Level*

(1) Per the Policy, "upon request of a graduate professional program charging PDST and with the concurrence of the Chancellor, the President is authorized to reduce PDST levels that were previously approved by The Regents."

(2) Students and faculty in the program, the campus graduate student association, or equivalent, president, and the campus graduate dean should be informed of an approved decrease in an already approved PDST level, and provided justification for any such decrease.

VII. Timeline & Multi-Year Planning (Policy Clause 6)

A) To guide the multi-year planning process, the following timeline has been established.
B) The specific dates may be adjusted at the discretion of the President or his/her designee, including for University holidays, campus closures, and changes in the Regents meeting schedule.
C) The President or his/her designee will communicate a full calendar at the time of the call for proposals.
D) Timeline follows on the next page.

7

Activity	Minimum time Required	Responsible Party	Recommended Start date	Recommended End date
Determine initial planning assumptions (anticipated ranges/bands may only be available)		UCOP		No later than February 1
Proposal call to campuses		UCOP		February 1
Proposal preparation	10 weeks	Program	February 1	No later than April 15
Consultation with program students and faculty, and the graduate student association President or designee	At least 4 weeks	Program and specific program entities outlined in Section F of these guidelines, where applicable	No later than March 15	April 15
Proposal revisions, if applicable	2 weeks	Program	April 15	May 1
Campus review	4 weeks	Graduate student government, Graduate Division, Faculty Senate	May 1	May 31
Webinar offered for new students		Program		No later than June 14
Proposal revisions, if applicable		Program		No later than June 15
Submission to campus leadership		Program, Budget office		No later than June 16
Communicate final planning assumptions to campuses		UCOP		No later than July 15
Campus leadership decision, proposal revisions, if applicable		VCPB, EVC, Chancellor, Program, etc.		No later than August 15
Submission to UCOP		Chancellor		No later than August 15
Review by Provost and UCOP	4 weeks	UCOP	August 15	September 15
Feedback to campuses from UCOP, if applicable		UCOP		No later than September 15
Proposal revisions, additional information, etc. requested after UCOP review	2 weeks	Program	September 15	October 1
Draft Regents item	2 weeks	UCOP	October 1	October 15
Review of updated proposals by Provost and UCOP	1 week	UCOP	October 1	October 15
Circulate Regents item for UCOP approvals	1 week	UCOP	October 16	October 24
Update item per comments from Provost, General Counsel, etc.	3 days	UCOP	October 24	October 27
Submit final Regents item to Secretary of the Regents		UCOP		Late October (varies)
Request approval at Regents meeting		President and/or Provost		Mid-November (varies)

8

VIII. Programs Charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (Policy Clause 7)

Per the Policy, the President or his/her designee shall develop implementation protocols to provide guidance on characteristics of graduate degree programs eligible to charge PDST.

A) Effective with the approval of 2015-16 PDST levels, PDST shall not be charged by programs awarding a Doctor of Philosophy degree or a Master's degree on a path to a Doctor of Philosophy degree.
B) Generally, the determination of whether a program is a professional degree program eligible for PDST should be determined on a program-by-program basis. However, the Office of the President may use some combination of the following characteristics when determining the appropriateness of charging a PDST for the first time:
   a. Program may require accreditation or may need to meet licensure requirements that will justify additional instructional needs for which PDST is required.
   b. Job prospects for graduates of professional degree programs are very specific and targeted, often requiring licensure or certification to practice in the job market.
   c. Program content is characterized by acquisition of an identifiable cluster of skills that is not predominantly theory- or research-focused.

IX. President's Designee and UC Office of the President Review

A) The President assigns the Provost and the Executive Vice President of Business Operations as his/her designees in all capacities related to PDST in the Policy and these protocols.
B) The Provost and the Executive Vice President of Business Operations will convene an Office of the President Review Team to review, analyze, and evaluate submissions of program three-year PDST plans.
C) The Office of the President Review Team will consult with campus budget officers, program administrative leadership, and student and faculty leadership as needed during the review, analysis, evaluation, and revision of three-year PDST plans.
D) The Office of the President Review Team will recommend to the Provost and the Executive Vice President of Business Operations three-year PDST plans which adhere to the Policy and these protocols.
E) The Provost and Executive Vice President of Business Operations will recommend to the President PDST levels for his/her recommendation to the Regents for their approval.

9

<p align="center" style="color:red">DRAFT FOR CIRCULATION</p>

Regents Policy 3103: POLICY ON PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION*

(1) Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) shall be assessed to students enrolled in designated graduate professional degree programs in order to achieve and maintain excellence so that these programs remain among the best in the country, public or private.

(2) The Regents shall approve PDST increases in the context of multi-year plans submitted by the President for the years covered by the multi-year plan endorsed by the campus Chancellor, and any increases above the approved PDST levels must be supported by a new multi-year plan. The President or his/her designee is responsible for: (a) ensuring that programs engage in appropriate multi-year planning of PDST levels within the context of principles and goals expressed in this policy and implementation protocols developed by the President or his/her designee; (b) reporting to the Regents periodically on the status of the efforts of programs charging PDST to advance the principles and goals articulated in this policy; and (c) consulting with graduate students, faculty, and program and administrative leadership on substantial changes to implementation protocols.

(3) Each PDST program is responsible for establishing and justifying a set of peer programs at other institutions. The comparators shall be used in all elements of the planning and evaluation process regarding academic quality, total charges, financial aid, and diversity. The total cost of education as well as other market-based factors, such as scholarship and grant support, relative to comparable peer programs shall be considered when setting PDST.

(4) Access and inclusion are among the University's core commitments, and affordability is a vitally important component of a public education system. Any initiation of, or increase in, PDST must be justified by programmatic and financial needs, but also must not adversely affect the University's commitment to access, inclusion, and affordability for students interested in pursuing lower-paying public interest careers.

    a. The University is committed to ensuring the inclusion of diverse populations in its programs, including its graduate professional degree programs charging PDST. In keeping with this commitment, each program charging PDST must have comprehensive strategies, based on measurable outcomes, for the inclusion of educationally and economically disadvantaged groups, consistent with Regents Policy 4400 (Policy on University of California Diversity Statement), and that consider the impact of institutional climate within programs.

    b. Financial aid targeted for students enrolled in professional degree programs is necessary to ensure access to the degree program, to minimize financial barriers to the pursuit of lower-paying public interest careers, and to reduce restrictions on students' career options due to student debt. The President or his/her designee is responsible for ensuring that each campus complements its proposed PDST multi-year plans with financial aid measures, including scholarships, grants, and loan repayment assistance programs, to meet these goals adequately.

      i.   Current base levels of institutional financial aid shall be maintained and an amount equal to at least 33 percent of new PDST revenue shall be dedicated to financial aid for students in programs charging PDST.

      ii.   Campuses reserve the discretion to supplant the 33 percent of new PDST revenue financial aid requirement with other fund sources not specifically designated for student financial support.

     iii.   Other revenue sources specifically designated for student financial support (e.g., fundraising or donor contributions designated for student scholarships) shall provide student financial support in addition to the 33 percent of new PDST revenue that is dedicated to financial aid.

     iv.   Campuses will regularly evaluate and report on the effectiveness of these financial aid measures.

(5) Campuses are required to consult with students and faculty in the program when determining the proposed multi-year plan for PDST.

(6) The Regents recognize the importance of program planning relative to PDST charges, as well as planning and predictability for students, and thus shall further this goal by approving PDST levels in a timely manner for the years covered by a multi-year plan, with any increases above the approved PDST levels supported by a new multi-year plan.

(7) The President or his/her designee shall develop implementation protocols to provide guidance on characteristics of graduate degree programs eligible to charge PDST.

(8) Upon request of a graduate professional program charging PDST and with the concurrence of the Chancellor, the President is authorized to reduce PDST levels that were previously approved by the Regents. The President shall report those actions to the Regents.

* Nothing in this policy constitutes a contract, an offer of a contract, or a promise that any tuition or fees ultimately authorized by The Regents will be limited by any term or provision of this policy. The Board of Regents expressly reserves the right and option, in its absolute discretion, to establish tuition or fees at any level it deems appropriate based on a full consideration of the circumstances, and nothing in this policy shall be a basis for any party to rely on tuition or fees of a specified level or based on a specified formula.

2