



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502  
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

February 25, 2014

**WILLIAM JACOB, CHAIR**

UC Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

**RE: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Task Force**

The Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Task Force draft proposed policy revisions were forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees from the Schools and Colleges. Responses were received from the Committee on Planning and Budget and the Faculty Executive Committees from the College of Letters and Science, the College of Education, and the Graduate School of Management, as well as from Graduate Council.

Substantive comments were received from the Faculty Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Management, which I summarize below.

1. The Graduate School of Management noted that on page 9, Section VIII, (A), a blanket prohibition against charging PDST for programs offering a Doctor of Philosophy degree is unnecessarily restrictive. Some Doctor of Philosophy degrees are highly professional, and so the determination of whether a program offering a Doctor of Philosophy degree, or a Master's degree on a path to a Doctor or Philosophy degree, can charge PDST should be considered on a program-by-program basis. The Committee suggested that clause (A) be omitted or at least modified so as to accommodate the possibility of charging PDST.
2. The Graduate School of Management also noted that, though there is support for upfront financial aid assistance to socioeconomically disadvantaged applicants, clear rationales do not exist for requiring that the financial aid strategy include a loan forgiveness program for students seeking low-paying job opportunities. According to the Committee, loan forgiveness creates distorted incentives for students.
3. The appropriate levels of fees and PDST are set in comparison with those set by peer schools. In addition, however, there are two other important factors that are currently missing in the proposed protocols:
  - a. Peer schools may not be subject to a 33% revenue financial aid requirement
  - b. Peer schools may receive greater state support and thus may be able to charge lower PDST than a comparable program would need to

In addition to comparative fees, operating cost differentials and state support differentials also need to be taken into account when setting the PSDT fee levels.

4. In clause (4), b, (ii) of the Regents Policy 3103, it is unclear whether the word "supplant" (i.e., replace) should instead read "supplement."

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) could not find anything in the proposed policy revisions that related PDST to the actual cost of delivering the program. The document states that the amount charged should allow the

unit to “achieve and maintain excellence so that these programs remain among the best in the country, public or private,” which is a very far ranging statement. CPB would not approve of PDST increases justified by the cost of hiring the very best faculty at, say, \$500,000 annual salary. When the document suggests consultations with students, what is going to convince any student that they need to spend an extra \$15,000 on tuition per year when their debt load is already going to be very high? Perhaps consultation with students would be more meaningful if programs would be required to provide students with detailed information about the cost per student of putting on the program.

Graduate Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee on the draft proposed policy revisions, with the discussion noting that the process outlined in the proposal was somewhat cumbersome and lengthy with a strict timeline. The Council noted that this was probably necessary in light of assuring that the PDST is a well justified and rare occurrence.

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate looks forward to receiving an updated policy proposal addressing the concerns raised before the policy is finalized. Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bruno Nachtergaele". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor: Mathematics