

## **Multi-Year Plan for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Levels Effective Beginning Summer or Fall 2018**

- **This form should be completed for** (1) programs seeking to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for the first time, (2) continuing PDST-charging programs whose multi-year plan is expiring, and (3) continuing programs with multi-year plans that have not yet expired if the program is proposing an increase in PDST effective summer or fall 2018 that is greater than that indicated in its approved multi-year plan. All PDST-charging programs are expected to submit a new multi-year plan at least every five years.
- Part A is due **October 23, 2017** and Part B is due **November 3, 2017**.
- **Before completing this form**, refer to the document titled "Deadlines, Instructions, and Planning Assumptions for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Proposals Effective 2018-19" for important information about the planning assumptions that should be reflected in the proposal.

### **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%, as long as the proposed increase does not exceed the amount previously indicated in the program's current multi-year plan, for the President's approval for PDST levels that become effective summer or fall 2018 and summer or fall 2019. All proposals to establish or increase PDST will have been considered under the amended policy by summer or fall 2020.

## **I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND PROJECTED PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION**

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

The CANDEL program is designed for working professionals in education, such as teachers in leadership positions, superintendents, and school principals. All of the students are working professionals, and many of them are already in mid-level leadership roles in these educational settings. The nature, purpose, and goals of the CANDEL program are to maintain the quality of the program and meet the expectation of our students in terms of support and services. Given the pressure of attending to coursework and degree requirements as well as meeting the expectations of their professional roles, it is necessary to provide greater support for each student so that they can negotiate, effectively manage, and succeed in the program and at their work sites with these workloads. Most importantly, the support would provide more opportunities for students to focus on the necessary reading, writing, data collection, and development of skills and knowledge to connect theory and practice, research and action, in their work settings and in the program. The program also intends to continue to attract excellent part-time lecturers and full time faculty.

**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 particular years in the table do not apply to your multi-year plan, please leave those columns blank (and do so throughout the template). Please also refer to the planning assumptions for further details about fee increase rates.**

UC Davis/Ed.D. Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)  
Established program  
Established PDST

	Actual	New Proposed Fee Levels					Increases/Decreases									
		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23
							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
Prof. Degr. Suppl.	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0.0%	\$0	3.0%	\$132	3.0%	\$138	2.9%	\$138	3.0%	\$144
Tuition (CA resident)																
Prof. Degr. Suppl.	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0.0%	\$0	3.0%	\$132	3.0%	\$138	2.9%	\$138	3.0%	\$144
Tuition (Nonresident)																
Mandatory Systemwide Fees (CA resident)*	\$12,630	\$12,966	\$13,320	\$13,680	\$14,046	\$14,424	2.7%	\$336	2.7%	\$354	2.7%	\$360	2.7%	\$366	2.7%	\$378
Campus-based Fees**	\$977	\$991	\$1,005	\$1,020	\$1,049	\$1,088	1.4%	\$14	1.4%	\$14	1.5%	\$15	2.8%	\$29	3.7%	\$39
Nonresident Suppl. Tuition	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	\$12,245	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0
Other (explain below)***							#DIV/0!	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$0
<b>Total Fees (CA resident)</b>	<b>\$18,017</b>	<b>\$18,367</b>	<b>\$18,867</b>	<b>\$19,380</b>	<b>\$19,913</b>	<b>\$20,474</b>	1.9%	\$350	2.7%	\$500	2.7%	\$513	2.8%	\$533	2.8%	\$561
<b>Total Fees (Nonresident)</b>	<b>\$30,262</b>	<b>\$30,612</b>	<b>\$31,112</b>	<b>\$31,625</b>	<b>\$32,158</b>	<b>\$32,719</b>	1.2%	\$350	1.6%	\$500	1.6%	\$513	1.7%	\$533	1.7%	\$561

\* Mandatory systemwide charges include Tuition and Student Services Fee.

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

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

**Additional comments:**

We are not proposing an increase to PDST for the first year of our plan (2018/19), the proposed fee increase is for 3% per year for four years starting in the 2019-20 academic year.

**II. PROGRAM GOAL EVALUATION\***

**\*If your program is proposing to charge PDST for the first time, please proceed to Section III.**

**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.**

The Schools primary objectives for this increase are:

1. Maintain the quality of the program

2. Meet the expectations of our students in terms of support and services. The CANDEL Program is designed for working professionals, such as teachers who are in leadership positions, superintendents, principals and professionals in community based organizations in the P-14 educational system. Students are required to meet during the weekend and have a summer summit offsite. All of the students are working professionals, and many of them are already in mid-level leadership roles in these educational settings. Given the pressure of attending to coursework and degree requirements as well as meeting the expectations of their professional roles, it is necessary to provide greater support for each student so that they can negotiate, effectively manage, and succeed in the program and at their work sites with these workloads. Most importantly, the support would provide more opportunities for students to focus on the necessary reading, writing, data collection, and development of skills and knowledge to connect theory and practice, research and action, in their work settings and in the program.
3. Continue to attract excellent part-time lecturers to supplement course offerings and full-time faculty.
4. Long term goal to create a community of leaders in Education with a strong alumni association that will advance the alumni's ability to lead for change and influence policy.

**Describe how you used PDST revenue to advance the goals specified above.**

- The program provides a unique structured 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the program to support students during the writing of their dissertations.

The students with whom we work are working professionals who have experience and expertise in writing very short notes and policy and position statements. Academic writing is quite another matter. We are asking them to engage in much more detailed scholarly writing. The editorial assistance provides support for the students at the end of their second year and during their third year of writing their dissertation proposal and their dissertation study. Their writing will improve with this support as will the time required for them to refine their writing skills and complete their dissertations with this assistance.
- The program provides support to students in their quantitative and qualitative research design and analysis process.

As noted above as working professionals, our students have had less experience with academic research. The research design assistance that will be provided (typically over the summer) will assist students with more intensive so they complete their dissertations in timely manner. Students will be able to seek support for both quantitative and qualitative methodology.
- Support for Outreach recruitment with in targeted communities, especially seeking candidates of color who serve the economically poorest students in educational settings in the Northern California area.

The percentage of administrators of color who serve communities of color and poverty in Northern California is low. The school continues to increase our recruitment efforts throughout the Northern California area so that these prospective

students know about our program, are encouraged to apply and are provided financial support when necessary to encourage them to matriculate after applying and being accepted.

- Support for Visiting lecturers and faculty who are nationally known in specific fields

Timely issues about educational research, policy, and practice arise throughout each year. Bringing visiting lecturers and faculty to our students will enhance our students' course work as well as their awareness and comprehension of national issues in education and the issues and problems that they face on the job. These visiting experts would also become aware of our students and encourage our students' involvement in national activities that they could bring back to their work sites to enhance their own skills and the resources of their institutions and the State of California.

- Support for Program Associate Director

The primary goal of this position is the overall administration of the program, including serving as a first point of contact for students and providing consistency as faculty leadership changes after one to three year appointments. The coordinator works closely under the direction of the Program Director to quickly solve program problems, and assist students and faculty. They also ensure necessary instructional materials and resources are readily available, and collect and analyze data about students' satisfaction with the program, including the impact that the professional fees may be having on their ability to succeed in the program, student progress in courses and the program, and untapped opportunities for students to better connect their course learning with their work settings. This person also facilitates ways for students to take advantage of the writing and research design assistance offered through the PDST.

**Please elaborate on the extent to which your program has achieved each of the goals listed above. Please include quantitative indicators of achievement wherever possible.**

The PDST has allowed for the CANDEL program to achieved all of our goals listed above, and the new structured 3<sup>rd</sup> year that is possible primarily due to the revenue from the PDST has increased the number of students we see advancing to their qualifying exam.

### **III. PROGRAM GOALS AND EXPENDITURE PLANS**

**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?**

When the proposed 3% increase takes effect in 2019-20 it will be the first PDST fee increase in over three years. While the PDST fees have been frozen the program continues to absorb fixed cost increases associated with salary, benefits and other campus assessments. The primary reason for the increase is to address fixed cost increases that are outside the control of the program. Once fixed costs are covered any additional revenue remaining from the fee increase will go toward the continued refinement of the structured third year; which is important to support our students for their advancement to qualifying exams. The essential benefits are to maintain program offerings while supplementing support provided in the third year of their degree.

**For established PDST programs, please indicate how you are using total actual Professional Degree Fee revenue in 2017-18 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 particular years in the table do not apply to your multi-year plan, please leave those columns blank).**

UC Davis/Ed.D. Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)  
 Established program  
 Established PDST

	Proposed Use of Incremental PDST Revenue						Total New PDST Revenue
	Total 2017-18 PDST Revenue	Incremental 2018-19 PDST revenue	Incremental 2019-20 PDST revenue	Incremental 2020-21 PDST revenue	Incremental 2021-22 PDST revenue	Incremental 2022-23 PDST revenue	
Faculty Salary Adjustments	\$40,000	\$0	\$6,382	\$6,643	\$6,657	\$6,947	\$26,628
Benefits/UCRP Cost*	\$55,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Services	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Improving the Student-Faculty Ratio	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Expanding Instructional Support Staff	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Instructional Equipment Purchases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Providing Student Financial Aid	\$104,782	\$0	\$3,143	\$3,272	\$3,279	\$3,421	\$13,116
Other Non-salary Cost Increases	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Facilities Expansion/Renewal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other (Please explain in the "Additional Comments" below)	\$37,738	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total use/projected use of revenue</b>	<b>\$317,520</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,526</b>	<b>\$9,914</b>	<b>\$9,936</b>	<b>\$10,368</b>	<b>\$39,744</b>

\* Benefits costs and UCRP contributions should be reported as a single line item.

**Additional Comments:**

There is not a line item to capture the funding that is spent on the existing non-salary expenses associated with the program. Reflected in the "other" line item are the costs of the annual student retreat for first year students, which includes the first courses the cohort will receive. Also, reflected in the other line item are some of the student recruitment costs and support costs for the program Director and Associate Director.

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

The SOE has pursued other sources of funding such as extramural C&G and fundraising revenue to augment the cost of the program but these source are not sufficient or consistent. Specifically regarding cost-cutting, the program is has leveraged the use of the shared services offered by the School of Education. CANDEL also has been able to absorb some of the past fixed costs increases by creating efficiencies, specifically by leveraging some of the student services already provided by the School of Education at Davis. We feel that there are no new efficiencies to be gained without impacting the program received by our CANDEL students.

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

The CANDEL program is proposing that the fee increase to the PDST start in 2019-20, not 2018-19 to allow our student the ability to plan for the increase. We are also hopeful that this approach will help motivate our current students to stay on track to finish the program in three years so they do not have to pay the fee increase.

**Please indicate your program’s current and expected resident and nonresident enrollment in the table below.**

	Enrollment					
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Resident	72	72	72	72	72	72
Domestic Nonresident						
International						
Total	72	72	72	72	72	72

#### IV. MARKET COMPARISONS: TOTAL CHARGES

**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 other programs or only private comparators, please list those.**

Source(s): Webpage of each institution

**Please indicate the total first-year student tuition and fee charges of the comparison institutions in the table on the next page. To project your program’s total charges after 2018-19, assume annual increases in Tuition, the Student Services Fee, and campus-based fees of 2.5%, 5%, and 3%, respectively. To project your comparators’ total charges after 2018-19, assume 3% annual increases, unless your program has compelling justification for using a different figure.**

**Note: A comparison of total charges to complete a degree may be more meaningful for programs whose comparator programs vary in length. If this applies to your program, you may provide figures on total charges to complete a degree in addition to annual first-year comparison institutions’ amounts shown below. Please check the box below and attach the total charges to complete a degree template provided by Budget Analysis and Planning; if you have any questions about how to calculate the total charges to complete a degree, please contact [richard.michaelson@ucop.edu](mailto:richard.michaelson@ucop.edu).**



Program has completed and attached the total charges to complete a degree template.

**DO NOT CONTACT OTHER INSTITUTIONS DIRECTLY FOR THIS INFORMATION. USE ONLY PUBLICLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION.**

UC Davis/Ed.D. Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)  
Established program  
Established PDST

	First Year Annual Charges															
	Actuals	Projections					Increases/Decreases									
	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	2018-19		2019-20		2020-21		2021-22		2022-23	
Residents							%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$
University of the Pacific (private)	\$30,528	\$31,444	\$32,387	\$33,359	\$34,360	\$35,390	3%	\$916	3%	\$943	3%	\$972	3%	\$1,001	3%	\$1,031
Mills College (private)	\$43,277	\$44,575	\$45,913	\$47,290	\$48,709	\$50,170	3%	\$1,298	3%	\$1,337	3%	\$1,377	3%	\$1,419	3%	\$1,461
University of Southern California (private)	\$36,984	\$38,094	\$39,236	\$40,413	\$41,626	\$42,875	3%	\$1,110	3%	\$1,143	3%	\$1,177	3%	\$1,212	3%	\$1,249
University of Oregon (public)	\$19,041	\$19,612	\$20,201	\$20,807	\$21,431	\$22,074	3%	\$571	3%	\$588	3%	\$606	3%	\$624	3%	\$643
Sacramento State (public)	\$19,644	\$20,233	\$20,840	\$21,466	\$22,109	\$22,773	3%	\$589	3%	\$607	3%	\$625	3%	\$644	3%	\$663
Public Average	\$19,343	\$19,923	\$20,520	\$21,136	\$21,770	\$22,423	3%	\$580	3%	\$598	3%	\$616	3%	\$634	3%	\$653
Private Average	\$36,930	\$38,038	\$39,179	\$40,354	\$41,565	\$42,812	3%	\$1,108	3%	\$1,141	3%	\$1,175	3%	\$1,211	3%	\$1,247
Public and Private Average	\$29,895	\$30,792	\$31,715	\$32,667	\$33,647	\$34,656	3%	\$897	3%	\$924	3%	\$951	3%	\$980	3%	\$1,009
University of California, Davis (public)	\$18,017	\$18,367	\$18,867	\$19,380	\$19,913	\$20,474	2%	\$350	3%	\$500	3%	\$513	3%	\$533	3%	\$561
<b>Nonresidents</b>																
University of the Pacific (private)	\$30,528	\$31,444	\$32,387	\$33,359	\$34,360	\$35,390	3%	\$916	3%	\$943	3%	\$972	3%	\$1,001	3%	\$1,031
Mills College (private)	\$43,277	\$44,575	\$45,913	\$47,290	\$48,709	\$50,170	3%	\$1,298	3%	\$1,337	3%	\$1,377	3%	\$1,419	3%	\$1,461
University of Southern California (private)	\$36,984	\$38,094	\$39,236	\$40,413	\$41,626	\$42,875	3%	\$1,110	3%	\$1,143	3%	\$1,177	3%	\$1,212	3%	\$1,249
University of Oregon (public)	\$26,169	\$26,954	\$27,763	\$28,596	\$29,453	\$30,337	3%	\$785	3%	\$809	3%	\$833	3%	\$858	3%	\$884
Sacramento State (public)	\$29,148	\$30,022	\$30,923	\$31,851	\$32,806	\$33,791	3%	\$874	3%	\$901	3%	\$928	3%	\$956	3%	\$984
Public Average	\$27,659	\$28,488	\$29,343	\$30,223	\$31,130	\$32,064	3%	\$830	3%	\$855	3%	\$880	3%	\$907	3%	\$934
Private Average	\$36,930	\$38,038	\$39,179	\$40,354	\$41,565	\$42,812	3%	\$1,108	3%	\$1,141	3%	\$1,175	3%	\$1,211	3%	\$1,247
Public and Private Average	\$33,221	\$34,218	\$35,244	\$36,302	\$37,391	\$38,512	3%	\$997	3%	\$1,027	3%	\$1,057	3%	\$1,089	3%	\$1,122
University of California, Davis (public)	\$30,262	\$30,612	\$31,112	\$31,625	\$32,158	\$32,719	1%	\$350	2%	\$500	2%	\$513	2%	\$533	2%	\$561

Source(s):

Websites

Additional Comments:

The data was correlated based on public information and we did not contact the institutions based in accordance with the direction we received. We do have screenshot of the information collected if there are any questions about the fees reflected for the institutions.

**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. (If a program is unlikely to achieve comparability to an aspirational program within 5 years, the aspirational program should not be included.)**

These institutions offer doctoral programs in Educational Leadership that target the same professional students as the CANDEL program. They are all located in the West Coast and often recruit for the same applicant pool as the CANDEL program.

**If you assumed increases above or below 3% for your comparison institutions, how were those projected tuition and fee increases determined?**

Not applicable, the table assumes 3%.

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

We feel that, even with the Professional fee, our fees will still remain very attractive when compared to Private institutions offering an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. Additionally, we will remain very competitive with other comparable public institutions such as University of Oregon and Sacramento State.

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

The CANDEL program at UC Davis is designed to prepare exemplary educational leaders in schools, community colleges, and related educational capacities that reside in the greater Sacramento Valley, Bay Area and across northern California. The School of Education at Davis is distinguished by preparing graduates to lead for change in educational environments that promote learning, equity, and achievement for all students. Since the beginning of the CANDEL program it has continued to grow in prestige and when talking to prospective students it is clear we have a competitive edge due to the reputation of our faculty as leaders in their fields.

## **V. ENROLLMENT AND DIVERSITY STRATEGY**

**In the table on the following page, please provide details about enrollment in your program and in your comparison public and private institutions. The enrollment figures provided should align with the most recent three years for which data are available.**

***Note: UCOP will provide campuses with data from the Corporate Student System that should be used to complete the table below for your program. Please note that, as used here, established programs consist of programs that have enrolled students prior to 2018-19; new programs are those that seek to enroll students for the first time in 2018-19. For established programs, provide data for academic years 2014-15 to 2016-17. In the columns shown, programs should provide as many figures for comparison public and private institutions as are available.***

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Comparison (2015-16)	
				Publics	Privates
<b>Ethnicity</b>					
<b>Underrepresented</b>					
African American	15%	16%	16%		
Chicanx/Latinx	21%	27%	28%		
American Indian	3%	3%	4%		
<i>Subtotal Underrepresented</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>46%</i>	<i>49%</i>	<i>0%</i>	<i>0%</i>
Asian/East Indian	13%	14%	13%		
White	40%	34%	34%		
Other/ Unknown	8%	6%	4%		
International	0%	0%	0%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Socioeconomic</b>					
% Pell recipients	46%	39%	63%		
<b>Gender</b>					
% Male	39%	41%	46%		
% Female	61%	59%	54%		

Sources:

UC ethnicity, socioeconomic status: UC Corporate data

Comparison institutions: [please indicate]

**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 School of Education at Davis is proud that approximately half of our students are from underrepresented groups, however we are still committed to increasing the diversity of our student population. The trend reflected in the table above shows our continued growth in underrepresented students by ethnicity. Our program, in many ways, is comparable in racial and ethnic diversity student populations with other UC Campuses that offer an Ed.D. program. When our program was established in 2005,

33% of our students were from underrepresented groups. This has increased to 49% for the 2016-17 year. We remain committed in our underrepresented recruitment efforts and to the purposes of the program. The CANDEL program has a recommended program admission requirement that applicants be currently in positions of leadership and desire to learn to be agents of change in their districts, institutions, and schools. This requirement is coupled with the requirement that the applicants' employer must sign a letter of support allowing the admitted student to attend full-day Friday classes every third week, and receive other district or institutional support if available. Nevertheless, CANDEL acknowledges that, within our recruiting efforts for each student cohort, we need to focus on recruiting a larger community of under-represented students, with particular attention being paid to recruitment in our Latino/Chicano communities that are underserved in our region and interested in the important educational benefits of the CANDEL program.

**For established programs, please comment on the trend in enrollment of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., students who received Pell Grants as undergraduates). What is your strategy for promoting access for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds?**

Since our students enter the program typically ten to fifteen years after completing their undergraduate education we do not see their Pell Grant information. We do not access this information.

**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? What will be your strategy for promoting gender parity in your program?**

Looking at our annual reporting of demographics we have established gender parity in our CANDEL program. We strive to achieve gender parity as we consider the overall diversity of each cohort during the admissions process. When our faculty are admitting students in to the cohort they do take into consideration a balancing the cohort among all demographics, which can include gender parity.

**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.**

The CANDEL program expects the composition to be similar to the current state since it already encompasses the multiple dimensions of diversity represented in the question above. CANDEL will continue to consider the make-up of each incoming cohort during the admissions process, taking into consideration diversity of the students and their disciplines.

## **VI. FINANCIAL AID STRATEGY AND PROGRAM AFFORDABILITY**

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

The UC Davis School of Education was ranked 36<sup>th</sup> in the nation by US News and World Report in 2017. One of the goals for CANDEL is to provide a high quality education to our students indicative of a top 40 School of Education in the nation at a price that is similar to the other Ed.D programs in the region. The CANDEL total tuition, including the PDST increase will be the most inexpensive Ed.D in the region, including the program offered by Sacramento State University less than 50 miles away. CANDEL also provides financial aid to students based on the FAFSA. CANDEL measures success in this area by maintaining quality and affordability in comparison to similar programs in the region.

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

CANDEL targets the allocation of our financial aid resources to the “highest” need students first based on FAFSA calculation of need, we then look at the other types of aid the students are receiving which could include aid from the UC employee fee reduction. The vast majority of CANDEL students enroll in the program while maintaining full time positions. Using the FAFSA as a guide to award aid we believe has helped us with to create balanced cohorts of students from varying professions and backgrounds.

### **Please describe any resources available to students in your program, while enrolled or following graduation, to promote lower-paying public interest careers or provide services to underserved populations. Examples may include targeted scholarships, fellowships, summer or academic-year internships, and Loan Repayment Assistance Plans.**

The CANDEL programs aim is to cultivate educational leaders from public schools, community colleges, state and local educational agencies, and community based organizations serving education in California. Our common purpose and theme is to produce exemplary leaders who are willing to question how they do business in education and seek changes that truly impact our students. Many of our students currently work with underserved populations in school districts, community colleges, and communities and provide service to these populations on a daily basis.

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

We use a variety of marketing and outreach activities to allow us to effectively and efficiently communicate our Financial aid resources to prospective students. We discuss the use of FAFSA as a tool for students to access financial aid resources. We also provide contact information for our liaison in the office of Financial Aid.

We continue to successfully use in-person Information Sessions to explain and describe our academic and our Financial Aid Programs. We have expanded our use of list serves to include school districts in the Central Valley and at UC Merced to staff who qualify for the Career Staff Reduced Fee Program. We have begun to use web-based and live stream options to reach a wider and more diverse audience and to address the travel barriers that prospective students may experience.

***Note: UCOP will provide you with figures from the Corporate Student System that should be used to complete the table below.***

Graduating Class	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Percent with Debt	13%	50%	46%	38%	77%	62%	75%
Cumulative Debt among Students with Debt	\$57,218	\$28,816	\$36,641	\$63,010	\$59,535	\$42,969	\$64,984

**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?**

We realize that CANDEL students are working professionals, already employed at middle management levels or above. We believe, even with the proposed professional fee, the additional debt load of less than \$150 per year created by increased professional fees will remain manageable for our students.

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



***provide you with a formula for you to use to calculate the last column. If you describe starting salary using a measurement other than the median, please note that in the table below and explain in the “additional comments” section below.***

	Graduates with Debt	2015-16 Average Debt at Graduation among Students with Debt	Median Salary at Graduation	Est. Debt Payment as % of Median Salary
This program	75%	\$64,984	\$150,000	6%
Public comparisons	%	\$	\$	#VALUE!
Private comparisons	%	\$	\$	#VALUE!

Sources:

UC: Corporate data

Comparison institutions: [please indicate]

Additional Comments:

**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.**

As detailed in the above data, our graduates can expect to spend approximately 6% of their salary towards the repayment of loans. We feel this is very manageable with the median salary of our graduates at \$150,000. The UC Davis Financial Aid office provides loan repayment counseling and information, even after their degree completion. Also, typically our graduates will be advancing into other higher level positions with greater responsibility and, therefore, higher salaries.

**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?**

The majority of our students are in public interest careers upon entering our program through careers with the public school and community college systems. Most will continue to serve this population after graduation as well. Because CANDEL graduates are already in career positions, they typically do not earn less than our other graduates. For many of our CANDEL graduates the completion of their degree will provide increased salary potential.

**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?**

No we do not currently provide the average and median debt of graduates to our students, and to this point have not been requested to provide the information.

## **VII. OTHER**

**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.).**

## **VIII. SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS FOR PROGRAMS PROPOSING TO CHARGE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION FOR THE FIRST TIME IN SUMMER OR FALL 2018**

**Please describe the program for which you propose to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition, including: What unit/department houses the program? Is the program new or already offered? If new, has the program already been approved by the campus and by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the system wide Academic Senate committee responsible for reviewing and approving the academic plans of all campus proposals for new graduate degree programs? The President must approve implementation of the program. Program approval at both the campus and system wide levels is necessary for program implementation. A proposed new program that a campus has submitted to CCGA and UCOP may apply for PDST approval before receiving formal program approval; PDST approval by the Regents would be contingent on final program approval by the Academic Senate and the President, however, and no student charges may be imposed in advance of final program approval. For questions about the status of system wide academic program approval, please contact Chris Procello (Chris.Procello@ucop.edu).**

**PDST shall not be charged by programs awarding a Doctor of Philosophy degree, a Master's degree on a path to a Doctor of Philosophy degree, or a Baccalaureate degree. Generally, the determination of whether a program is a professional degree program eligible for PDST should be based on a program-by-program review. 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; and (c) Program content is characterized by acquisition of an identifiable cluster of skills that is not predominantly theory- or research-focused. Please describe the rationale for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition for this program, including: Why is it appropriate for this program to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition? In what ways is the program "professional" rather than "academic"?**

## **PART B**

### **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)**

**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) 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): Text
- 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): Text

**Attach the feedback written by students of the program during the opportunities for consultation checked above and describe below any proposal changes as a result of this feedback.**

A week before one of our regularly scheduled CANDEL Teaching Weekends in October, students received a letter from Dean Lindstrom and Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Instruction, Cynthia Carter-Ching explaining the rationale and the plan for the use of PDST funds. Students were provided with multiple opportunities to provide input:

1. CANDEL leadership invited students to attend a one hour round table discussion regarding the changes. Students were able to provide their comments and feedback in person or they could call-in and participate remotely. Dean Lindstrom, Assistant Dean Chapman and Co-Director Martorell were available during this time to provide students with information regarding the multi-year plan; however no students attended the meeting.
2. The Associate Director of CANDEL contacted each of the instructors for Fall quarter and asked them if students had raised the issue or asked any questions during the courses. All instructors indicated that students had not asked about the PDST plan or proposed increase.

**In addition to consultation with program students and faculty, please confirm that this multi-year plan has been provided to the program graduate student organization, if applicable, and the campus graduate student organization. *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 each 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 GSA Chair Roy Taggug on 10/18/2017 .  
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 \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ .  
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**

**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): Text

**Attach the feedback written by faculty during the opportunities for consultation checked above and describe below any proposal changes as a result of this feedback. Also attach a summary of feedback written by designated faculty leaders in the program.**

On October 23, faculty received a letter from Dean Lindstrom and Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Instruction, Cynthia Carter-Ching explaining the rationale and the plan for the use of PDST funds. In addition to a letter detailing the proposed changes, the plan was discussed as an agenda item at the 10/30/17 faculty meeting. In attendance were a quorum of the School of Education Faculty, which includes all faculty who teach in CANDEL (except three who were on sabbatical or traveling). Faculty were also given the option to weigh in via email or other correspondence with the SOE leadership, but no written concerns were submitted. At the meeting, the proposal was well received, and a productive discussion ensued. Faculty were satisfied with the explanation and use of the monies as they are being administered, and found very convincing the argument that fixed-costs were going up and needed to be covered for CANDEL. In particular, faculty were very supportive of the gradual roll-out model, wherein students will experience only the 2.7% general tuition increase in 2018-19, and then the additional 3% PDST increase will take effect in 2019-20. Several faculty raised the question about whether this increase would negatively impact admissions and the general consensus was that even with this increase, CANDEL tuition is lower than competitors in the region and thus this change would not result in a significant decrease in our applicant pool. Overall, faculty were in support of this change.

**Please confirm that this long form template was provided to the campus Graduate Dean and endorsed by the Chancellor.**

Plan shared with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Prasant Mohapatra on 10/18/2017 .  
Graduate Dean

Plan endorsed by Chancellor Gary May on 10/20/2017 .  
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>