



Henry C. Powell  
Telephone: (510) 987-0711  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [henry.powell@ucop.edu](mailto:henry.powell@ucop.edu)

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

June 3, 2010

**PROVOST AND EVP LAWRENCE PITTS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Re: Proposals for new professional degree fees**

Dear Larry:

Per your request, I solicited comments on the proposals for new professional degree fees from CCGA, UCPB and the divisions. Both committees and UCSD responded. Since these are pre-proposals, the comments did not address the merits of the particular cases. Instead, they addressed the principles that should be used to determine whether a program should be allowed to charge a professional degree fee.

There is a clear distinction between academic degrees aimed at generating new knowledge and degrees that train students in the application of knowledge. Although the graduates of Ph.D. programs may work in industry, their coursework addressed the broad, intellectual underpinnings of their fields along with the frontiers of new knowledge. UCSD's Committee on Planning and Budget points out that Berkeley is proposing a professional engineering program with a high PDF in addition to proposing a lower PDF for their existing M.S. and Ph.D. programs. The committee advises differentiating the curricula to correspond clearly with different career tracks, such as offering a terminal masters. As a general rule, Ph.D., M.A. and M.S. degrees should not be considered professional degrees and therefore should not be allowed to charge additional fees.

All respondents are concerned with maintaining access and adequate financial support. UCSD opposes PDFs as contrary to the mission of a public university. They also run counter to UC's practice of distributing fee revenues across disciplines. UCPB observes that the proposals address the issue of access with varying degrees of specificity and focus, and suggest that the template be revised to clarify expectations. CCGA argues that the professional degree fee should be renamed to reflect its nature as a supplemental fee levied due to decreasing state support.

UCSD's CPB expressed great concern about professional fees proposed for programs that seldom lead to high-paying jobs. They note "that although the Regents' order does not explicitly limit the PDF to degrees reliably leading to high-paying professions, this may be implicit in their financial aid and loan-forgiveness requirements, and they should consider amending their order to make this

clear.” CCGA believes that the earning potential of students should not be a consideration in approving a PDF, while UCPB is willing to consider this as one of several legitimate criteria.

The respondents argue that self-supporting programs should be entirely independent of state support so that they do not drain resources from the core academic mission (though UCPB acknowledges that this may not be possible in the initial years of a program). Such programs are defined by being geared toward working professionals, with part-time instruction offered outside of normal instructional hours.

Regarding proposal review, UCPB asks whether all campuses have similar review procedures for PDF proposals. CCGA recommends that professional fee proposals be approved on a case-by-case basis and that no fees be approved until a coherent policy for assessing them is developed.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Henry C. Powell", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Henry C. Powell, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council  
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl (3)



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)**

**Peter Krapp, Chair**

[krapp@uci.edu](mailto:krapp@uci.edu)

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

May 21, 2010

HENRY POWELL, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Re: Professional Degree Fee Proposals**

Dear Harry,

In response to an expansion of professional degree programs in the last few years, Provost Pitts has asked UCPB and CCGA to comment on nine proposals for professional degree fees (PDFs) submitted on February 2, and provide guidance on three inter-related questions regarding the criteria for such proposals. It is our understanding that Provost Pitts requested campuses to submit such proposals for pre-review with the understanding that this would not prejudice the actual eventual submissions.

We do not feel that it is appropriate for UCPB to comment on the merits of specific proposals at this stage, because they were submitted with the understanding they were preliminary and because they are clearly at different levels of completion. This pre-review is informational and an opportunity to provide feedback, not a de-facto early approval or an opportunity to veto specific proposals. However, taken as a group, the proposals do raise a few issues for discussion, as noted below:

- 1. Criteria for campus review and timing of Systemwide Senate review.** Some of the proposals (e.g. the two from Irvine) are completely new, and are clearly required to undergo the usual campus and Systemwide review process. At least one (the M. Eng. from Berkeley) envisions substantial changes to an existing current program, and therefore may require full review (we agree with the Provost that CCGA should decide this). Do all campuses have similar procedures for their own review procedures for PDF proposals, without other program changes? We think they should, and that divisional senates should be involved.
- 2. Choice of Comparison Institutions.** The template calls for comparison institutions, specifying only that at least three should be public. While this does allow for some strategic selectivity, we do think that the flexibility is appropriate. It can also be telling: at least one proposal chooses institutions not ordinarily compared with the University of California. Perhaps some guidance would be appropriate; or perhaps we should let campuses choose the comparison institutions they want and live with the consequences of their choices. However, one may consider reference to the standard Comparison 8 as a control group.

3. **Access and Financial Support.** The responses regarding financial support and access vary in specificity and focus, suggesting that the template is not as clear as it might be on these points. No one would argue that access and diversity are unimportant, but academic excellence is the prime criteria for selection and support in graduate and professional education at the University of California.

Provost Pitts also poses questions regarding the criteria for such proposals; to wit, whether the particular programs proposed are professional in nature and to the extent that they are not, whether they are still justified in charging a professional fee. For purposes of our consideration, these were parsed into the three broad policy questions discussed below. We note that the Senate and other components of the University devoted considerable energy to this task just a few years ago. The ground rules set out over the past few years, even if imperfect and not satisfactory to all of us, provide reasonable criteria for PDF review procedures. These are embedded in the template required for proposal submission. Although the nine current proposals do vary in the specificity of responses, likely because some are very preliminary, the template used for these initial proposals seems to provide sufficient uniformity. With this in mind, UCPB would answer the three policy questions as follows:

- (1) What defines a “professional” degree program that distinguishes it from an academic degree program?

The primary distinction between an academic professional program and a professional one is that the former educates broadly in the intellectual underpinnings of a field or discipline whereas the latter trains an individual for a particular job or career. The latter certainly assumes a significant component of practical training, sometimes geared towards some ultimate certification or licensing process. Students are being trained for positions that are inherently different from the types of research activities pursued by academic scholars in the discipline. In this sense, another defining characteristic of professional programs is that they are outside the core academic mission of faculty of a comprehensive research university.

This does not always define a clear dividing line, however, and it has to be acknowledged that in some cases the distinction is somewhat arbitrary. But in the majority of cases, the distinction is also understood by history and convention. Most programs that fit this description are at the graduate level and therefore layered on top of an academic undergraduate degree program, though there are also undergraduate programs that are essentially professional in nature—e.g., nursing, and perhaps engineering.

- (2) What criteria determine when it is appropriate to charge a professional degree fee?

The main justification for charging a professional fee must be to maintain the quality of the program. However, in an era of inadequate and still declining State support even for core academic programs, a professional fee is likely to be necessary in offering any program outside, or even at the fringes of, the core academic mission of the University. Other issues should also be considered, e.g., the market for similar degree programs at other institutions and the value-added by the degree in terms of increased earning power. The template for the new proposals appears clear in this regard. Most of the responses make similar arguments, asserting that the cost of the new program must to be passed on to its students in the form of a professional fee for the program to exist. A more difficult question would be what fee structure is appropriate, and what fraction of costs should reasonably be borne by students in programs that are essentially

professional in nature as outlined above, but which are not likely to lead to substantial earning power. We can imagine such programs in the performing arts and in primary and secondary education, for example.

(3) What criteria determine whether a program should be self-supporting or State-supported with a PDF?

A second category of professional program is entirely self-supporting and independent of State support. The distinction between these and partially state supported programs with a PDF is important, because the revenue generated by the latter is generally retained by the department or unit offering the program and does not have a return to aid requirement. Consequently, such programs often generate net revenue to the sponsoring department, while drawing teaching resources away from that unit's state-sponsored mission. Given this feature, we would reasonably limit these to programs that cannot be delivered as professional and that contain three essential elements: 1) geared for working professionals; so 2) necessarily part-time; and finally 3) with courses offered outside normal instructional hours, i.e., nights and weekends, so requiring separate courses/instructors, etc.

In addition, the curriculum of a mature self-supporting program should be expected to include no state-funded courses. We recognize that this expectation is perhaps too restrictive during the early years of development, when it might be critical to leverage existing courses when those courses have sufficient capacity. However, the specter of different classes of students paying different fee structures for the same courses is not attractive.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter Krapp". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Peter" being more prominent than the last name "Krapp".

Peter Krapp  
UCPB Chair

cc: UCPB  
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)

Farid Chehab, Chair

[chehabf@labmed2.ucsf.edu](mailto:chehabf@labmed2.ucsf.edu)

ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, California 94607-5200

May 21, 2010

**HARRY C. POWELL**  
**ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

**Re: Proposals for Professional Degree Fees**

Dear Harry:

At the request of Provost Larry Pitts, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has reviewed the nine proposals for professional degree fees to be levied in 2010-11 and beyond. The review of these proposals by CCGA and UCPB in advance of the existing Compendium process for approving new programs presents a unique opportunity for the Senate to provide feedback early on in the process.

The CCGA critique focuses predominantly on the policy questions posed by the recent expansion of professional degree fee-charging programs, taking into account the background materials provided to the Senate by Provost Pitts. After much impassioned and far-reaching debate, CCGA members identified a set of principles that are applicable to graduate academic and professional programs. At the outset, CCGA points to a sharp distinction between information generated to create new knowledge as in academic research programs versus the application of knowledge to a singular domain or industry as in professional programs.

Among the listed programs, two of the proposed programs (M.S. programs at Irvine) are new and would thus fall under the Senate Compendium review process. Another program (M. Eng. at Berkeley) is proposed to be redesigned to such an extent that it is likely to require Compendium review. An initial screen of such changes would have to be determined by the divisional Graduate Council and then, if needed by CCGA. The same process would apply to newly redesigned programs that fall close to the threshold for Compendium review.

As to levying new fees for existing, already Senate-approved programs that are not undergoing substantive changes, CCGA deemed that in most instances, a program re-review would not be necessary. For example, a proposal for a redesigned program that is an extension of an existing academic program would require a simple review by the divisional Graduate Council, and if needed by CCGA.

On the fundamental question of how the University should define “professional,” the Committee considered definitions of a professional degree fee-charging program that would distinguish it from an academic program. While there are no common criteria that would apply to all disciplines, a broad definition could be “occupational degree programs that lead to the training of students for a specific and singular profession in a field not widely recognized in professional schools and for which these schools do not offer a corresponding doctoral degree.”

Sometime ago, the professional degree fee was established to protect the quality of programs in light of lost state support, and the graduates of professional degree fee programs were expected to have high earning potential as a result of earning the degree. While the earning potential should no longer be listed as a measure of professional degree programs, it would be more accurate to refer to a professional-degree fee as a *[fill-in-the-blank]*

*supplemental fee*. A more literal description could reflect that a supplemental fee is necessitated by the need to make up for the loss of state funding and to maintain competitiveness of UC programs, for example a “state shortfall fee”. Members felt that to characterize the professional degree fee by any other name would come across as just another unjustified fee increase. Overall, CCGA members agreed that the professional degree fee should not be named as such.

In reviewing, the circumstances under which charging a professional degree fee is appropriate, Committee members expressed that the professional degree fee designation needs to be expanded with a broader meaning that reflects the true cost of maintaining and offering quality graduate education at the University of California. It is important to note that doctoral academic degree programs are by definition research programs. Therefore, Ph.D. programs are not professional degrees and cannot charge a professional degree fee component. However, some terminal Master’s degrees could qualify as a professional degree.

CCGA cautions about blurring the line between *academic* and *professional* degree programs. The proposals submitted indeed raise new questions and push the boundaries between these two types of programs. At this juncture, CCGA recommends that professional fee proposals be approved on a case-by-case basis. The designation of a professional degree should be grounded in a policy that defines professional degree programs as noted above.

CCGA calls attention to the large-scale and long-term repercussions of adopting the professional degree fee model and advises that the potential downsides are multiple and could negatively change the character of the University in the future. **CCGA feels that the nine proposals are premature at this time and strongly recommends that they not move forward until the above stated issues are resolved**, e.g., the lack of a coherent policy for how they should be approved, an assessment of the potential downsides and a framework for how programs generate income to sustain academic excellence. The CCGA recommendation is in no way a reflection of where it stands on the individual proposals; it is simply meant to restate CCGA’s dissatisfaction with the proposed ad-hoc review process for justifying professional fee increases.

Finally, the Committee feels strongly that the current professional degree fee route is open to abuse and cautions that it could merely be a duplicitous way of charging differential fees by major. We also noted that the concept of a “one-formula-fits-all” skirts these issues and perpetuates this problem. CCGA members recognized that the above suggestions may be politically difficult to justify to the Regents, at least until UC adopts the “tuition” model.

CCGA also opined on questions raised in one of the background documents furnished by Academic Affairs. An annotated copy of our answers is attached for your reference.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide input in these critical times. Please let me know if you have any questions about the Committee’s comments.

Sincerely,



Farid Chehab, Ph.D.  
Chair, CCGA

Enclosure

Copy: Executive Director Martha Winnacker

## Enclosure 1

(CCGA comments are in BOLD)

### University of California

#### Issues to Consider: New Professional Fee Degree Charging Program Proposals, 2011-12

**1) What is a Professional Degree Fee? How do we define it? What makes a field professional?**

- High earning potential **(NO)**
- Students who have jobs “in the industry” or are “working professionals” **(NO)**
- Other institutions also charging high tuition/fees for similar programs **(NO)**
- An easily identified, non-academic career path after earning the degree **(YES)**
- An expectation that graduates will have “professional” or “executive” careers **(NO)**
- A degree other than the M.A./M.S./Ph.D. **(YES)**
- The program includes aspects of an already PDF-charging program **(YES)**
- Cost of the program **(NO)**

**2) Under what circumstances is charging a PDF appropriate?**

- To maintain the quality of the program **(YES)**
- Other institutions charge high tuition/fees for similar programs **(NO)**
- High earning potential of graduates **(NO)**
- Career expectations of graduates **(NO)**
- Students are working professionals **(YES)**

**3) What factors should determine whether a program is designated as self-supporting (SSP) versus state-supported with a Professional Degree Fee?**

- Part-time **(NO)**
- Geared toward working professionals **(YES)**
- Evening/weekend classes **(YES)**
- Curriculum includes no state-funded courses **(YES)**
- High cost **(NO)**
- No research/thesis component **(NO)**
- Funding from fees supports the department **(NO)**

**4) Should a program offering an academic degree (e.g., M.S./Ph.D.) be allowed to charge a professional fee? (NO)**

**5) Should a distinction be made between students intending to pursue academic careers versus those intending to pursue careers in industry? (NO)**



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002  
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640  
FAX: (858) 534-4528

May 20, 2010

Professor Henry Powell  
Chair, Academic Council  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

Subject: Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees

Dear Harry,

In response to your recent request, the San Diego Division sought and received comment from the appropriate Divisional committees on the Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees. The Senate Council considered the Proposals at its meeting on May 3, 2010.

Committee reviewers and Council members were opposed to the proposals for the new professional degree fees, citing a variety of reasons, both practical and principled. Senate Council members, echoing Committee comments, expressed grave concerns about the proposed new professional degree fees, especially with regard to the seeming assumption that existing Ph.D. and Master's degrees could be changed from academic to professional degrees by the decision to assess a professional degree fee. The Committee responses are eloquent, speak for themselves, and are appended in their entirety.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "W S Hodgkiss".

William S. Hodgkiss, Chair  
Academic Senate, San Diego Divisioncc: Divisional Vice Chair Frank Powell  
Executive Director Martha Winnacker

April 28, 2010

PROFESSOR WILLIAM HODGKISS  
Chair, Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees

The Graduate Council has carefully considered the proposals for new Professional Degree Fees from different graduate programs in the UC system. Many arguments were offered both in support of and against the proposed fees, reflecting the range of opinion in Graduate Council and the complexity of the issue. At the core of member concerns was the identity of the University of California as a public institution, especially in times of economic crisis. How should the University balance the notion of accessibility and affordability with the need for maintaining quality with whatever resources are available? Will these fees encourage or discourage high-quality students from entering the UC system? Will these fees be effective in maintaining the quality of the programs that have proposed the fees? In the end, most Council members were strongly opposed to the proposed professional degree fees for the following reasons:

- The University of California has long been the leading example of a world-class public University system. As such, the University of California has the responsibility to remain accessible to the public. The University's mission is to "serve society," and it seems contradictory to the University's educational mission to reduce the accessibility of the University to segments of society. While the proposals do mention some financial aid that will be available to students who are in need, some members were concerned that the financial aid system will not be adequate to offset the new fees, and that such fees will create a system heavily biased in favor of more wealthy students, while effectively excluding economically disadvantaged students from considering such programs that charge high fees. Members expressed concern that such professional degree fees, in addition to proposed and already approved high-fee degree programs, would lead to a commercialization of the University's academic programs accompanied by a shift in the values governing access to the University away from merit and toward affluence
- In addition, some members viewed fees charged by individual Schools and Divisions within the University as contrary to the University's commitment to fiscal sharing between and across disciplines. Historically, the University has distributed the income and cost across disciplines, but the proposed fees abandon this type of redistribution. Other disciplines are no less impacted by the budgetary environment, and are no less global, or important.
- With regard to UCSD's proposal, the Jacobs School of Engineering does not have official School status and, as is the case with other Divisions, does not therefore automatically have the authority to charge fees that will remain within the School itself.
- Members were unclear from the proposal about how the proposed new fees will be paid (from faculty grants, by the department, or by the student), and whether these fees will adversely affect the recruitment of Ph.D. students.

- Council notes that the professional degree fees have not only been proposed for a wide range of disciplines, but also for degree programs that have traditionally been defined as academic, and not professional. The Ph.D., M.A., and M.S. are *not* professional degrees, and the justification in the UCSD proposal does not address the differences between professional degrees and academic degrees. The educational goals of a professional degree are quite different from those of an academic degree. An academic degree trains students not only in the development of a skill set attractive to employers, but also empowers them with tools to further the field through original research. With regard to the UCSD proposal, while it is true that some graduate students in the engineering fields may have the potential to earn more than students in other disciplines and some graduate students in the engineering fields may go on to get jobs in industry, such conditions are not absolute, and should not be used as a justification for charging a professional degree fee in Ph.D. and Masters programs.
- With regard to the UCSD proposal, some members of Council were concerned that no consultation with current students in the Engineering departments has yet taken place, despite a specific request in the call for such consultation.

While most Council members were opposed to the fees based on the above reasons, there was a small minority in support of the proposed fees, based on the current economic conditions, and a dismal outlook regarding future state support for the University of California system. There is concern that, without these fees, the quality of these degree programs would decline, thus hurting the University. Council is sympathetic to and does not dismiss these arguments, but places a higher value on maintaining access to the university for meritorious yet economically disadvantaged students.



Jim Carmody  
Chair, Graduate Council

Cc: F. Powell  
Chron File

April 29, 2010

WILLIAM S. HODGKISS, Chair  
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

**SUBJECT: Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees**

The Committee on Planning & Budget (P&B) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the proposals for new professional degree fees.

The Regents approved ‘Professional Degree Fees’ (PDF) for selected graduate programs with a ‘professional’ focus in order to maintain the quality of these programs at a time of decreasing state support. Although the Regents’ policy does not explicitly require that the graduates of the program have a high earning potential, it does require that the program have sufficient financial aid so that “*needy students are able to pursue their academic and summer interests without regard to financial considerations.*” and “*Loan forgiveness programs (or some equivalent alternative program) for, among others, students interested in pursuing low-paying public service jobs such that their debt from professional school does not unduly restrict their career decision.*” It is indeed hard to argue that scarce UC resources should be devoted to subsidizing the education of those who are destined to enter very lucrative professions. However, the distinction between ‘professional’ and ‘non-professional’ is vague and undefined, and the criteria and policies for assuring that financial considerations from heavy student loans do not enter into career choice are generally absent from the proposals. The lure of additional resources at the time of severe budget cuts, together with the vague guidelines for qualification and implementation, has led to a slippery slope of proposed fee increases for those not destined for high paying professions.

A clear example of this is the proposed PDF for the Master of Fine Arts at UCLA. The proposal is justified by the expense of this education and the need for more resources. However, the careers of these students will most likely be as teachers or artists with a modest or sporadic income. If one considers the independent creative artist as being in a ‘low-paying public service job,’ then the loans they took to pay their PDF should be forgiven under the Regents’ policy. Similarly, it is difficult to understand a definition of ‘needy’ for this degree that would not require so much financial aid as to remove most of the ‘profit’ from the PDF. Students entering graduate school are all over 21, and often are older, so their parents are not expected to pay for their education. With rare exceptions, who among them will have surplus assets or income to pay the PDF? We find that, although the Regents’ order does not explicitly limit the PDF to degrees reliably leading to high-paying professions, this may be implicit in their financial aid and loan-forgiveness requirements, and they should consider amending their order to make this clear.

Similar issues are raised by PDF proposals for Engineering degrees. Here, the resolution of the issues of what constitutes a professional degree, and how to judge the influence of debt and cost on career choice, are much less clear, but much more urgent, since most of the proposals, including those from UCSD, are to increase the tuition and fees for graduate study in this discipline. In our judgment, there needs to be more consideration of the distinction between Engineering as a research activity, and as a professional activity, and the PDF should be directed toward the later. Often the proposals do not recognize that the Engineering degree can lead to a career either as a professional engineer, or as an academic researcher, and these career paths have different earning potentials. We do not want to change the atmosphere or focus of our Engineering Schools away from research to exclusively professional training. The goal should be

to enhance research training by removing the subsidy that it may currently provide to professional training.

Some applications, for example that from Berkeley, propose a professional engineering degree program (M. Eng.) with a high PDF (\$30k) and in addition propose adding a lower PDF to their M.S. and Ph.D. degree programs (\$6k). Although the UCSD School of Engineering is currently preparing a professional degree program (the Master of Advanced Studies, submitted recently to the Academic Senate in another context), it is not mentioned in their proposal for a PDF. Rather, UCSD proposes a PDF of \$6k to be phased in for all students in their M.S. and Ph.D. degree programs. Although in discussions with Engineering faculty it appears that the intent is to effectively shield research track students from the PDF, this has not been made clear in the application. There also seems to have been minimal consultation with the faculty at JSOE, and this must be corrected if their proposal is to move forward.

This difficulty ultimately arises from the fact that the two career paths in Engineering (professional vs research) do not necessarily correspond to different degrees (as is the case, for example, in the health sciences). It is essential that if Engineering wishes to adopt a PDF, that it either creates two degree programs or differentiates its existing programs to more cleanly correspond with these career tracks. One possibility would be to offer the Masters as a terminal professional degree (with PDF), and the Doctorate as a terminal research degree (without PDF). Another possibility to consider would be to automatically grant PDF waivers to all students during the time that they are exclusively engaged in research.

In proposing degree programs that are explicitly ‘professional,’ the Engineering schools are implying that their M.S./Ph.D. programs are not professional, and this begs the question as to their justification for applying a PDF for the latter. If the claim is that the Ph.D. in Engineering is often used as a professional degree then we should examine where that slippery slope leads. Like Ph.D.’s in Engineering, Ph.D.’s in Neuroscience sometimes end up working in industry on applied projects; does this mean that we should also consider a PDF for that degree? In summary, we feel that the proposals need to consider the distinction between professional and research more seriously, and the Regents need to promulgate a clearer definition of what makes a degree ‘professional.’

Our analysis assumes that the ‘low-paying public service jobs’ protected by the Regents’ policy includes postdoctoral researchers and independent fine artists. We assume that the Regents support subsidizing education leading to such jobs as part of UC’s primary mission, and that this subsidy is an important reason that UC receives support from the General fund. This assumption is certainly open to discussion, but such a discussion goes to the core of the meaning of what it means to be a Public University. Pending a new consensus on these issues, the Regents should also consider revising their PDF policy to exclude programs that usually lead to ‘low-paying public service jobs’ from consideration.

Sincerely,

Jean-Bernard Minster, Chair  
Committee on Planning & Budget

cc: F. Powell  
D. Hamann

April 27, 2010

PROFESSOR WILLIAM HODGKISS, Chair  
Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees

- The proposal from the San Diego Campus
- The principle of charging professional fees for targeted Ph.D. Programs

At its April 2, 2010 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) considered the proposals for new professional degree fees. CEP forwards the following comments:

- The Committee found the justifications for many of the proposals, including the UCSD proposal, sorely lacking any intellectual justification. The justification that students cannot get a job in a professional career without an advanced degree and that graduation from a professional Ph.D. degree program (whatever that means) dramatically improves professional career options can only be viewed as nonsensical.
- The proposals solicited by OP have unprecedented and broad sweeping ramifications for the future of UC, yet the individual divisions are left to wrestle with unresolved issues and repercussions. The Committee could not conceive how Ph.D. degrees can be considered professional degrees. How can these degrees be intellectually justified? What defines a professional degree from an academic degree? Will the sole differentiation between a regular and professional Ph.D. degree be the dollar amount assessed? Will faculty be required to absorb admitted professional Ph.D. students and the professional fee on their grants? Members were not sure this is an educational correct response to the current fiscal crisis and wondered what this could do to our educational mission and the integrity of a UC Ph.D.
- A majority of members view these proposals solely as one of many last ditch efforts to raise monies and save some individual campus divisions without any clear evidence that the monies generated by these programs will go to the individual departments offering the degrees.
- None of this should be viewed as lack of support from CEP for departments and schools to raise money in the current crisis.



Stefan Llewellyn Smith, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: F. Powell  
ChronFile

April 23, 2010

WILLIAM S. HODGKISS, Chair  
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

**SUBJECT: Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees**

For the Proposals for New Professional Degree Fees, CDE requests that the Proposals from the San Diego campus address the following three issues regarding affordability, diversity, and quality of research and education.

1. Plans of financial aid: We need multi-year plans to set a defined portion of the fees revenue for financial aid. A failure to direct a substantial amount of the funds raised by the professional degree fees to financial aid for the affected students would be to ignore under-represented students' needs (Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Fees for Selected Professional School Students item (6)).
2. Plan of access and inclusion: Access and inclusion are among the University's core commitments. We need a plan of access and inclusion and policies to ensure or enhance access and inclusion (Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Fees for Selected Professional School Students item (7)).
3. The impact of Ph.D. student enrollment: Rising fees create pressure on faculty research grants that provide tuition and fee remission to Ph.D. students as research assistants. With a given amount of research funds, the increases of fees would reduce the number of supported Ph.D. students. Since most departments in the School of Engineering admit students only with full support, the Ph.D. student enrollment may drop by the fee increases. Moreover, in some cases, the reduction of supported students would cause a negative impact on the ability of faculty to attract external research funding.

Sincerely,

C.K. Cheng, Chair  
Committee on Diversity and Equity

cc: F. Powell  
D. Hamann