Communication from the Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees
Lisa Kroon, PharmD, Chair

November 20, 2006

Deborah Greenspan, DSc, BDS
Chair, UCSF Academic Senate
Office of the Academic Senate, Box 0764

RE: Recommendations for Divisional Response to the Systemwide Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

Dear Chair Greenspan,

The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees, consisting of one Member of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (Chair) and representatives selected by the Faculty Councils of each of the four schools, met on November 20, 2006 to review these Proposed Guiding Principles and to suggest a possible response from the San Francisco Division. Norman Oppenheimer served on this Task Force on behalf of the School of Pharmacy, who is also reviewing and commenting on these Guiding Principles in his role as the UCSF representative to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). The Task Force makes the following recommendations for a response from the San Francisco Division.

The first sentence of the second bullet point is currently worded to address revenue from student fee increases, but not the current fees themselves. The Task Force recommends that this sentence be modified to read as follows: “Revenue from future professional school fees and fee increases approved by the Regents should be used...”

Overall, the Task Force’s primary concern with these Guiding Principles is the issue of distribution. The Task Force believes that funds from student fees should not be distributed to the Chancellor, but directly and proportionately back to the Schools. The Task Force recommends that the first sentence of the second bullet point be further modified to read: “Revenue from future professional school fees and fee increases approved by the Regents should be used by the Schools to maintain and enhance...” In more practical terms, the Task Force recommends that funds not be returned to the Chancellors, but to the Deans.

The second overall concern the Task Force has with these Guiding Principles is the issue of transparency. The campuses, administration, faculty, and students should have an idea how these fees are being used by the University of California. Included in these Guiding Principles should be the manner in which the funds from student fees are applied—proportions used for student aid and proportions used for faculty support.

In bullet point five, the Task Force finds the reference to “salary and non-salary price increases” to be too vague and recommends clarification for these price increases. The Task Force considers this to be another
issue of transparency. Furthermore, the Task Force recommends that the reference to “Chancellors” here be changed to “the Schools” (“the Schools may request approval of a supplemental increase in the fee for a particular program...”).

In Guiding Principle bullet point three, describing the factors to be taken into account when setting professional school fees, the Task Force is again concerned with distribution of fees collected. The Task Force recommends that this bullet point include a more concrete expression of commitment to recruiting quality junior faculty and providing competitive support. Specifically to UCSF, recruitment of junior faculty is severely disadvantaged by the cost of living factor and the inability of UCSF to provide sufficient housing support for new faculty and their families. The professional school fee structure should take into account not only factors of enrollment and faculty compensation, but also competitive student-to-faculty ratios. Currently at UCSF, the student-to-faculty ratio is not comparable among the four Health Sciences professional schools (e.g., the School of Pharmacy is 11:1 and the School of Medicine is 3.5:1); this disparity further limits schools to sustain academic quality when increasing student enrollment and should be addressed.

Regarding the comparable nature of UC professional school fees for California residents to the in-state rates charged by peer institutions described in bullet point four, the Task Force raised concerns regarding the amount of fees returning to the students (who are applying to these schools) in the form of financial aid. Even if UC fees were set at a lower level, it would remain difficult to recruit top students who are offered a “free ride” at our competitive institutions. In the health sciences, the current fee structure has resulted in a situation in which it is less expensive for a laboratory to hire post doctoral students than to hire graduate students. Furthermore, UC fees may, at first glance of the data, appear competitive, however this does not take into account the disproportionately high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Task Force offers these final observations and general philosophy regarding Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees:

- The Task Force believes that continued increases in student fees can negatively affect diversity and enrollment levels of underrepresented populations of California scholars.
- The Task Force has concerns regarding the use of fees paid by some students to subsidize the tuition of others. While the Task Force maintains that the subsidizing of disadvantaged and underrepresented students is important and essential, it should not be the burden of other students, but such support should come from other sources, such as the State.
- As a general philosophy, the Task Force believes that public education by the University of California for its citizens is a necessary infrastructure of the State and that faculty salaries should not necessarily be derived from student fees.

The Task Force hopes you find this review and these recommendations helpful in forming a response from the San Francisco Division to the Academic Council.

Sincerely,

The Task Force Reviewing and Recommending Divisional Response to the Proposed Guiding Principles for Professional School Fees

Lisa Kroon, PharmD, Chair of the Task Force, Member of Academic Planning and Budget
Sheila Brear, DDS, School of Dentistry
Phil Rosenthal, MD, School of Medicine
Marguerite Engler, PhD, RN, FAHA, School of Nursing
Norman Oppenheimer, PhD, School of Pharmacy