

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Minutes of Meeting

February 7, 2017

I. Chair's Announcements

Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Chair

Update: Chair Sadoulet updated the committee on several items of interest. 1) The Senate leadership is at the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) today, meeting with the heads of the CSU and CCC faculty. 2) The long-term vision planning exercise is in flux. The Academic Council is drafting a letter to convey methods of improving the process. Senate participation at the campus level is still lacking, and the time-line is changing. Concerns about standardized metrics, duplication of current efforts, and involving 2040 stakeholders remain. 3) The Academic Planning Council is continuing its discussions on international activities, enrollment principles, and faculty diversity best practices. 4) The budget impacts of the new presidential administration are still unknown, as are the impacts to various student groups. The UC administration has stated their intention to assist vulnerable members of the UC community. 5) The administration continues to develop a non-resident policy for the Regents and in accordance with state legislative dictates. The Academic Senate opposes an arbitrary cap, but many think UC must show "harm".

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Response to Presidential Policy Business and Financial Bulletin G-28 Travel Regulations
2. DRAFT Response to Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D

Action: The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Provost

*Aimee Dorr, Provost*1. Non-Resident Policy

Issue: Provost Dorr reminded the committee that the issue of non-resident enrollment is a politically volatile topic to many. Current thinking indicates that any cap over 20% will be "DOA" in Sacramento and could incur budget retaliation. Many worry that sunset clauses could be received similarly.

Discussion: Members asked if domestic and international non-residents were being viewed differently by lawmakers, but Provost Dorr indicated no. Members also noted that campus climates and enrollment ratios vary widely at present, and that pedagogy supports exposure to peers with different backgrounds and points of view.

2. Framework for UC's Growth and Support

Issue: Provost Dorr noted that CFO Brostrom is co-leader of the project. The project is intended to help planners better tie growth plans to the necessary resources to make

planned growth viable. This is a visioning exercise, not an LRDP. Revised project parameters are being developed in response to received feedback. The timeline calls for submission of the first draft by each campus by March 31, followed by a systemwide meeting in April. Final drafts will be due to UCOP at the end of August, and should include capital projections. The final report will be systemwide only. Each campus is being asked to develop different scenarios; one scenario must show maximum enrollment under ideal resource conditions and include a narrative as well as data points, such as: total number of students, including those in self-supporting programs; the percent of students who will be graduate students; total instructional FTE; percent ladder-rank faculty; percent clinical adjuncts; percent lecturers; and total number of staff, excluding UC Health.

Note: CFO Brostrom joined the discussion at this point.

Discussion: Members voiced concerns that this project is not grounded, and Provost Dorr indicated that the April meeting is intended to ensure that all participants are operating under the same assumptions. Members also voiced concerns that public messaging around this project will be difficult, as indeed, internal messaging has proven difficult already. CFO Brostrom noted that the public is calling for a positive vision from UC. Members suggested that the Master Plan might be revised, given that it is nearly 80 years old now. The framework is targeting 2040, but no one currently involved in the project is likely to be at UC in 2040. Members also noted that UC has a history of absorbing crises, which defy planning. They added that the current political crisis is one of admission to preferred campuses; it is unclear how this project will help address those concerns, especially in the short-term.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Finance

Nathan Brostrom, CFO

David Alcocer, Director, Operating Budget

1. Non-Resident Policy

Issue: CFO Brostrom agrees with the Senate that a non-resident cap will not increase California undergraduate enrollment, and such a cap may in fact curtail California undergraduate enrollment. Persuading Sacramento lawmakers of that fact has proven difficult. The policy is scheduled for action at the March Regents meeting, even though many in the legislature want more severe action.

Discussion: Members wondered UC has been unable to educate lawmakers as to the value of non-resident students, but fiscally and pedagogically. Director Alcocer noted that last year's audit harmed the dialogue and the narrative surrounding academic data. Members stressed concerns about codifying campus differentials in student support, and the need to develop alternative revenue vis-à-vis state cuts with all due haste.

2. Rebenching

Issue: Director Alcocer reviewed the weights assigned to each type of student. For graduate students, the figures are budgeted, not actual, since there has been no increase in relevant state funding. Actual numbers are available on a time-lag basis.

Discussion: Members asked if summer sessions were being treated differently, but there is no residency distinction for summer students.

3. Funding Streams

Issue: CFO Brostrom reviewed the current campus assessment rate, and noted that the spike this year reflects an increase in cyber-security measures. UC Path will also increase the assessment, but in a more modest manner.

4. Middle Class Scholarship

Issue: CFO Brostrom reported that there are no changes for 17-18, but for 18-19 onward significant cuts have been proposed by the governor. The outcome is uncertain at this point, since many expect legislative push-back. In part, the cuts are based on lower state revenue projections.

5. Trump Administration Impacts

Issue: CFO Brostrom noted that international student enrollment has declined everywhere, not just at UC. The proposed federal budgets include significant cuts to NIH and NSF, as well as possible cuts to the Pell grant program. Potential regulatory roll-backs could have wide-ranging impacts, but not many specifics are known at this time. Cuts to Medicaid and Medicare could have domino impacts on UC operations.

Discussion: Members asked if applicants from potentially “banned” countries could receive refunds on their application fees, and CFO Brostrom indicated that it would be a campus decision. Members wondered if J1 visas would be targeted, or if parallel labs would become necessary.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Academic Affairs

Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning

Issue: Director Greenspan summarized the draft enrollment allocations. Transfer rates are in flux this year, though, and summer session accounting changes are still being discussed.

Discussion: Members asked if summer salary increases for faculty were possible or if extension limitations could be addressed. Director Greenspan referred such questions to Academic Personnel. Members asked if attrition rates varied between resident and non-resident students, and between native freshman and transfers. Director Greenspan indicated that systemwide planning assumes the same rate for all populations, but noted that campuses will have disaggregated data. Members asked if time to degree and capacity issues could be addressed by increased use of graduate student instructors or increased use of credit by exam (CBE). Director Greenspan noted the historical difficulty of securing funds for graduate students, but added that many external audiences like CBE, but internally there are pedagogical concerns.

VI. Review Items

1. SSP: UCSD Drug Development and Product Management

Tim Lane, UCLA Representative and Lead Reviewer

Issue: Overall, the proposal is well-written and was responsive to concerns raised by local reviewers. They propose to launch an online program by 2021 in order to better access the international market. They propose to use existing campus computing resources, but this raises capacity and security concerns. Both budget and space were addressed, and the expected return to aid is 10%. Faculty are projected to teach on overload and be reimbursed in accordance to a rate included in the budget.

Discussion: Members wondered if reliance on overload teaching would have negative impacts on state-sponsored programs in the long-run. Members wondered about **course development and precedents for online SSPs.**

Action: Representative Lane and Analyst Feer will revise the report prior to transmittal to CCGA.

2. Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy

Action: The committee elected not to opine on this item.

VII. Executive Session

Note: Other than action items, no notes are taken during executive session.

1. ANR Task Force

Action: Analyst Feer will circulate a revised draft charge for the task force.

Action: Members will submit nominations for members on the task force.

2. Follow-up Business

Action: Chair Sadoulet will convey the committee's concerns regarding a non-resident cap to the Academic Council.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Chair

Attendance:

Bernard Sadoulet, Chair

Josh Schimel, Vice Chair

Raveevarn Choksombatchai, UCB

Bob Powell, UCD

Jim Steintrager, UCI

Tim Lane, UCLA

Mukesh Singhal, UCM

Christian Shelton, UCR

Ann Jensen Adams, UCSB

Abel Rodriguez, UCSC

Andrew Kahng, UCSD

Aaron Dolor, Graduate Student Representative