

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Minutes of Meeting

January 10, 2017

I. Chairs Announcements

*Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Chair**Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair***Update:** Chair Sadoulet Vice Chair White updated the committee on several items of interest:

- The Academic Council has sent memos to the president regarding the proposed tuition increase and the required non-resident policy. Many are unhappy with the current version of the non-resident policy and further drafting is expected. Cap-and-trade is unacceptable in Sacramento, and the “compare favorably” standard is being scrutinized. Another obstacle is the profile of some UC campuses relative to their sister campuses, especially in Sacramento.
- A concern has arisen at UCLA that a data tracking project for applications may have been used during admission considerations.
- The Regents are beginning an investigation into graduate careers and PhDs after receiving their degrees.
- A new long-term planning exercise is still being developed.
Action: UCPB will draft a memo urging greater Senate involvement and the use of consistent metrics in the long-term planning effort.
- Members should send suggestions for the ANR task force roster.

II. Consent Calendar

1. SSP- UCI Conservation Restoration
2. SSP UCFS Dr of Nursing Practice

Action: The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

III. Review Items

1. SSPs
 - a. UCLA MS Business Analytics
Mukesh Singhal, UCM and Lead Reviewer
Issue: This is a rapidly growing field; 4 UC campuses have such programs already. The cost analysis did not include a space line-item. The tuition growth projections are not accompanied by a justification, but are comparable to market expectations. Return to aid is stipulated at 5%, including scholarships for recruitment which some may find objectionable. Faculty time compensation should be more explicit.
Discussion: Members asked about pedagogy and whether the proposal has improved since its first submission. Many questions have been answered.
Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo of support for transmittal to CCGA.
 - b. UCSD Drug Development and Product Management
Action: Tim Lane, UCLA Representative, will serve as lead reviewer.
2. Proposed Revised Policy on Professional Degree Supplement Tuition
Discussion: It was noted that the student involved in the drafting committee was not enrolled in a PDST program. Members were concerned about the lack of a long-term, overall cap in

increases. The requirement for a justification allays several concerns about academic quality being sidelined and improves accountability.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a note of support.

3. Proposed Revised Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015

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

4. Proposed Revised APM Sections 278 and 210-6

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

5. President Policy Business and Financial Bulletin G-28 Travel Regulations

Discussion: Members supported the goal of the changes to include spouse or child travel as needed.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo of endorsement.

6. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D

Discussion: Members agreed that the residency requirement was reasonable and would have minimal impact on tuition concerns.

Action: Analyst Feer will draft a memo of endorsement.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Note: See Item I above.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President

David Alcocer, Director, Operating Budget

Nina Robinson, Associate President and Chief Policy Advisor

1. Non-Resident Policy

Issue: The specifics of the policy continue to be in flux. Chancellors and Regents have held discussions, and various proposals are being circulated. The prevailing thinking at present favors a systemwide 20% cap while allowing those currently over that amount to keep their ratio. Since some campuses will not reach 20% for several years, this option is thought to be a reasonable compromise. It is likely that action will be postponed to the March meeting to allow robust discussion.

Discussion: Members asked if there was an “escape clause” being built into the policy, and Director Alcocer said it seemed likely. Members asked why a higher number, such as 22 or 23%, was not being considered, and AP Robinson suggested that politics and optics, rather than finances, are the driving considerations for some decision-makers. Some members pressed again for a cap-and-trade style policy, but it was noted that such a policy would not answer the public questions about California students not getting into their first choice of campuses. Members cautioned against leaving money on the table and referenced the well-publicized structural deficits in the system. Members also lamented the de facto tiering of the campuses this policy would represent, especially after rebenching was designed to level the playing field by fixing historical discrepancies like this policy would create. AP Robinson noted that the policy could be time-limited.

2. State Budget

Issue: Director Alcocer noted that UC has been defending the proposed tuition increase publicly, and has met with success so far. The students will ask for a state buy-out, and UCOP will work to help craft the message. UCOP is not anticipating a buy-out, however. The governor’s budget, released this morning, includes the promised 4% base budget growth and the final one-time payment for UCRP from the new tier deal. Proposition 56 funds were to have provided \$40M for graduate education at UC, but the governor has swapped those funds for part of the 4% base growth, leaving a hole in graduate medical education. UCOP will ask the

legislature to restore the full 4% base growth along side the Prop 56 funds, especially as there were no new funds for graduate student growth. There were no funds for deferred maintenance, which has been attributed to lower-than-expected state revenue projections.

Discussion: Members asked if UCRP borrowing for STIP was planned this year, and Director Alcocer said it was an option but that no decision has been made due to competing priorities.

Members also asked about the new payroll services fee, and Director Alcocer said it was for UCP Path start-up costs; the project should be self-supporting in the long-run.

VI. New Business

None.

Meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Chair

Attendance:

Bernard Sadoulet, Chair (UCB)
Josh Schimel, Vice Chair (UCSB)
Raveevarn Choksombatchai, UCB
Bob Powell, UCD
Jim Steintrager, UCI
Tim Lane, UCLA
Mukesh Singhal, UCM
Christian Shelton, UCR
Russ Pieper, UCSF
Ann Jensen Adams, UCSB
Abel Rodriguez, UCSC
Andrew Kahng, UCSD
Aaron Dolor, Graduate Student Representative