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SUMMARY:

From September 1, 2009 to August 31, 2010, the Planning & Budget Committee (P&B) met a total of 19 times. The average meeting length was 2 hours and meetings involved one of the following two types of activities. The Committee discussed and analyzed reports, proposed programs, or other items of official business that required a written report or opinion by P&B; these are listed in Appendix A. The Committee also interviewed UCR Administrators on specific topics of interest to P&B during the year; see list of interviews below.

MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS:

Planning and Budget met with the following administrators during the course of the year:
December 2009 and May 2010 - VC Gretchen Bolar
February 2010 - VC Peter Hayashida
October 2009 - EVCP Dallas Rabenstein
May 2010 - Dean Richard Olds
May 2010 - Chair Tony Norman
May 2010 - Prof. Dan Hare, Chair, Faculty Welfare

Planning and Budget members spent a significant amount of time discussing documents that came from systemwide with regards to Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition, two rounds of recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future, UC Systemwide Planning and Budget Committee’s Choices Report as well as three drafts of the UCR Strategic Plan. The outcome of the bulk of their discussions for 2009-10 is contained in the following recommendations that were made to the Chair of the Division.
UCR Academic Senate Planning and Budget Committee
Recommendations to
Chancellor White and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Rabenstein

1. The Regents should fulfill their fiduciary responsibility to the University of California by either securing adequate resources from the State for UC to fulfill the Master Plan or by raising student fees and accepting the fact that UC will not educate students not funded by the State. Further, the Regents should negotiate multi-year State funding commitments. An enterprise as large and as intricate as the University of California cannot be run efficiently or effectively with budgets that are negotiated annually and frequently finalized after the start of the fiscal or academic year.

2. The Regents should move rapidly to restore the fiscal base for the University by approving a schedule of fee increases for undergraduate students of 15% in 2011-2012, 10% in 2012-2013, 5% in 2013-2014 and 5% in 2014-2015, with the decreases proposed for the later years contingent on State support to UC not falling below the 2007-2008 level adjusted for inflation. This would raise student fees from $10,302 in 2010-2011 to $14,368 in 2014-2015. By this fee schedule there would be a greater near-term infusion of revenue to UC than there would be with a 10% annual fee increase over five years as proposed by the UC Commission on the Future Funding Strategies Working Group, which results in fees of $16,591 by 2014-2015. With substantial increases in fees, we propose that non-resident tuition not be increased or only marginally increased. In subsequent years, the Regents should establish student fees at a level that provides the University with at least a constant, inflation adjusted, per student budget when student fees are combined with State support.

3. We endorse the UC Commission on the Future Funding Strategies Working Group recommendation for the development of a strong multi-year advocacy campaign and we believe the most immediate goal of the campaign should be to get a UC funding initiative on the ballot. Given a simple choice, people will pay for what they want, and we believe that they want a strong UC. We agree with the working group that the advocacy campaign should include UC’s 184,700 faculty, staff and students and its alumni, aimed at grass roots opinion leaders throughout the State of California to foster public and political support for the University as a major priority for state funding.

4. UCOP should rebalance per student funding to an equal dollar amount for instruction per student across all campuses. Historic differences in per student funding have for decades advantaged the older campuses. Conversely, campuses that are more successful than others at enrolling a more diverse student body are receiving less per student, which is not good for UC’s public reputation. Additional funding for such campuses should be prescribed since many of UC's ethnically diverse students come from our State’s most impoverished and underperforming school systems and thus,
require additional preparatory programs and support services to succeed at UC. Rebalancing per student funding is imperative immediately if the older campuses will be allowed to keep the entire amount of NRT they generate.

5. Increase the number of non-resident students and reduce the number of unfunded students. A portion of all NRT revenue should be distributed across campuses for the educational benefit of all UC students. We endorse the recommendation of the UC Commission on the Future Funding Strategies Working Group to double the 7,600 2007-2008 non-residents paying $22,879 in non-resident tuition to 15,200 by 2015-2016 and reduce the number of unfunded students to zero, resulting in a minimum net gain of $22,879 per non-resident student.

6. Increase the ICR rate to more closely recover the actual cost of doing research, develop a standardized mechanism for including direct costs in proposals to agencies that do not pay full ICR, and do not reject grants from funding agencies whose policy is to not pay any or full ICR, as such an action would disproportionately affect the humanities faculty, faculty who conduct applied, commodity board, or State funded research, and junior faculty in the medical sciences. Further, these grants are significant sources of support for graduate and undergraduate student researchers.

7. Total remuneration for faculty needs to be increased; it presently lags that of the comparison eight by 11.2%. UC needs to issue pension obligation bonds or find another source to cover the UCRP unfunded liability and stop trying to make UCRP solvent by cutting post-employment benefits to existing and new faculty and stop trying get the faculty to raise funds for their salaries and UCRP from grants and outside professional activities. Nothing will destroy the quality of UC faster than an inability to retain and recruit the best faculty. Negotiated annual salary increases based on the “availability of other funds” will create inequities within and among departments and de facto “tiering” among campuses.

8. Increased graduate student support is essential to the success and reputation of UC. Graduate students are critical to both the instruction and research missions of the University. Competitive support packages for recruiting and retaining top quality graduate students must be a high priority. Using greater portions of grants to support faculty salaries and benefits is contrary to this goal.

9. This is not the time to switch to semesters – the costs, which ramify through almost everything campuses do, including academic advising, are prohibitive in terms of dollars and faculty time, at a time that we have little of the former and want the latter used for securing grant dollars. The increased time spent teaching in a semester system will cut dramatically into the time faculty will have to spend on research, writing grants and outreach.
10. We do not support online education in the context of creating a virtual 10th campus, as a means of offering introductory courses to a large number of first or second year UC students or for the purpose enabling community college students to fulfill a UC core course requirement in order transfer to UC. We support the use of online instruction as part of more traditional forms of teaching and in particular circumstances, such as small, specialized graduate courses or self-supporting professional degree programs.
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Evidence of a trend in the Round 2 Recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future that advantages UCB and UCLA and disadvantages the other campuses, including UCR

1) New plans for financial aid to undergraduate students in the Round 2 recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future are written vaguely and leave UCR P&B concerned that the responsibility for providing support for students with financial need, many of whom will be first-generation college attendees and members of under-represented minority groups, will be off-loaded by UCOP onto individual campuses. This would mean that the campus that is providing the greatest access by enrolling the largest number of these students would be penalized by having to bear the greatest financial burden for doing so. This would be a devastating disadvantage to UCR.

2) In the Round 2 recommendations from COTF, the near-term goal is to institute the policy that NRT revenue remains on the campus generating it and the long-term goal is to rebalance (rebench) the dollars allocated per student to a uniform value across all campuses. This time line advantages UCB and UCLA and disadvantages other campuses (UCR) to a greater degree than they are already disadvantaged by the disparity in per student funding.

3) The proposal that UC increase the number of nonresident students in the place of unfunded students is a good idea; that NRT revenue remain on the campus generating it advantages UCB and UCLA and disadvantages the other campuses, especially UCR and Merced, the growth campuses, which are unlikely to attract many non-residents and additionally will have increased pressure to take more in-state students and unfunded students. Remedy: UCR P&B and systemwide P&B want at least some proportion of NRT generated on all campuses shared among all campuses for the good of all students.

4) There is a recommendation to allocate dollars based on the number of Ph.D. students. This advantages UCB and UCLA and disadvantages all other campuses, including UCR.
5) There is also a down side to many campuses, especially UCR, with off-loading of faculty salaries (all salaries) to the individual campuses as proposed. One would think that UCB and UCLA would be taxed at a higher rate than other campuses to support UCOP, but the details were not provided in the Round 2 recommendations, so whether UCR’s share will be fair or not remains to be seen.

6) Other recommendations that will disadvantage UCR with regard to retention and recruiting include the continued attempt to create a new salary plan for faculty (excluding professional schools and professional graduate degree programs). In this proposal, general faculty salaries will be negotiated annually based on available funds. Development funds are used as an example. UCR doesn’t have sufficient “other available funds”. Shifting faculty salaries to grants will cut into support for graduate students and research, which is contrary to our need to increase graduate student support and enrollment. Course "buy out" is insidious. Incentive plans that increase faculty salary as a reward for moving salary from state funds to “other funds” jeopardize UC’s merit based remuneration system. The result will be inequality in faculty salaries within and among departments and de facto “tiering” among campuses. It is also proposed that general campus faculty should not be allowed to retain income from outside professional activities (OPA) since medical school faculty don’t get to keep theirs.

7) The switch from quarters to semesters will advantage UCB (and UC Merced) and disadvantage other campuses, including UCR, which must bear the up-front costs of faculty and staff time as well as the financial costs. The time and resources consumed by the switch is counter-productive to grant writing, research, teaching and outreach. Semester-long courses reduce the time left for research and grant writing. Making the switch at this time will be demoralizing to faculty and staff. It is disappointing that no analysis of the cost vs. benefit of switching from quarters to semesters has ever been provided to support this recommendation.
APPENDIX A

Universitywide Issues

CCGA Request for UCOP Report on Differential Fee Program ...................... 10/9
Review of the final report of the joint Senate-Administration Task Force on the Education Abroad Program ........................................................................ 11/20
UCPB Position on Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition. 01/27, 02/17, 2/24
Proposed revisions to Policy on Fees for Selected Professional School Students. 2/10, 2/17
Approval of Principles Underlying the Determination of Fees for Students of Professional Degree Programs ................................................................. 02/10
TFIR Recommendation to Assure Adequate Funding for UCRP ................. 03/17
Commission on the Future Recommendations. 03/29, 04/08, 04/15, 04/22, 4/29
Choices Report ............................................................................................. 06/03, 7/12

Campus Issues

Faculty furloughs and the budget ................................................................. 10/2
Review of questions for EVCP D. Rabenstein ........................................... 10/9
Met with EVCP Dallas Rabenstein to discuss the strategic plan process... 10/16
Discuss process on the upcoming visit by UC Commission of the future Workgroup members that was scheduled for 11/3 ..................... 10/30
Draft final UCR P&B comments to the UC Commission on the Future..10/30, 11/1
Review of questions for VC Gretchen Bolar ................................................ 10/30
Proposed Changes in procedures for election of the UCR Division Senate Leadership ................................................................. 01/13
Reviewed the Strategic Planning Subcommittee Report on Resources, Budget and Infra-structure (RBP) ......................................................... 01/13
Finalized response to proposed changes in procedures for election........ 01/27
Review of questions for VC Peter Hayashida .......................................... 01/27
Met with VC Peter Hayashida to discuss funding goals for the campus....02/03
The UCR Strategic Planning Report – Draft 1 .......................... 03/17, 3/29
Review of questions for Dean Richard Olds ................................. 04/08
Met with Dean Olds to discuss the UCR School of Medicine plans ....... 05/06
The UCR Strategic Planning Report – Draft 2 .............................. 5/27
The UCR Strategic Planning Report – Draft 3 ................................... 6/28
Review request to transfer 50% of Prof. Christine Gailey's FTE from Women's Studies to the Department of Anthropology .............................. 7/21
**Academic Programs**

Proposal to Establish a Self-Supporting College-Wide Online Master of Engineering Degree Program in BCOE………………………………………10/2, 10/9 / 10/16

**Budget**

Budget Shortfall...................................................................................................................12/04
UCRP funding.......................................................................................................................05/20

**Department/ORU Issues**

Proposal to Split the Department of Finance.................................................................11/20

**Endowed Chairs**

Tokuji and Bettie L. Furuta Endowed Chair for CNAS.................................................11/20
Muir S. Mulla Endowed Term Chair in Entomology..............................................11/20

**Guests**

VC Gretchen Bolar.........................................................................................................12/09, 5/06
VC Peter Hayashida ....................................................................................................2/2010
EVCP Dallas Rabenstein ..............................................................................................10/16
Dean Richard Olds ......................................................................................................5/06
Chair Tony Norman......................................................................................................5/06
Prof. Dan Hare, Chair, Faculty Welfare .................................................................5/06