June 5, 2014

To: Chancellor Kim Wilcox

Fr: Kenneth Barish Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Kimberly Hammond, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
J. Daniel Hare, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
Barry Mishra, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
David Pion-Berlin, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
Roger Ransom, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
Michael Vanderwood, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget

Re: Committee on Planning & Budget Summary of Recommendations

The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d), which authorizes the Academic Senate to appoint committees to advise a Chancellor concerning budgets. The advice of the 2013-14 CPB is summarized in this document.

The campus has been in the process of wholesale leadership changes, with a new Chancellor, the search for a new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, appointment of a new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the search for a new Dean for the School of Graduate Education, and the naming of a permanent Dean for the School of Business Administration. At the same time, the campus is emerging from years of cuts due to the financial crisis with the prospect for growth and reinvestment. While additional funds are limited and tempered by mandated cost increases, growth is in sight and the campus has some reserve funds due to conservative budgeting during the financial crisis. This year the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) met with all academic and major non-academic units. The focus was on assessing the current state of the campus and the reality of achieving the aspirational goals laid out in UCR 2020. In short, we are excited by the prospects of growing the faculty and reinvesting in the quality of the University, but are concerned that there is no realistic and comprehensive plan to achieve the aspiration goals and that blind growth in an attempt to meet our aspirations may be risky. Quantity and quality of space, support for graduate students, and transparent budgeting top our areas of concern.

The reports of the discussion with each unit are attached.
The following summary of our recommendations is based on common themes that emerged from the above discussions. We recommend that:

- **New Faculty and Initial Complements**
  Increasing the percentage of filled faculty positions, which is low compared to other UC schools, should be a top priority. CPB supports growth aligned with the ultimate achievement of having a profile consistent with a premier research institution, e.g. AAU institution. However, the growth should be balanced and realistic. The feasibility and time scale to achieve the goals of the strategic plan need to be reexamined annually based on budget limitations. Critical needs, including resources needed to maximize the productivity of current faculty, must not be neglected. We are concerned that the growth numbers that have been mentioned, 250 or 300 new faculty by 2020, are unrealistic. We recommend a full study of the resources, space, and initial complement requirements take place prior to setting a growth target. Further, we think that a sustainable initial complement policy must be developed and budgeted.

- **Graduate Student Support**
  The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR 2020 and is intrinsically tied to the success of current and new faculty. An integrative planning process should take place, and it should include a thoughtful and realistic discussion on the size and shape of the graduate student population. Increases in the graduate student population are deeply related to new faculty, space, central fellowship money, TA positions, and extramural grants. A study of the job prospects for graduate students, both inside and outside of academia, must also be performed. Producing a large number of graduates with grim job prospects would have a large negative effect on the reputation of the campus. Additionally, a market study of professional masters programs should be conducted if supplemental fees and tuition from students in those programs is assumed. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular:
  
  a) Additional funds should be allocated to pay the in-state tuition of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards.
  
  b) The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will diminish as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded in-state students.
  
  c) Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and
shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.

Additionally, changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that non-resident tuition (NRT) remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, the non-resident fees should not be an inhibiting factor in recruiting the best students for a particular graduate program. We recommend that programs and grants be rebated for any NRT fees and for the Graduate Division to work with individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

➤ Extramural Grant Targets
A careful, integrative planning process should be undertaken to determine realistic targets for increasing extramural grant income from Federal agencies under current and foreseeable Federal budgetary constraints. Anecdotal evidence from a recent NSF panel member suggests, for example, that, whereas available funds for that NSF Division are essentially unchanged since 2002, the number of proposals has increased 2.5 times. Flat funding coupled with increases in the number of grant applications has several implications for UCR’s ability to achieve its goals for increased Federal funding under UCR 2020. Thus, the committee recommends careful consideration be given to the following questions under the current, austere, opportunities for Federal funding:

a) What funding rates should be anticipated for faculty in different disciplines?
b) What size of grants should be anticipated for faculty in different disciplines?
c) How should the goal of tripling grant income by 2020 be modified?

➤ Space
The Committee similarly is concerned that the faculty recruiting target is unrealistic considering the amount and quality of available space for faculty across campus. This includes office space as well as facilities for research and graduate students. We have heard about space constraints from the deans of the three schools and colleges targeted with bulk of UCR’s growth – CNAS, Engineering, and Medicine – and were not presented with a feasible solution. The Committee is concerned that faculty recruiting will be done “on the cheap” with regard to competitive allocations of research space. Compared to the institutions with which we compete for faculty, we recommend that careful, meaningful calculation be done to determine the amount of space necessary to meet the faculty recruiting targets, and that space be identified, before additional recruiting is done. Similarly, the faculty is concerned whether there is sufficient space to admit and train more undergraduate students in the sciences and School of Medicine. We recommend that CNAS conduct a study of the utilization of space for lectures and teaching laboratories to determine the capacity of the College to admit and train students in its majors and to provide lower-division instruction, particularly in Biology, Mathematics and Physics, to undergraduates from the College of Engineering.
Retention Support
Retention of our most productive faculty poses a great threat to our aspirations. Particularly recently tenured faculty retention costs should be considered an anticipated cost of doing business. The retention process should be a strategic process and should including consideration of the costs associated with replacing existing faculty members, including initial complement. Anticipated costs should be explicitly budgeted and the process (both pre and post retention) should be transparent as to not alienate current and future faculty. Improved support and mentoring of faculty may also help reduce the number of faculty looking to leave.

Undergraduate Education and Student Success
The Office of Undergraduate Education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population. Converting the Office of Undergraduate education to an academic unit parallel to the Graduate Division should also be considered. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses. We recommend a group be formed to study the ramification of this issue across the campus. Student success programs should be well balanced and not neglect the success of our students in upper division classes, and their efficacy should be regularly evaluated from all perspectives (student, faculty, and administration).

Joint Appointments
Joint appointments are critical to the success of the School of Public Policy and necessary for the campus to take full advantage of the School of Medicine. However, not all joint appointments have worked well in the past and agreements between the School of Medicine and other units have been elusive. There are complex issues involved, such as 9 vs. 12 month appointments, teaching expectations, and merit and promotion issues. We recommend these issues be confronted immediately by all stakeholders. These issues need to be solved.

Clustering and Consolidation
Colleges have consolidated and/or clustered services in recent years; however, the cost savings and efficacy are unclear. The Committee recommends that “user satisfaction” surveys be performed to ensure that the recent centralization and consolidation of services still provides the faculty the same level of expertise and support as when such services were maintained in departments. Clustering may be working as a budget tool but if so, it still comes at a cost of significantly decreased loss of moral among the staff and a loss of internal cohesion among the faculty staff relationship.

Budget Transparency and Consistency
Transparency of campus budgets and the budget process, including discussion of determining priorities with allocations from central administration to the college, from the college to the department and from the department to individual faculty is paramount. The College and School budgets should be published annually, as is already
the case for the University budget, and resource allocations should be transparent. Consistency demands that common methodology be implemented for budget requests, reporting, and accountability. We recommend that a comparison of budgeted and expenditures must be made for all units. For example, there should be no reason why the colleges should have to utilize unfilled FTEs (staff and faculty) to pay for staff and faculty benefits. These costs are predictable and mandatory, and we recommend that these funds be allocated from the central administration to the Colleges in full. Another example is the seeming imbalance between TA needs and workload; we recommend increasing TA needs to align with workload.

- **Collaborative Budget Process**
  Even at the end of the academic year CPB was not fully involved in the budget process and while we appreciate the transparent explanation from the EVCP and anticipate future meetings with the new EVCP, we would like to see the Academic Senate have a greater presence in budget presentations from all sectors of campus. We hope that this was a one-time oversight and recommend that the Committee on Planning and Budget be invited to have significant participation and more advisory input in future budgetary processes. Administrative collaboration with the faculty via the Academic Senate must be an on-going process throughout each academic year.

We look forward to continued discussion of these items and appreciate your consideration of our recommendations.

Attachment: 2013-2014 Report by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: J. Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
D. Rabenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost
M. Anguiano, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget
The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d), which authorizes the Academic Senate to appoint committees to advise a Chancellor concerning budgets. The advice of the 2013-14 CPB is summarized in this report.

The campus has been in the process of wholesale leadership changes, with a new Chancellor, the search for a new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, appointment of a new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the search for a new Dean for the School of Graduate Education, and the naming of a permanent Dean for the School of Business Administration. At the same time, the campus is emerging from years of cuts due to the financial crisis with the prospect for growth and reinvestment. While additional funds are limited and tempered by mandated cost increases, growth is in sight and the campus has some reserve funds due to conservative budgeting during the financial crisis. This year the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) met with all academic and major non-academic units. The focus was on assessing the current state of the campus and the reality of achieving the aspirational goals laid out in UCR 2020. In short, we are excited by the prospects of growing the faculty and reinvesting in the quality of the University, but are concerned that there is no realistic and comprehensive plan to achieve the aspiration goals and that blind growth in an attempt to meet our aspirations may be risky. Quantity and quality of space, support for graduate students, and transparent budgeting top our areas of concern.

The attached recommendation summary of the committee is based on common themes that emerged from the above discussions. The summary of recommendations has been submitted to the Chancellor. Individual reports of each unit with additional recommendations are included. We also discuss changes to the campus budget process, which this year largely excluded CPB. We did submit short notes on budget principles and priorities to the new Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget. These notes are included in the report.
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REPORT ON THE GRADUATE DIVISION

Dean Childers visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 14, 2014. We thank him for the forthright and informative discussion.

Background

The aspirational campus goal outlined in UCR 2020 is for the number of graduate and professional students to be 20% of the total student population by 2020, up from the current 12.6%. The 20% number stems from the plan to achieve the profile of an AAU institution. The graduate population as of Fall 2013 was 2676 students, accounting for 12.6% of the total student numbers enrolled at UCR. In order to meet this goal, we would need to increase our current population by 87% in 7 years assuming a total 2020 population of 25,000 students. A breakdown of targeted levels for Ph.D. Students, Masters, and M.D. is shown in the following figure.

This figure comes from a presentation at the Chancellor’s retreat in Fall 2013. It is consistent with the long range enrollment plan submitted to the Office of the President.

Given these aspirations, a number of questions come to mind. Is there a plan to meet these aspirations? PhD. Students are expensive. How will they be supported? How will these students be distributed among the graduate programs? How effective is the Graduate Division in meeting the needs of our current students? Are there programs in place to maximize the success of current and new students?
The Graduate Division mainly distributes recruitment funds, and the majority of students are supported through T.A.s, which are allocated in the Colleges, and GSRs, which primarily comes from extramural funding for PIs. Therefore, the discussion and recommendations pertain to multiple units on campus.

**Summary of Discussion Items**

**Graduate Student Success**
Dean Childers reported that in recent years the Graduate Division has expanded services to the campus with the establishment of the Grad Success resource center. This grant-supported mentoring program has proven successful. The 100 or so self-selected 1st year participants have an attrition rate of 3% compared to the campus rate of 12%, has become a model for other UC’s, and is being expanded for students from all years. Increasing retention is the most cost-efficient means to increase the graduate population. Professional development programs include the Writing Center, which has been taken advantage of by a large portion of graduate students, a certification program for advanced pedagogical training, and professionalization workshops and seminars. CPB commends the Graduate Division for a number of new initiatives and their overall efforts in improving graduate student success.

**NSF Graduate Research Fellowships**
Dean Childers discussed how the Graduate Division has been active in increasing the number and quality of NSF GRPF grant proposals, with the campus averaging 12 awards over the past few years. This has been facilitated by initiatives including workshops, involvement of the writing program, and incentives to students to submit grants. This has led to a change of culture and currently results in $6M in external money to fund graduate students, and CPB feels we are on the road to future increased success.

**Graduate Student Funding**
We had a long discussing with Dean Childers regarding graduate student funding. The money allocated as financial aid to the Graduate Division for graduate students has increased some over the past three years, however, when taking into account increases in tuition and benefits, the amount available to programs for stipends from central fellowship funds have effectively been reduced on a per student basis. The funding of the Provost’s Research Fellowship for the very best students, however, is a positive step. The Graduate Division provides fellowships, primarily for the first year or two. The bulk of funds that support graduate students over their tenure at UCR are provided by TA positions and/or externally funded GSRs. Graduate programs set their targets based on their carrying capacity and expected TA and GSR funds, and the Graduate Division reacts to those requests.

Permanent funding allocations for TAs to the colleges by the campus administration are based on a formula based on undergraduate FTEs. The Colleges receive separate supplemental funds for the overenrolled students, but at a 50% funding level. It is at the discretion of the colleges how funds are distributed among the programs. In the past, college deans added additional
support with soft funds. When the budget crisis hit, these supplements were reduced or eliminated, leading to volatility. For example, the reduced TAs resulted in CHASS dropping off in SIRS from 223 to 159 students in one year. CNAS still allots some supplemental funds for TAs to make up for the 50% funding level for the overenrolled students, but at a greatly reduced level than several years ago.

While TA funds provide the bulk of funding to graduate students, they are formula based on an undergraduate student metric and are not, in general, strategically allocated. In other words, the major source of graduate student funding is not strategically targeted to programs that have targeted growth. Unless the process is changed, this leads to an inherent tension. State support (central fellowships, TAs or state supported TAs) accounts for 70% of graduate funding in CNAS, 98% in CHASS, and 45% in BCOE. This is high compared to other UC schools. Funds to support additional graduate students will largely have to come from extramural grants and any funds generated from professional Master’s programs. Recent trends in research funding place this plan in doubt. While we expect funds to be increased with the addition of new faculty, a jump in funding per faculty in the near future cannot be assumed.

CPB feels that the Graduate Division is being run efficiently and is maximizing the use of the budgeted graduate financial aid in a time of diminishing resources, but think additional investments need to be made by the campus administration in the short term to increase the quality and quantity of graduate students. The administration should do what it can to incentivize placing graduate students on extramurally funded GSRs. One mechanism would be for the campus to support the tuition for students placed on externally funded GSRs.

**Graduate Student Enrollment Planning**

While the campus has aspirations to significantly grow its graduate population, we pressed Dean Childers because there is no plan to achieve these aspirations. In addition to the funding challenge, there is no study as to how these students will be distributed across programs. It will clearly be related to the corresponding increase in faculty, but without a planning process that takes into account the full picture, it appears to be unrealistic. CPB has concern that growing for growth sake is risky. Dean Childers noted that this type of planning process should come from the EVC. The last few years have been consumed with emerging from the financial crisis, and it is now time to start this discussion across campus.

**Professional Masters Programs**

The growth of professional masters programs is seen as a mechanism to fund PhD. students. The School of Public Policy and Medical School are clear areas that will see expansion. Dean Childers believes there are additional areas of opportunity that we not fully taking advantage of, e.g. bioinformatics, agribusiness, and engineering. CPB agrees that these programs should be developed where appropriate, but that a marketing study needs to assess these areas before they can be integrated into any planning process.
Non-Resident Tuition
The non-resident tuition (NRT) inhibits the recruiting of international students in many graduate programs. However, this is now an internal matter since the implementation of the funding streams model. With funding streams, NRT funding remains on the UCR campus (except for a 1.5-2% assessment sent to UCOP). Therefore, there is little net cost to adding a non-resident graduate student and a rebate system could be developed to eliminate this issue. We discussed this with Dean Childers, and he agreed that the removal of NRT could have large positive effects for some graduate programs, e.g. economics, comparative literature, and Spanish. CPB believes the accounting mechanism for graduate student NRT should be revamped. There may be reasons to target particular levels of domestic/international students on a program-by-program basis, but this should be a transparent policy rather than a result of a self-imposed financial factor.

Recommendations

1. An integrative planning process should take place, and it should include a thoughtful and realistic discussion on the size and shape of the graduate student population. Increases in the graduate student population are deeply related to new faculty, space, central fellowship money, TA positions, and extramural grants. A study of the job prospects for graduate students, both inside and outside of academia, must also be performed. Producing a large number of graduates with grim job prospects would have a large negative effect on the reputation of the campus. Additionally, a market study of professional masters programs should be conducted if supplemental fees and tuition from students in those programs is assumed.

2. The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR 2020 and is intricately tied to the success of current and new faculty. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular:
   a. Additional funds should be allocated to pay the in-state tuition of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards.
   b. The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will diminish as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded in-state students.
   c. Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.
3. Changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that non-resident tuition (NRT) remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, the non-resident fees should not be an inhibiting factor in recruiting the best students for a particular graduate program. We recommend that programs and grants be rebated for any NRT fees and for the Graduate Division to work with individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

4. The considerable effort required of faculty graduate admissions committees and graduate advisors should also be rewarded. This can help even out the efforts across campus and is particularly necessary as the graduate population grows. In most cases, the time and effort required greatly exceeds the “compensation” given, and the efforts are not fully recognized in merit and promotion consideration.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY (SPP)

Dean Deolalikar visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 14, 2014. We thank him for sharing the progress of the launch of the SPP and for discussing the challenges.

Background

The School of Public Policy (SPP) was approved by the UC Regents in 2008 and launched in 2013. It will have an integrated social-environmental orientation, with a focus on policy issues that affect the region such as immigration, population growth, environmental degradation, traffic congestion, suburban growth, and healthcare. The School is well aligned with the campuses strategic plan. The SPP focuses on issues concerning the local community, the Professional Graduate Degree Programs will add 200 graduate students, and include the addition of synergistic programs with the SOM, CNAS, and CHASS.

Summary of Discussion Items

Dean Deolalikar discussed the roll-out plan for the SPP, which the Committee found to be reasonable. A summary of the plan is given below.

Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

The vast majority of graduate students in the school will be in state-funded professional degree programs. In a professional degree program, one-third of tuition is mandated to go back to financial aid (but is allocated to the grad division and does not necessarily go back to the program). At least one-third of the Professional Fee Supplemental Tuition must be spent by the program for graduate student support, the remainder goes to the program.

The Master of Public Policy is the flagship program for the SPP. The proposal was approved by the campus in the Fall of 2013 and submitted for system wide review. The goal is to begin recruiting during Fall 2014, with an inaugural class of 20 to 25 students in September 2015. The number of entering students is anticipated to increase by 5 students per year, and this 2-year program will have 120 students at full build-out in 7-8 years. The top development priority is to fund a significant fraction of the inaugural class.

A joint MD-MPP program is being developed. Given the School of Medicine’s focus on community medicine and preventative health, there is strong interest in augmenting their MD degrees with public policy of public health background. It is expected that approximately 10 students in the School of Medicine’s 1st year class are interested in adding 1 year of coursework beyond their MD, graduating in 5 years with a MD and MPP.

A proposal for an MS in Global Health is in progress, and is expected to be submitted for campus approval in the near future. The 1 ½ -year program is targeted to enroll 20-25 students/year at full build-out.
A CHASS undergraduate program in public policy was developed in 2007, which has 130 majors and is increasing. The plan is to move and expand the program when there is enough faculty in the SPP and the MPP is up and running (2-3 years).

A PhD program is envisioned, but further down the road. The expected size is approximately 5 students per year. While a large PhD program is not anticipated, it is central in developing the research mission and attracting top faculty.

**SPP Faculty and Joint Appointments**

12 FTE are set aside by the administration for the SPP. The plan is for half to be joint appointments (50%) with other units. The total faculty number, then, will be 18 with 6 full time faculty and 12 with joint appointments. Most of the joint appointments will be filled by UCR faculty members who shift 50% of their position to the SPP.

Already 5-6 faculty are interested in shifting 50% of their FTE to the new school. Two recruitments for new faculty are underway, one joint with CHASS and one joint with GSOE. Next academic year, another 5-6 current faculty will transfer 50% of their FTE to the school. According to this plan, one half of the faculty lines will then be filled before arrival of the first students.

In addition to faculty, Professors of Practice, the equivalent to adjunct faculty, will play a key role in teaching specialized classes in their areas of expertise.

**Issues Noted**

The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of the SPP:

1. The campus will need to determine how to successfully implement joint appointments since the limited campus experience thus far has not been favorable. In particular, merit and promotion issues for joint faculty have been problematic as there are often different expectations for teaching, service, etc. Advance planning on the evaluation process for faculty with shared FTEs is crucial.
2. The school must be vigilant in tracking student placement after graduation.
3. Adequate resources given to maintain the growth of school.
4. Adequate space. This could be a problem after a couple of years.

**Recommendations**

1. Joint appointments are critical to the success of the SPP; however, not all joint appointments have worked well in the past. We recommend these issues be confronted in advance of joint hires and steps taken toward a solution. Joint appointments are also central to taking full advantage of the School of Medicine. A plan of action should be developed between the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, the Dean of the Colleges and Schools, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

The Committee met with VCSA Sandoval on January 21, 2014. We thank him for the informative discussion.

Background

Student Affairs is one of the largest budgetary units at UCR. The total budget for Student Affairs was $131.7, only 5% of which was General Funds and another 9% generated from student fees. These funds pay for a wide variety of student services, including Student Health Services, the Career Services Center, and the Recreation Center. VCSA Sandoval also handles the organizational functions for recruitment and admission of students.

The largest budgetary responsibilities are tied to income from Sales & Services, which funds Student Housing and Dining and the Bookstore. The unit is also responsible for maintaining physical facilities at the HUB and the Student Rec Center. These activities, together with staff benefits, account to more than 75% of the SA budget.
Summary of Discussion Items

The committee discussion touched on a variety of topics:

**Housing and Dining**
These operations are run on what VCSA Sandoval called a “non-profit” business model where the intent is to pay for the services without generating a profit. This turns out to be a considerable challenge – particularly with regard to dining services. While food services in the dorms are able to pay for themselves, it has been difficult to find vendors for the retail food outlets around the campus. Vendors complain that food operations are not 24/7, and there are major breaks between quarters and over the summer. Vendors therefore find on campus sites less attractive than nearby off campus sites. A second problem is the difficulty dealing with labor arrangements if UCR uses help at non-union rates. VCSA Sandoval did not have any ready fixes for these difficulties – they represent an ongoing process of negotiations.

**The Campus Bookstore**
Campus Bookstore has a budget of $6 million. [Note: it is unclear if the figure in the table accompanying the presentation refers to the total budget or just the “subsidy” from the campus budget. CPB assumes the latter.] The situation appears to be getting worse, not better over time. Since the visit with VC Sandoval, it’s been announced that Barnes and Noble was selected to take over bookstore operations.

**Student Healthcare**
We discussed the challenges of providing health services as the student population continues to grow. VCSA Sandoval emphasized the need to expand on-line assistance for student healthcare. He also stressed the shortage of psychiatric help to provide mental health for both undergraduate and graduate students. He has asked for a budget augmentation in this area to meet future needs.

**Admission of New Students**
VCSA Sandoval feels that a major success of his department has been to increase the quality of students coming to UCR. An important component of this has been the profiling of students using a “pipeline” that fits student needs to the UCR academic experience. These efforts have improved both the SAT scores and the GPA of incoming students over the past four years. The following graphs document that success. He emphasized that the rise in scores is evident across all three schools shown in the graph.
Organization of the Budget

We discussed at some length the difficulties of organizing the Student services budget. A situation VCSA Sandoval feels created some difficulties in setting budget priorities is that the allocation of funds from student fees is a joint decision between his office and students serving on a budget committee. The student priorities do not always coincide with those of the administration, and this makes budget decisions that are consistent with the campus 2020 goals somewhat problematic.

Recommendations

1. Roughly three quarters of the SA budget is, in effect, a business operation that lies largely outside the academic sphere that is the central concern of our committee. The committee agrees that maintaining the quality of campus housing and dining is an essential part of attracting students. We also recognize the importance of health services, and support the efforts to expand these services as our student population increases.

2. The Committee commends the efforts of VCSA Sandoval to facilitate the “pipeline” of qualified students accepted to UCR at both the graduate and undergraduate level. This is an essential part of the 2020 plan and deserves continued support.

3. While the Office of Student affairs does a fine job of processing files, CPB feels strongly that the Office of Undergraduate Education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population.

Overall, the committee feels that the goals expressed by VCSA Sandoval are consistent with those in the present academic plan.
REPORT ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Interim Dean Mitchell visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 28th, 2014. We thank Dean Mitchell for his informative and forthright presentation.

Background

The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) is a professional school focused on graduate education, yet it recently added an undergraduate minor. The GSOE has 21.25 faculty members and 11.65 funded staff members. The GSOE also has 3.4 unfunded staff positions. The GSOE has 100 teacher credential and M.Ed. students, and 110 masters and Ph.D. students. The school offers programs of study in five graduate areas (i.e., Higher Education; Education, Society and Culture; Special Education; Educational Psychology; School Psychology) and teacher education. During the 2013-2014 academic year, three faculty searches and one Dean search were held. One of the faculty searches was successful at the time of Dean Mitchell’s visit and the Dean search is still in progress.

Summary of Discussion Items

Budget Priorities
The GSOE has four budget priorities developed to reflect the vision articulated in UCR 2020.

Priority 1 is to expand graduate student enrollment by increasing the number of faculty. The assumption inherent in this priority is that by increasing faculty, more students will want to attend the GSOE. The Dean reported the largest number of high quality graduate students have been in the school psychology doctoral program. In addition to increasing the faculty, the Dean is working to increase student enrollment by enhancing financial support packages, and more aggressively recruiting students.

Priority 2 is to support the development of the Child Wellbeing Initiative in collaboration with the School of Medicine and the School of Public Policy. A workgroup of 10 faculty from the three professional schools worked together to conceptualize the initiative. A search for a joint appointment for a director for the initiative was unable to produce a candidate this year.

Priority 3 is to expand and support the Undergraduate Minor in Education. The GSOE is offering 3 to 4 classes per quarter for the Education minor. The GSOE suggests there is a need to add 5.5 FTE of new Teaching Assistants to support the growth of the program.

Priority 4 is to expand the teacher education credential and M.Ed. programs to address an anticipated teacher shortage. GSOE’s desire to expand the teacher education program has received resistance from the administration, yet there is a substantial need for high quality teachers in the Inland Empire.
Budget Process
An annual budget request is made to key staff members in Teacher Education, Student Recruitment, Information Technology and Development. This year, a faculty retreat was held to obtain faculty input. Budget priorities were also presented to the GSOE Executive Committee and at a faculty meeting. The budget process appears to be very transparent and responsive to faculty input.

Extramural Funding
The Dean uses discretionary funds to encourage grant development. In addition, one staff member is funded to support grant development and works in collaboration with the Office of Research. Interim Dean Mitchell suggested a need to strengthen cross academic unit research support and a need by the campus (via the CALL) to formalize recognition of research proposal submission versus only recognizing grant submissions that are eventually funded.

Concerns
The problems that the GSOE are currently facing are related to space and resources. The Interim Dean expressed concern that the GSOE will be challenged to find space for new faculty hires in the near future. The GSOE is also finding it difficult to find classrooms large enough to support their Education minor classes. The Interim Dean identified a need to add 5.5 FTE TA support for Undergraduate Minor.

Benchmark Compared to UCSB
As requested by CPB, Interim Dean Mitchell provided key benchmark data from UCSB. UCSB has a 15 million dollar endowment that supports many aspects of their college. The data suggest the UCSB College of Education has approximately twice the faculty size as GSOE and significantly more than twice the number of Ph.D. students.

Effect of CSU Ed.D.
As requested by CPB, information about how the addition of the Ed.D. to CSU programs affected GSOE was included in the presentation. Interim Dean Mitchell suggested the CSU Ed.D.’s option eliminated a joint doctoral program that UCR faculty were in the midst of developing and indirectly led to the elimination of the Education Leadership and Policy program in the GSOE.

Recommendations
1. We recommend that the GSOE consider a more targeted approach to faculty recruitment designed to increase student enrollment. From the documents provided, it is unclear how the current faculty recruitment plan will lead to an increase in the number of graduate students. There are currently several faculty members in the GSOE who advise very few students, therefore it seems critical to identify why adding faculty members will lead to an increase in students. The recruitment plan does not indicate specific areas that GSOE faculty believe will attract new students.
2. CPB supports the proposed addition of new TA lines as long as the increase in positions is consistent with current guidelines.

3. The GSOE is commended for having a very transparent budget process and is encouraged to more clearly connect budget requests to UCR 2020.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE) Steven Brint, visited the Planning and Budget Committee on January 28, 2014. The Committee thanks the VP for a thorough and informative presentation and discussion.

Background

The Office of Undergraduate Education provides leadership for the University with the aim of improving the quality of undergraduate education. Its focus is to implement a series of cross-campus educational programs designed to enhance undergraduate student performance and educational experiences. This includes improving the first year learning communities, enhancing support for first generation and racial ethnic minority students, developing state-of-the-art academic support services, encouraging undergraduate research, expanding study abroad opportunities for UCR students, and improving the University Honors Program. The Office has expanded its jurisdiction in recent years, having absorbed the Academic Resource Center in 2007, the University Writing Program in 2008, Summer Sessions in 2009, and Study Abroad in 2013. UE’s mandate links up with UCR’s 2020 Strategic Plan in at least two areas: enhancing student success and improving the honors program.

Summary of Discussion Items

Learning Communities
The Colleges run the learning communities while UE funds them. Advising within these communities has suffered as a result of the past fiscal crisis. Normally there should be a student to advisor ratio of 300:1; currently it is 600:1. Being overworked, advisors have not been able to adequately guide students in planning to graduate in four years. VP Brint noted differences in performance of LCs across campus. Whereas there has been a bump in GPA and retention rates in CNAS and BCOE, there have been no such improvements shown in the CHASS LCs. Insufficient peer mentorship may have something to do with this. As a result, Vice Provost Brint has withdrawn some funds from the CHASS LCs and asked that these programs be re-designed.

Undergraduate Research
UE has expanded opportunities for students to participate in research and creative activity. VP Brint created the Chancellor’s Research Fellowship, the research symposium has expanded with 150 submissions last May, and awards have been granted to help students attend conferences.

Honors
The Vice Provost has attempted to strengthen the honors program, with a goal of having our students win Rhodes and other prestigious scholarships, and exploring the possibility of establishing an honors college. He notes that not enough faculty have agreed to take on course honors sections in part because Departments are not receiving enough buyout funds to make it worthwhile. The Committee discussed the option of reducing the number of sections and
having larger buyouts, or keeping the same number of sections and requesting more funds from the campus.

**UE as an Academic Unit**

A major reorganizational issue was a proposal by CPB, for UE to become an academic unit. Vice Provost Brint believes such a move does make sense because UE already runs courses, awards degrees, and reviews student petitions in the summer. The academic programs run by the Office of Undergraduate Education, e.g. University Honors, could then be housed more naturally in a Division of Undergraduate Affairs. This conversion may be resource neutral and would give greater prominence to undergraduate education because the Vice Provost would then sit on the Dean’s Council, as does the Dean of the Graduate Division (with which UE shares some similarities).

**Admissions**

Currently, UE has no direct responsibility for admissions, though the Vice Provost has been actively involved in enrollment issues. VP Brint believes that admissions, now under the jurisdiction of the Office of Student Affairs, should be shifted to UE. The Committee raised questions about the extensive paperwork involved in processing applications and whether this might place an undue burden on UE. Though reading transcripts and statements is fairly routine and can be handled by staff, there is not, according to VP Brint, a clean division between paperwork and analysis, and thus academic assessments must be made. More importantly, there are outreach functions that demand faculty input, such as working with feeder high schools to improve student preparation for entering the university, and improving recruitment strategies for attracting better students to UCR. In general, there is a need for improved analytical studies regarding admissions, better outreach and recruitment, and closer articulation of requirements for success in campus majors with admissions criteria. All of this could be enhanced should admissions come under UE’s purview.

**Graduation rates, racial diversity and advising**

The Vice Provost issued a comprehensive report on graduation rates, indicating that an increase in admission standards in CNAS, BCOE and CHASS has had no negative impact on the racial diversity of the student body. The VP said a better job still needs to be done to recruit top-ranked minority students to UCR. As far as prospective business students are concerned, he recommends that CHASS adopt a program of early advising for students thinking of entering SOBA. The difficulty is that students who major in business and don’t attend SOBA have much poorer graduation rates than those who do attend SOBA. Majoring in Economics is not yet an option for the pre-business students who lack the math skills. VP Brint believes we need a balanced approach, which recruits better pre-business students with enhanced math skills, so that some percentage of these students can feed into majors like economics, relieving SOBA which cannot absorb all of them.

**UE Staff**

There is a critical need for more advisors, additional tutors in the ARC staff, and a staff person for honors. The most critical staff need is in Human Relations, owing to the absorption of
several campus units in recent years, and responsibilities UE has in dealing with employee grievances.

Recommendations

1. The Committee believes that notwithstanding budget limitations, UE has performed remarkably well. It has absorbed new units and developed new programs which have helped to enhance the educational performance and experience of our undergraduates.

2. The Committee proposes converting UE into an academic unit parallel to the structure devised for the Graduate Division. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses. We recommend for a group be formed to study the implications and implementation.

3. The Committee also believes that the VPUE should play a more active role in admissions, which is more likely to occur should certain admissions functions be placed within UE’s jurisdiction.

4. The Committee also acknowledges the importance of UE making additional staff hires.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Vice Chancellor Pazzani visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on February 6, 2014. We thank him for a forthright and informative discussion.

Background

The UCR Strategic Plan requires that the campus greatly increase its grant income. VC Pazzani stated that UCR must more than triple its annual grant income from its current amount of $63.8 M in 2012 to $200 M in 2020.¹

There are three main routes toward tripling grant income:

1. Increasing the total number of grant awards per faculty member.
2. Increasing the size of the faculty.
3. Assisting the faculty to secure larger grants.

Certainly all must occur, and all require a more active and engaged Office of Research, now the Office of Research and Economic Development (RED), than was the case before the UCR Strategic Plan was adopted.

Summary of Discussion Items

Vice Chancellor Pazzani presented data showing that UCR lagged comparator institutions in R&D expenditures, recognizing that many comparators had established medical schools that contributed 50 – 60% of the funds attributed to our comparators. He then provided the committee his thoughts toward tripling our grant income, either in total or from all Federal granting agencies and emphasized increasing the effort for UCR faculty to work in teams toward obtaining more NSF awards over $1 M.

It was VC Pazzani’s view that UCR faculty had not been encouraged to think on the scale necessary for a tripling of grant income, and UCR had not developed the infrastructure to assist and encourage the faculty to apply for large grants (i.e., over $1 M). Simultaneously, UCR policies and procedures seem prohibitive and cumbersome, in his experience, if UCR is to achieve such a lofty goal.

The committee was pleased to see the growth and reinvigoration of the Office of Research and Economic Development since the arrival of VC Pazzani. Although the committee appreciated VC Pazzani’s perception of the campus administrative culture and the need to improve the

¹ In a meeting with another administrator $43.1M was cited as the current baseline figure for direct C&G federal expenditures, requiring that the campus nearly quintuple grant income. The discrepancy may come from whether indirect costs are included or in the definition of federal C&G expenditures. CPB was unable to resolve this discrepancy and focuses here only on VC Pazzani’s goal of tripling annual grant income.
grantsmanship of the faculty overall, the committee also was skeptical of: 1) the ability of the RED office to change the administrative culture on the campus and 2) how effective the campus efforts will be to increase funding success. Members noted that all of our competitors are also making efforts to increase their success in securing extramural grants, so what is needed is not simply for UCR to improve its extramural funding success, but to improve our funding success more than our competitors are improving theirs.

VC Pazzani’s budgetary requests focused upon increasing RED staff in anticipation of additional clinical trials research proposed by the UCR SOM and to provide better training to campus staff in the preparation and submission of grants on behalf of the faculty.

**Recommendations**

1. A careful, integrative planning process should be undertaken to determine realistic targets for increasing extramural grant income from Federal agencies under current and foreseeable Federal budgetary constraints. Anecdotal evidence from a recent NSF panel member suggests, for example, that, whereas available funds are essentially unchanged since 2002, the number of proposals has increased 2.5 times. Flat funding coupled with increases in the number of grant applications has several implications for UCR’s ability to achieve its goals for increased Federal funding under UCR 2020. Thus, the committee recommends careful consideration be given to the following questions under the current, austere, opportunities for Federal funding:
   a) What funding rates should be expected for faculty in different disciplines?
   b) What size of grants should be expected for faculty in different disciplines?
   c) How should the goal of tripling grant income by 2020 be modified?

2. The Committee, however, encourages the Research & Economic Development office to continue to question and change campus procedures and culture that inhibit the process of grant preparation and submission and inhibit collaboration across academic units.

3. The Committee also support continued strategic investment in RED to continue to better support faculty in their pursuit of extramural support.
Executive Vice Chancellor Rabenstein visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on 11 February 2014. We thank him for an informative discussion and a transparent view into the 2013/2014 Campus Budget process.

Summary of Discussion Items

Campus Budget
EVC Rabenstein noted that while the two categories of 1) Systemwide state funds and 2) tuition and fees account for 37% of the total UC budget, those two categories account for 62% of the UCR budget. This means that because UCR is much more dependent on state funding than larger campuses, it has been adversely affected by the recent budget cuts much more so than most other campuses. One of the ways that UCR can grow funding in the future is to increase grant support from federal mechanisms (research grants) as well as from philanthropic sources. Another way is to gradually replace the unfunded undergraduates with non-resident undergraduates.

EVC Rabenstein’s sobering presentation pointed out that UCR remains $73M behind what we need in permanent funding because of unfunded mandates of $65.6M and a $7.4M deficit due to residual budget cuts that were not restored in 2013/2014. This also includes increases in UCRP costs that remain unfunded. Finally, although we have had an increase in support from UC Systemwide after the passage of Proposition 30, UCR remains in a deficit position that increases at a rate of 3.5% a year (the costs of running the University increase at 6% a year but we only reserve a 2.5% a year increase in funds from the State). At this point the University is still not in a positive position, but the central administration looks forward to improving the situation with several initiatives including increasing faculty numbers to meet the UCR 2020 goals.

The budget was still not firm at the date of our meeting.

Enrollment Targets, Increases in Enrollment and Overenrolled Students
EVC Rabenstein reminded us that to meet the aspirations of an AAU University, UCR should increase the student body up to 25,000 students by 2021. To achieve this goal the current number of domestic students will increase slightly, but the aim is to increase the number of non-resident undergraduate students by 350% so that by 2021, 10% of the total undergraduate student body that will pay non-resident tuition. Non-residents include both domestic out-of-state and foreign students. The majority are expected to be foreign. The non-resident tuition paid by these students will substantially increase the campus funds (~$30M) on an annual basis. In addition to the undergraduate growth, the University plans to increase the graduate student population by 88% so that the proportion of graduate students relative to undergraduate students is larger and more aligned with AAU Universities.
There is still a problem of over-enrolled students on the campus because while we gain the tuition dollars, we are not funded for them by the State. Additional resources for teaching those students must come from the UCR central administration to each of the colleges. Those costs are distributed in temporary funds within each College budget allocation annually. Although EVC Rabenstein believes that those funds are sufficient, the Colleges are still finding themselves short of funds to adequately cover teaching costs (lecturers and teaching assistants). Although the colleges still spend the money on appropriate sources, it is difficult to determine where that money goes and if it is spent effectively. Nonetheless, planning and budget’s evaluation of the college budgets was that the money is generally used for teaching resources (specifically teaching assistantships) that matches that allocated in the temporary and permanent lines.

Therefore, it is not clear why there is an inconsistency between what the EVC allocates to the colleges and what the actual expenditures are. Furthermore it is not clear, in the University budgetary planning process, that there have been sufficient funds allocated to fully educate the unfunded students. It may be unreasonable to expect that we can educate those students for the cost of their tuition alone.

**Unfilled faculty FTE, increase in faculty numbers and retention of faculty**

EVC Rabenstein believes that it is crucial that the faculty numbers grow by 250 faculty members by 2021. This would bring the total to 910 faculty members and would require that new faculty be hired at a rate of 36/year. This year (2013/2014) the university had initiated 99 searches. Of that 99, approximately 30 will be used to replace current positions, and with a predicted 68% success rate, the campus will grow by 47 faculty members. The first 100 new faculty positions will be funded from:

i. the 2011/2012 faculty allocation that was used for other purposes during the budget cut (44.4 positions)
ii. the current unfunded positions in the School of Public Policy (12 positions)
iii. the Writing Program (13 positions)
iv. Summer Session (23.6 positions)
v. Operational Research Lines (7 positions).

The remaining 150 faculty members will come from other open provisions in the Summer Session and the Writing Program as well as monies available from the addition NRTs that come to campus.

By increasing the faculty numbers, the EVC hopes that the extramural dollars coming to campus will triple and that the overhead funds obtained from that money would support further growth.

It was unclear exactly where the initial complement funds for new faculty members in the sciences will come from; however, the increased revenue generated by greater grant overhead dollars will help to defray those costs. The increased revenue coming from non-resident tuition must be used for educating those students and defraying the costs of education in general. As
such it is important that those non-resident dollars be used for the education mission rather than the research mission (initial complement) and other campus costs.

Another point that should be addressed is the fact that there is a well-recognized declining emphasis on funding for the sciences and thus, declining funding rates. While it is acceptable to ask that the faculty maintain or increase their attempts to bring in those grant dollars it is risky to depend on that income to fund critical initiatives on campus.

**UCR vs. UCSB**

EVC Rabenstein suggested that the comparison between UC Riverside and UC Santa Barbara is counterproductive and misinformed for a variety of reasons. First UCSB is budgeted for more than 4000 more students than is UCR so they receive about $25M more from the state. In addition they do not have unfunded students. Furthermore UCSB brings more grant dollars in than UCR in all disciplines except in the life sciences. Thus the indirect cost recovery at UCSB is approximately $24M more than UCR. These two factors make the comparison between the two campuses unrealistic. CPB notes that our aspirational targets most closely mimic UCSB, so such a comparison is instructive.

**Recommendations**

1. Even at the end of the academic year P&B was not fully involved in the budget process and while we appreciate the transparent explanation from the EVC, we would like to see the Academic Senate have a greater presence in budget presentations from all sectors of campus. We hope that this was a one-time oversight and recommend that the Committee on Planning and Budget be invited to have significant participation and more advisory input in the budgetary process in the future.

2. We recommend that the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget and the EVC’s office revisit the formula used to determine teaching resource allocations from the central administration to the colleges to determine if, indeed, funding is sufficient to match the stated needs.

3. It appears that in planning for future hires the EVC and the Office of Planning and Budget have creatively used the potential for finally filling much needed faculty lines and using the hoped for non-resident tuition to defray remaining costs. While there is no question that the UCR faculty number should grow in the future, this plan is at best risky if any of the targets (non-resident students, grant income, etc.) are not reached and at worse unrealistic. In addition this plan may be cutting the campus budget very close, leaving little for other purposes across the campus. It is recommended that these plans be revisited regularly by the new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget and the new Executive Vice Chancellor to determine if the plans are still sound. Likewise, it is important that the University be able to step back from plans in the event of other financial problems.
4. Because of the important role that graduate students play in the research enterprise as well as in teaching we feel it is important that there are adequate resources put into each college to support graduate researchers and teaching assistants. Strategic investment of resources into maintaining graduate student support is necessary to promote the work that will ultimately lead to greater faculty funding. The planned increase of graduate student numbers by 88% cannot be solely paid for by an aspiration to obtain more federal grant funds. In an environment of uncertain federal support for basic research dollars, it is critical that this goal of UCR 2020 be carefully reconsidered.
REPORT ON THE UCR LIBRARIES

University Librarian Steven Mandeville-Gamble visited the Committee on Planning and Budget on February 11, 2014. We thank him for an informative and forthright discussion.

Background

Steven Mandeville-Gamble came to UCR in March 2013. His background included extensive experience in the creation and management of digital and physical collections. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble came to UCR with “a vision for how to surface the campus needs around the libraries and the services they could be providing but also recognized the need to tailor that vision to meet the UCR community needs”. He presented an ambitious plan to realize this vision and contribute to the campus strategic plan for 2020.

Summary of Discussion Items

Our discussion with Librarian Mandeville-Gamble covered a wide range of issues dealing with the UCR libraries and some major challenges facing all university libraries in the context of the digital revolution.

Use of Library Space and Resources

We began with the question of how students use the resources of the UCR libraries. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted that one of the most persistent requests by student groups is a need to keep the libraries open for longer hours. The obvious constraint on longer hours is the limit on allocation of staff time to maintain the longer hours. Another use of library resources by students is the availability of study spaces. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted that the current study rooms are heavily used, and they are also in need of major upgrades to make them “smart” rooms in terms of technology. He illustrated what he would like to see by describing North Carolina State University’s Hunt Library, where the walls of study rooms were completely covered by “whiteboard” – including the hallways. He mentioned the possibility of getting outside funds to help upgrade the study facilities.

Improvements to Search Tools to Access our Holdings

Librarian Mandeville-Gamble feels that our present search tools for locating UCR holdings are inadequate. We do not have a “One Stop” technology for locating items in our own collection, or in other collections. In fact, third party vendors were better at locating materials in our own collection than our own search engines. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble feels UCR should make use of third-party vendors rather than developing our own search software. He would like to use our resources for getting and training staff members who can employ the new technology.

Information literacy

We have moved from a world where the problem facing those searching for information has changed from a scarcity of data to a world of information abundance. Libraries must train their staffs to be in a position to develop skills in our students on how to identify which sources are
reliable. We spent several moments discussing the merits and pitfalls of Wikipedia as an example of the difficulty of assessing information when too much information is available. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble regards the challenge of improving “information literacy” to be of paramount importance to our students in the 21st century.

Electronic Books or Paper Books
Several committee members commented that digital books posed some problems with regard to ease of reading and restrictions on downloading of information. They asked for Librarian Mandeville-Gamble’s views on the use of digital books. He agreed that there were areas of inquiry such as art history and chemistry where digital books simply did not work and suggested that it was important to make sure the information in our collection was in the most “usable” format.

Books and Space Considerations
The obvious advantage of digital information is that it takes far less space to store than printed material. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble suggested that better inventory management of our printed collections might free up a considerable amount of space for new printed material. He cited his experience at Washington University, where they determined that 25% of books had not been used in 10 years, and hopes to institute a similar study at UCR.

Intellectual Property Rights and Open Access Policies
A major challenge facing libraries is the issue of intellectual property rights and access to academic journals. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted what amounts to a revolution in the rising costs of academic journals. The inflation rate on journals is 8.5% per year – which will eventually bankrupt most university libraries. Options to deal with this problem are limited until publishers come up with a sustainable business model that can deal with the issue of who is actually going to “pay” for the journals. At the moment the librarian feels that libraries are in the middle of the struggle over intellectual property rights and open access. His suggestions for dealing with the problem include: 1) support journals with a sustainable business model; 2) centralized purchase of journals through UCOP California Digital Library; and 3) have libraries negotiate with journals over the costs.

General Budget Considerations
Librarian Mandeville-Gamble communicated that his major budget challenges are:

- Hiring new staff with skills to implement the ideas discussed above. Investing in hiring and training of staff is the best way to improve the availability of services and collections at the libraries.
- Instituting access to third party software to enhance the search capabilities of our collections.
- Upgrading the study spaces to the status of “smart rooms” with better technology.
- Keeping up with inflation. He estimates that we lose $250,000 a year simply in the costs of journals each year.
- Finding ways to lengthen the hours the library is open to students.
• Developing a more sophisticated metric that compares program to program so that we can put funds where they can offer the most support for our strongest programs

Recommendations

1. The Library system is at the heart of our academic community. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble has outlined an ambitious program to maintain the quality of the UCR libraries. We support the direction of his “vision”.

2. The recommendations to upgrade study areas to “smart rooms” should receive strong consideration. It seems unlikely that this can be accomplished in a single budget cycle; the sooner such renovations can be done, the better.

3. The recommendation for third party search engines to create a “one stop” technology for searching not only our holdings, but those of other libraries should be vigorously pursued.

4. CPB suggests a cost-benefit analysis, including the effect on the purchase of new books, of all the IT tools being proposed.

5. Some sort of “task force” or “study group” should be set up to study the problems surrounding intellectual property. The library seems to be at a nexus of this problem and is therefore in the best position to head such a group.

6. The faculty must vet any ‘optimization’ of the library’s functions.
REPORT ON THE BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Dean Reza Abbaschian visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on March 11, 2014. We thank him for a forthright, informative, and insightful discussion.

Background

The specific mission of BCOE is to produce engineers with nationally recognized research which contributes to knowledge and provides curriculum that inspires creativity and imagination in students. In doing this BCOE also is interested in focusing in the Inland Empire by helping with industrial goals and new industries in our local region. With nine degree granting departments and eight centers that are collaborative across the campus, they are well situated to move towards that goal. Right now they are 38th among top public university Engineering programs according to US News and World Report, and in the top quartile of the NRC rankings. The college is planning on new online master’s degree granting programs in Energy and Civil Engineering.

Summary of Discussion Items

Bourns College of Engineering Vision and Alignment with UCR 2020
BCOE’s goal is to be in the top 25 colleges of engineering in the world, which put it in line with the campus strategic plan. In order to accomplish this, BCOE has ambitious plans to increase faculty numbers by 53%, increase the undergraduate student numbers by 30%, and increase graduate student numbers by 43%. Dean Abbaschian argued that BCOE is well poised to achieve the goal as rankings of UC Colleges of Engineering are proportional to the number of faculty and BCOE is currently ranked where it should be given the current faculty size. In addition, the college wants to increase the number of faculty who hold endowed chairs by more than 500% so that by 2020 one third of faculty positions are endowed (48 faculty members). Dean Abbaschian stressed the point that they cannot achieve the goals required to become an AAU University unless faculty numbers are enhanced so that the number of PhD students per faculty can be maintained and there is a balance struck between the numbers of graduate and undergraduate students.

Finally, Dean Abbaschian pointed out that faculty in BCOE are doing very well at attracting federal research funding. The current average annual federal direct cost coming to UCR in BCOE is $308K/faculty whereas the campus average is $170K per year. This suggests that BCOE is well situated to attract high quality faculty who will improve our position in national rankings.

Resources needed to meet the BCOE hiring plan
Dean Abbaschian emphasized what this committee has heard from all the Deans, that the most important need is space to house new faculty and teach the growing student population. He noted that EBU 3 is in the queue and would be ‘shovel ready’ when sufficient funds are identified. In the interim, Dean Abbaschian has requested space in Pierce Hall to house incoming faculty.
The next most important need is an increase in the budgeted amount for initial complement (IC). In Engineering the average IC is $600K. On average the central administration has provided $150K of these funds and the college has had to find $450K from its own sources such as money from indirect cost recovery. Those funds are insufficient to support the expected faculty growth so the college looks to the central administration to either start to fund a much greater percentage of all IC packages or to provide the college with a greater proportion of the indirect cost recovery funds.

A third need that was identified by Dean Abbaschian was for faculty retention to be made a higher priority in the eyes of central administration and the Executive Vice Chancellor’s Office. As pointed out by other Deans, the EVC’s office does not entertain a request to retain faculty unless they come with an offer from another University. Yet, often by the time an offer has been made in writing too much negotiation has transpired and the faculty is beyond the point where they will accept our retention offer. He did point out one example of a pre-emptive retention this last year which was much appreciated. The committee agrees that the EVC should be more nimble with respect to these offers and have more faith in the College Dean’s and Department Chairs when they report the potential of losing highly-valued colleagues. Dean Abbaschian would like to see the EVC’s office be willing to give more money to retain faculty early in their negotiation with other Universities. A very compelling argument that supports Dean Abbaschian’s point of view is that many times the faculty member in question has a well-supported research program with expensive equipment. When that faculty member leaves the university the University loses $2-3M in research income as well as expensive equipment. Those faculty members are then replaced by younger, less experienced faculty so it leaves the college behind.

**Two Year Staffing and Budget Comparison of the College**
The college budget has increased by $2.6 M over the last two years but most of that increase was necessary to support merit increases of the existing staff. The actual increase to the college budget over and above those necessary increases has been $151K. This money has been used to hire 1.5 new staff FTEs in the College. This funding rate has not been enough to support the growth that is planned and this will have to change if we are to achieve much larger student and faculty numbers.

**Campus Student Growth and Support**
Since 2006 undergraduate number have grown more than projected, faculty numbers have fallen below, and the number of graduate students has stayed on projection. The college attempted to implement a more selective freshman acceptance rate because the college currently loses 2/3 of those students to other parts of the campus or as a result of them leaving the University. In addition, the college is focusing more on students who transfer to the college in their junior year. This would place a smaller load on the faculty and allow faculty to focus on those students who will be successful while maintaining attention to their own research. Currently, Dean Abbaschian feels that faculty are saddled with responsibilities for undergraduate students which often causes the faculty to be less effective at their primary mission than they could be.
Out-of-state students would also be acceptable to the college as long as there was some kind of an incentive for the faculty to spend time recruiting those students from out of state or internationally. Dean Abbaschian also suggested that if they were able to implement online Master’s Degree programs to non-resident students, up to half of the student tuition and fee money would be available to pay for Teaching Assistants. The online funds would build up those TA resources.

As the other Deans have suggested, Dean Abbaschian reported that there is never enough money in the budget to cover the TA FTE that would be sufficient to adequately cover classes. Since 2006, the Graduate students in BCOE have increased 92% and the Undergraduates have increased by 88%. Nonetheless, they have received regularly only 29.7 TA FTEs until this year when they received an additional 1.7 FTE. This total of 31.7 TA FTE must cover 2300 students. This is far too few TAs and represents only a 5.7% increase in 8 years.

The same problem occurs with lecturers. Lecturer salaries come from unfilled faculty lines. In BCOE this yields $250K per year, but supporting lecturers costs $806K/year so the remaining $550K must come from the college. This last year BCOE received a one-time injection of $250K from overenrolled students. Dean Abbaschian suggests, and the committee agrees, that there should be better long term planning so that those costs that can be anticipated are guaranteed to be covered into future years.

**UCR vs. UCSB**

In almost all metrics, UCR receives less support for academic purposes than UCSB. This is true for BCOE as it is for other colleges. The funding rate in the college of engineering is $6K/student whereas at UCSB that funding rate is more than twice as high at $14K/student. With a similar funding rate the BCOE could use the $17.4M difference to support more TAs. Campus-wide UCSB receives $535M while we receive $536M, yet UCSB is able to afford 830 faculty while we are only able to afford 673 faculty. The committee is concerned that we still do not understand the reason for this discrepancy.

**Collaborations between BCOE and the general campus**

Dean Abbaschian reported that BCOE has been successful partly because it has been active in generating collaborations across colleges for several years. There are many examples of IGERTS and other training grants or collaborative proposals between several of the colleges and CNAS, SOBA, and CHASS. He suggests that the faculty are doing a great job so it is important to not saddle them with more responsibilities that may make them less effective.

Finally, Dean Abbaschian suggested that his faculty seek out development and advancement funds directly. They have not found that campus advancement adds value to their fundraising efforts. Their long term goal is to seek more support from foundations and private sources to begin to grow the number of endowed chairs.
Recommendations

1. We recommend that the campus support Dean Abbaschian’s plans for the building of EBU3 by working with UCOP to find the funds. This building is ‘shovel ready’ and building could start in very short order with little planning. We also recommend, as with other colleges, that the campus do space utilization studies to determine the space available for BCOE. In general, across campus space must be made a top priority before we can house the new faculty we want to hire.

2. We recommend that the administration either pay for a larger fraction of the initial complement or return a larger fraction of indirect costs to the college and faculty. A study of how our sister campuses allocate IC should be performed.

3. It is clear that, as in other colleges, faculty retentions in BCOE must be made a higher priority and that the central administration must act more quickly and be flexible in making retention offers before it is too late to keep a highly-valued faculty member from leaving UCR.

4. Along with the above priorities, if the campus is going to be able to sustain the growth projected, it is important that BCOE receive enough funds in Teaching FTE (TAs and Lecturers) to support the growing student population. Thus, the committee recommends increasing the amount of permanent teaching funds allocated annually to BCOE so that they can plan for teaching needs more than a year or two into the future.
REPORT ON UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Dean Duffy visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 18th, 2014. We thank her for a forthright, informative, and insightful discussion.

Background

University Extension (UNEX) is organized around several departments that include programs focused on many topics including education credentials, older adults, science, nursing, technology, and international students. The majority of UNEX’s domestic students are enrolled in classes to improve or change their occupation status. UNEX has one of the largest international student programs in the country that serves approximately 5,000 students per year. International students come from China, Japan, India, Brazil, Spain, Turkey, and several other countries. UNEX employs about 130 staff members with a large proportion of the staff members used to support the international programs. UNEX’s goals are aligned with UCR’s 2020 strategic plan. There is a standing Academic Senate committee focused on UNEX programs and courses.

Summary of Discussion Items

A large part of the discussion focused on UNEX’s international programs and mechanisms used to support international students. UNEX has several campus partnerships focused on international students including programs designed to help students from China gain admission into the University of California or another North American university, and targeted concurrent enrollment with SOBA and Engineering. UNEX also has partnerships with two Japanese universities and a center in Korea, and the UC President’s new UC Mexico initiative may result in a large influx of students from Mexico as well.

UNEX is self-supporting and produces almost all of its revenue through tuition. UNEX is currently in a growth period and has been able to use recent revenue to improve facilities and support systems (e.g., student information system). Due to the recent growth, UNEX has leased the top floor of University Village and may lease other parts of the building if necessary. UNEX has been able to create financial reserves that are primarily designed to support their mortgage responsibilities if the enrollment revenue decreases substantially.

UNEX pays for several campus and UCOP systems, and also splits concurrent enrollment tuition at a 50-50 rate with campus departments. It was not clear whether the UNEX portion for concurrent enrollment students (50% for domestic and 75% for international), which are historic numbers, is justified. Approximately, 30% of UNEX revenues come from on-line programs attended primarily by students in the local region. UNEX is currently engaged in a strategic planning process designed to identify the best way to deliver education to future students. UNEX also supports the campus by providing several departments student advisors who are focused on non-matriculated students who are concurrently enrolled. Concurrent
enrollment students are accepted into classes if space is available after UCR students have enrolled.

Recommendations

1. CPB recognizes the value of the programs under the direction of University Extension. One area of possible concern is in concurrent enrollment of students. This has been a useful revenue source for some departments, but space considerations and growing enrollments have made it increasingly difficult to accommodate students in key classes.

2. We recommend UNEX produce a complete accounting of the expenses associated with concurrent enrollment students, separating foreign and domestic.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SOBA)

Dean Wang visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 11, 2014. We thank him for sharing the budget and discussing the challenges and opportunities for SOBA.

Background

The School of Business Administration at the University of California, Riverside has provided students with a research-based education in the field of business. One of only three University of California schools that offer both an undergraduate and graduate component, the School of Business Administration is a professional school that offers students a unique opportunity to obtain business degrees at both undergraduate and graduate level. The school is almost 40 years old but has a checkered history due, at least in part, to inconsistent leadership and internal conflicts. Dean Wang has been the interim dean for last few years and was appointed the permanent dean recently after a limited search. He was an associate dean of SOBA before he became interim dean.

Summary of Discussion Items

Dean Wang discussed the budget plan for the SOBA, which the Committee found to be rather ambitious given the many constraints. A summary of the plan is given below.

Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

The SOBA graduate program has 294 students, well below the system average of ~850 students. The vast majority of graduate students in the school are in state-funded professional degree programs. The regular Masters in Business Administration (MBA) is the flagship program for SOBA and may be used to rank the MBA programs in business schools. Besides the state funded MBA program there is an identical self-supported Flex MBA program whose students take classes with regular MBA students. There are three self-supported programs: Accounting (MPAc), Finance (MFin) and the FlexMBA, which was originally created by previous dean (Dave Stewart) and is operational now.

The undergraduate program is the largest in the UC system at 1227 students, primarily because of the large demand for a business degree, but also because for a long time UCR was the only other school in the UC system with an undergraduate business program besides UC Berkeley. In comparison, UCB and UCI have 725 and 388 undergraduate students respectively. A small but growing minority of the business undergraduates are in the MBPP program, which recruits students from Chinese universities through UCR Extension. The school has recently undergone a difficult AACSB reaccreditation process, the final result of which is still pending. The administration released a large number of SOBA’s existing faculty lines this year to address a key concern of the reaccreditation committee. The undergraduate program was reviewed by the Academic Senate this year and the comments should be carefully evaluated when released. Self-supporting programs are new and mostly comprise of students from China. While they are used as a funding mechanism, its role in fulfilling UC objectives should be carefully evaluated.
SOBA Faculty Recruitment, Separation, and Budget
SOBA has had tremendous faculty turnover in past years, e.g. during the last two years, 8 new faculty have been hired and 9 have separated. Overall, the size of SOBA faculty has shrunk. The difficulty of faculty hiring and retention is a major issue for the campus and for the school’s accreditation. Dean Wang presented a comparison between SOBA and their UC counterparts. SOBA’s state allocation and operating budget per student is the lowest in the system, and significantly below the average. At face value, one may conclude that there has been an underinvestment in the school. However, the School’s checkered past of internal conflicts and leadership issues over a number of years are at least part of the explanation. In the current year SOBA is searching for 13 faculty lines, and has been able to attract five new faculty members so far. At this rate the plan to grow the faculty size to 46 from 23 by 2015-16 seems unrealistic. Dean Wang spoke about internal faculty problems within the school although is not clear from his statements if the internal problems are still ongoing or their source.

UC Caliber Business School
Both in Dean Wang’s presentation and in SOBA’s budget request executive summary, it is stressed that SOBA strives to become a UC caliber business school by 2020. This is clearly a worthwhile goal; however, the roadmap to achieving it is not at all clear to the committee. Dean Wang would like to increase the size of the professional graduate program from the current 299 to 384 by 2016-17, which will increase the revenue from the self-supporting program significantly. However, to be a UC caliber school, the quality of the students and their placement has to increase significantly. Dean Wang was unable to provide statistics on the UG student placement; CPB will follow-up next year.

Issues Noted
The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of the SOBA:

1. SOBA seems to have had internal problems, and the large faculty turnover indicates deep underlying issues. Without a critical impartial review, it is not clear if those internal problems are still present and will pose a roadblock in moving forward.
2. The schools hiring plan seems to be unrealistic based on recent history.
3. Adequate space will be a problem after a couple of years.
4. The size of the undergraduate program appears to be too large.
5. It does not appear that there is a clear strategic roadmap to become a UC caliber school by 2020.
6. While self-supporting programs can generate significant funds, their contribution to the goal of UC should be critically evaluated.

Recommendations

1. CPB believes the Dean’s assessment is overly optimistic and too ambitious given the residual effect of past disturbances in the school. We suggest that an outside expert committee or consultants perform a comprehensive review of all business school programs including the size of the undergraduate program, analyze SOBAs strengths and
weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and recommend the best possible direction for
the school to succeed.

2. CPB recommends that future budget proposals and hiring plans be revisited in light of
recommendations made by the above committee.
REPORT ON THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT (VCUA)

VCUA Peter Hayashida visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 18, 2014. We thank him for sharing the budget and discussing the challenges and opportunities for University Advancement.

Background

University Advancement (UA) at UCR consists of four primary activities; alumni relations, strategic communications, development/fundraising and advancement administration and service. A key goal of UA is to raise public awareness of UCR’s excellence in knowledge creation, knowledge dissemination and service to the state and nation to secure public and private resources which enhances these academic activities in the campus. UA’s efforts benefit faculty and students directly through research support and scholarship as well as builds leading edge facilities and equipment’s that facilitates discovery, creation and dissemination of knowledge.

Summary of Discussion Items

VCUA Peter Hayashida spoke at length and answered questions about all aspects of university advancement including its budget. His presentation was thoughtful and engaging. VCUA Hayashida noted that the three key priorities of UA are (i) Building a Sustainable Culture of Philanthropy at UCR, (ii) Enhancing UCR’s National Profile (iii) Planning and Executing a Comprehensive Campaign. These are discussed below along with other discussion items.

Building a Sustainable Culture of Philanthropy

Building a sustainable culture for philanthropy requires the DNA of philanthropy to be assimilated into the campus culture. A multi prong approach of increasing focus on donor stewardship, expanding faculty staff and student engagement around philanthropy, leveraging and supporting the academic leaders’ strength, improving student and family experience and providing appropriate support for new campus initiatives and priorities can create such a culture at UCR. VCUA Hayashida noted that the campus has started several such new initiatives, such as a Dance Marathon, Student Philanthropy Week, and Philanthropic focused content across all types of media platform. These initiatives along with expanding the staff support for donor stewardship is moving the campus in the right direction.

Enhancing UCR’s National Profile

UCR’s national profile has increased rapidly in last few years starting with the Living The Promise campaign in 2012. However, compared to our sister schools UCR still has a long way to go and maintaining the momentum and continuity of national outreach cannot be overemphasized. Building a communication infrastructure for comprehensive brand building initiative is absolutely necessary. Some of the key initiatives in this area include permanently funding the Living The Promise campaign, hiring in-house campaign capacity and expertise, and expanding production and cross platform dissemination of digital media. Finally, positioning
the Chancellor and other faculty as thought leaders in the issues of access, diversity and academic excellence would provide national recognition to the campus.

**Planning and Executing a Comprehensive Campaign**

Currently UCR is in a comprehensive campaign based on UCR 2020. This is an ambitious fund raising initiative in UCR’s history with several major milestones having been achieved so far. A campaign consultant, Marts and Lundy has been hired, and the initial feasibility study has been completed. The campaign has entered the quiet phase with the approval from UC president. So far approximately 96 million dollars, 24% of the goal has been raised. The campaign will go to public mode when 40-50% of the goal is achieved. Some of the current priorities of the campaign include raising leadership gifts, engaging faculty and academic leadership and creating volunteer campaign committees.

**Private support and gifts**

VCUA Hayashida noted that while the gifts and support trend has increased after flat lining during recession years, it has taken a dip in current years. This he believes is linked to the change in top leadership. The following graphs show the trend and gift amounts over years. CPB notes that the spikes are associated with particular gifts, e.g. most recently the Chung grant in BCOE. The redline separates the way software donation is accounted for before and after IRS rule changes. Almost 11 million dollars of the post 2012 gift is accounted for by these changes.

**PRIVATE SUPPORT TREND**

![Private Support Trend Graph](image_url)
**Budget Sources and Staffing for development**

The graph above shows the staffing for development. VC Hayshed noted that the staffing has been quite stable except for strategic addition of few development officers, which increased from 37 to 44.

The budget sources for development for fiscal year 2013-2014 is 9.1 million and the different sources of the funds are shown in the graph below. More than 70% of the funds come from general funds followed by development fees. The development fees consist of a 5% charge to the new gifts and a 0.5% charge for year for administrative support to manage the UCR foundation of 125 million dollars.

**BUDGET SOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT**

**Benchmarking with UCSB**

The following graphs provide a comparison of UCR advancement operation with UCSB. VCUA Hayashida noted that on an absolute basis, the cash support for UCR is around 22 million per year while the cash support for UCSB is roughly 60 million dollars a year (almost 300% more than UCR). However, this can be misleading as there are many factors including the nature of the school, the alumnae base and the very different story of each campus.

**TEN-YEAR CASH SUPPORT COMPARISON**
UCSB started as a research school and focuses on engineering and sciences, while UCR started as a small liberal arts college. A comparison of the budget table below shows that overall, on development, UCSB spends three times as much money as does UCR. Thus the comparison between the two schools has to be done in the right context. While the number of students currently enrolled in UCSB and UCR are almost same, UCSB spend twice as much per student on advancement activities as UCR.

**UCR UCSB BUDGET COMPARISON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>19900 Funding</th>
<th>Non-State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Reltns/Alumni Affairs</td>
<td>553,244</td>
<td>3,354,300</td>
<td>553,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>8,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2,963,485</td>
<td>8,621,306</td>
<td>418,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Services</td>
<td>1,336,850</td>
<td>1,982,964</td>
<td>1,336,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin./Foundation</td>
<td>837,170</td>
<td>885,499</td>
<td>837,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>187,001</td>
<td>187,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two graphs below show the endowment per student and the 5 year average private support. In both cases UCR is at the bottom. Per student endowment depends on both the total endowment and the number of students and large public universities tend to lag smaller private schools like Case Western Reserve. However, it is also true that while UCR’s 5 year support is around 26 million dollars UCSB is much higher at 65 million dollars. Thus, according to VC Hayashida these are more about our aspirations as to where we want to go rather than where we are now.

UCR COMPARATOR SCHOOL
Issues Noted
The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of University Advancement:

1. In the past top leadership turnover has negatively affected the private gift flow.

2. While the private support at UCR is much less in absolute terms compared to UCSB it may not be a fair comparison given that the story of the two schools is quite different.

3. UCR is aware of its position among comparators, however the current comprehensive campaign based on UCR 2020 is going well and is likely to improve the situation.

4. The private grants generated by faculty and the development office should be separated.

5. Advancement is working with faculty and leadership to enhance UCR’s national profile.

6. The comprehensive campaign seems to be going well and has reached a quarter of its goal.

Recommendations

1. CPB recommends that the campus separate the private support generated by faculty endeavor from that is generated by development. This will facilitate a better understanding of the nature of quantum private support generated by faculty and development.
2. UA should create better metrics to evaluate the return on development dollars, for example along with budget per student one can look at budget/development staff or staff hours. Also dollars raised per dollar spent tells how efficiently the system is working. Again we understand no one metric can tell the whole story but relying on multiple measures can give a more accurate picture and also reduce gaming if any in the system.

3. As a campus community, we need to move toward building a sustainable culture for philanthropy into the DNA of UCR. Doing so is a noble goal for the campus and no resource should be spared to achieve this goal.

4. Overall the committee feels that things are moving in right direction and should be expedited to the extent possible.
REPORT ON THE COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

Dean Marylynn Yates visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on April 3, 2014. We thank her for a forthright and informative discussion.

Background

CNAS oversees the education of all students in the sciences and mathematics and much of the lower-division education for students in engineering. The UC Strategic Plan requires that the campus triple its grant income to $200M annually and increase its enrollment of graduate students by 88%. The majority of the increases in both grant income and graduate students on behalf of the University are expected to take place within CNAS. The discussion with the Committee focused upon how such growth might be achieved and what might limit the College to meet the expectations of the Strategic Plan. CNAS also is coming to the end of a multi-year process to retire old debts. Much of the cost savings necessary to retire these debts occurred through temporary reductions in staff allocations and in centralizing services, such as personnel and payroll that previously were maintained in departments.

Summary of Discussion items

Faculty numbers and recruitment
Dean Yates stated that CNAS already has an excellent faculty, but it does not have enough of them. Faculty numbers within CNAS have been flat for the last ten years whereas total enrollment increased by 19%. At the time of the presentation, the estimate was that UC Riverside would need to increase faculty numbers by a net of 250 by 2020 after resignations and retirements. This number recently increased to 300. Two major barriers toward achieving this target are a shortage of quality space within the College to accommodate all new faculty, and the funds necessary to provide competitive start-up funds, or initial complements (IC). Space issues will be addressed separately, but it was obvious that the indirect cost returns, currently about $3.5M to the college were vastly short of providing IC packages of $500K to $1.1M for the 36 faculty who are being recruited during the current year.

The Committee was deeply concerned that there is not, as yet, any sustainable model to generate the necessary IC funds to meet the recruiting goals or to keep CNAS from once again plunging into debt over IC costs.

Research space
These new faculty members, and their new graduate students, will require adequate high-quality research space if their grant proposals will be competitive in the current, highly competitive environment for Federal funding. Dean Yates was forthright with the Committee about the quality and quantity of research space within the College and acknowledged that this was a disincentive to recruiting excellent new faculty members.
The Committee appreciated Dean Yates' description of efforts to renovate some existing space and to capture some “lost” space in existing buildings, but we all agreed that these efforts were at the margins and not a realistic, long-term strategy to reach the announced faculty recruiting targets.

**Graduate Student Recruiting**

Even the most optimistic assumptions about the growth of faculty numbers do not predict that the goal of increasing the graduate student population by 88% will be reached. The committee agreed with Dean Yates that the barrier to increasing the graduate student population was not finding the students, but finding the funds to support the students; she expects that this obligation will fall to the faculty. Because TA resources are allocated on the basis of undergraduate enrollment, and because graduate student enrollment will increase far more rapidly than undergraduate enrollment, then TA resources are predicted to play a diminishing roll overall in the support of graduate students in the College. GSR support from central administration or CNAS funds also will be required to reach these graduate student targets, but it was not clear to what extent GSRs from College or central funds would be available.

**Extramural Funding**

Dean Yates acknowledged that the two most productive ways to triple extramural funding was through increasing the number of faculty applying for grants and to encourage and facilitate multi-investigator work groups applying for large (> $1M) grants. Dean Yates then described several new collaborative institutes that might provide such facilitation.

**Undergraduate Enrollment and Student Success**

Dean Yates and the Committee had a productive discussion about improving “student success” in the College through expanding, at least temporarily, enrollment in Freshman Year Learning Communities, and in expanding the offerings of “bottleneck” courses. This issue generated a frank discussion about whether the limitation in offering additional sections of bottleneck courses was due to a) a shortage of faculty instructors, b) a shortage of lecture rooms, or c), most critically, space for teaching laboratory sections associated with those courses.

**Realistic Budgeting**

The Committee appreciated Dean Yate’s presentation about the mismatch between how funds were allocated to the College, and how they needed to be spent. Allocations to the College for Staff and Faculty benefits are short of expenditures, so it is necessary to make up the difference from unfilled faculty FTEs. Similarly, allocations from the central administration for temporary teaching do not cover the costs for all categories of: TAs, Lecturers, and “Associates In,” and leave a deficit of nearly $900 K. Although the Dean’s instructions are to cover this deficit with unfilled faculty lines, the Committee wonders if this is practical, because the total value of unfilled faculty lines is only about $1.3 M, and there are additional demands on this resource, such as unfunded faculty and staff benefits.
Centralization of Administrative Services
Although it is clear that centralization of administrative services had contributed to cost savings, the issue of whether centralization had gone too far was discussed. Expertise about how the campus “works” has been lost within departments, and some feel that associated savings are illusory if efforts were simply transferred from staff to faculty.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that CNAS conduct a study of the utilization of space for lectures and teaching laboratories to determine the capacity of the College to admit and train students in its majors and to provide lower-division instruction, particularly in Mathematics and Physics, to undergraduates from the College of Engineering.

2. There should be no reason why the college should have to utilize unfilled faculty FTEs to pay for staff and faculty benefits. These costs are predictable and mandatory, and we recommend that these funds be allocated from the central administration to the colleges in full.

3. We recommend that the College and central administration have a frank discussion about the issue of competitive initial complements. A policy needs to be development that takes into account the expected number of hires in the STEM fields, and how the necessary IC packages will be provided on a sustainable basis. The Committee is concerned that a hiring plan has been adopted without sufficient thought to the costs of successful recruiting. The Committee is especially concerned if recruiting is attempted “on the cheap” with regard to competitive initial complement packages.

4. The Committee similarly is concerned that the faculty recruiting target is unrealistic considering the amount and quality of available space for research by those faculty and their many graduate students. Again, the Committee is concerned that faculty recruiting will be done “on the cheap” with regard to competitive allocations of research space. Compared to the institutions with which we compete for faculty, we recommend that careful, meaningful calculation be done to determine the amount of space necessary to meet the faculty recruiting targets, and that space be identified, before additional recruiting is done.

5. As with all Colleges, CNAS should publish their budget annually and the resource allocations should be transparent.

6. Finally, the Committee recommends that a “user satisfaction” survey be performed within CNAS to ensure that the recent centralization and consolidation of services still provides the faculty the same level of expertise and support as when such services were maintained in departments.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (SOM)

Vice Chancellor of Health Affairs & Dean Olds visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on April 7, 2014. We thank him for supplying detailed answers to our questions and for sharing his views.

Background

The School of Medicine (SOM) was granted preliminary accreditation in 2012 and the inaugural M.D. class matriculated in 2013.

Summary of Discussion Items

Overview (Mission and Vision)
The SOM is specifically focused on improving the health of the local community. This guiding principle has led to rather unique aspects for a school of medicine, including the student population and research mission.

Doctors predominately practice based on where they come from and where they do their training, and as a result, the SOM highly values students from the local area. This is evidenced by the population of the inaugural class, which has no out-of-state students. The educational focus of the School is on training generalists, which is not common.

In most medical schools the research mission focuses on basic science research due to their connection with specialists. The CPB thus wanted to better understand the research mission of the school. Dean Olds explained that the research mission of our SOM is broad and in addition to basic science research, translational and clinical research will also be prominent. More ambitiously, the vision is to develop an entire area of investigation that involves understanding how to implement healthcare, how to manage health care, and how to look for value in health care. This is often referred to as population based health outcomes and quality improvement research. As a result the partnering disciplines are also broader. The social sciences, including anthropology, sociology, and psychology, will form the majority of partners. They will be able to investigate important research topics that need to be address in health care. This creates an unusual platform for a medical school with a much larger research spectrum.

Dean Olds believes that in the future the money will be in managing populations well, rather than the current fee for service model. For this reason, he believes there is no need to take on the liability risks of building or buying a hospital. Instead, he would like to partner with hospitals and manage health care systems, for example the Riverside County Hospital in Moreno Valley. Loma Linda is one hospital that is considered more of a competitor; however, even there we have an agreement for primary care pediatric residency and have discussions over a joint VA program.
Joint Positions
Dean Olds stated that a big area of frustration was hiring faculty shared with other schools and colleges, which is necessary for the University to take full advantage of the SOM. He has tried for the past 4 years, without success, and stated that it typically fails due to "faculty” or “UC” rules. The committee pressed Dean Olds on this issue. The example he gave related to the attempt to agree on a joint search with CNAS. He said the deal fell apart over 9 month vs 12 month salaries (SOM requires 12 month appointments due to the nature of the medical education programs). There are a number of issues, including differences in teaching expectations, merit and promotion complications, 9 month vs 12 month salaries, etc which must be addressed. From the lengthy discussion, we gathered that there is a poor understanding (in both directions) and poor communication by all stakeholders (the SOM, CNAS, Academic Personnel, the Academic Senate, etc.). This is a problem that needs to be fixed. As the first order of business, we recommend that everyone to study the relevant sections of the APM and that the new VPAP charge the Academic Personnel Office with taking the lead in examining the issues with joint appointments.

Funding Status and Accreditation
The inclusion of $15M in the state budget allayed concerns about funding for the medical school. The money is taken off-the-top, and thus does not negatively affect rebenching allocations for the rest of the campus. The SOM is generating enough additional funds, though, e.g. clinical services, to support full costs, and campus funds have not and are not being directed to the SOM. Medical School students are given a weight of 5 in the rebenching formula. Currently the $15M currently exceeds the funds we would receive based through rebenching; however, when the student population grows, this will change. Projections indicate in 2017-18 we will have enough students to seek additional state money.

The SOM currently has preliminary accreditation from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the national accrediting body for educational programs leading to the M.D. degree. All new medical schools go through a three step accreditation process: (1) preliminary, (2) provisional, and (3) full. The SOM received preliminary accreditation in 2012. The largest concern, funding, was removed after the state included $15M in its budget specifically for the school. Provisional accreditation will be considered in 2015, half-way through the inaugural class’ program. Full accreditation will be considered in 2017, when the first year’s class graduates. Dean Olds does not foresee any problems in receiving full accreditation in the prescribed timescale.

Diversity
Dean Olds highlighted that diversity is big strength of the SOM, including 20% of faculty who are from underrepresented groups, based on ethnicity. The inaugural class consists of 44% of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, as standardly defined by social and economic factors. Out of that group, 21% are self-reported as coming from underrepresented groups. In terms of gender, 52% of the medical students are women, 56% of their graduate students are women, and 60% of the biomedical science faculty is women.
Space and Buildings
Lack of space is perhaps the most pressing issue for the SOM. Additional education space is required to accommodate the planned increases in the number of students, and the lack of quality and quantity of research could limit the ability to grow and attract the best faculty. The current first year class is 50 and the SOM is approved to increase to a medical school class size of 80, or 90 when including Biomed PhD student. It is anticipated that there will be 320 medical students, including any MD/PhD students, by the end of the decade. In order to accommodate the 1st year medical class as well as those from the bio-med program, the SOM will require a lecture room capable of holding 120-150 students. They also need 5-6 conference rooms that can hold at least 12 students. Since a new medical school building is no longer on the horizon, the two short term projects are (1) complete the 1st floor of their current research building, and (2) renovate the rest of Webber. The first is “shovel-ready”, and the SOM is pushing for this to move forward first.

Buildings needed range from outpatient facilities for faculty practices, in a variety of geographic locations, e.g. Palm Desert, for faculty practices to research buildings. New buildings are unlikely to be financed through bonds, at least for the foreseeable future. A combination of public-private partnerships and philanthropy, depending on the nature of the building, will be necessary.

Clinical Faculty
Hiring clinical faculty quickly is a priority as it is key to financial stability. Originally, the clinical faculty was built up quickly to offset the lack of state funding. The contracts we sign with clinicians have minimal risk and are a reliable form of income to partially support the School. Dean Olds anticipates $15M in clinical income next year, with a margin of 10-15%, which will be used to support educational and research initiatives in the school.

Graduate Medical Education
The graduate medical education program will be of similar size of the medical program, and is an important part of the mission of the SOM. We currently have 60-70 residents staring in 3-5 year programs, and plan to grow to 300-400. We receive $135-$155K per resident per year, while they cost $70- $85K to teach. The margin is used to cover the cost of the GME residency program, so there is then a built in way to cover the program.

Development
Dean Olds explained that fund-raising for Medical Schools has a different focus from the typical alumni model that is the focus of the development office, as 85% development in medical schools comes from those that have absolutely no association with the university. Most of our funds will come from foundations, in direct connection to our mission. We have had success already with, e.g., Kaiser ($3M) for student pipeline programs and mission scholarships, First 5 ($5M) to support pediatrics medicine, and the Desert Healthcare District ($10M) to expand primary care. Philanthropy is also an important factor (currently at $1-1.5M), and it will grow as we hire more doctors and have more patients. This is another reason to grow the clinical engine.
**Undergraduate Programs**

Dean Olds reported on two important programs for undergraduate students, the Health Professions Advising Center and the Medical Scholars Program.

The Health Professions Advising Center advises students from across the campuses who are interested in pursuing careers in the health sciences, including, e.g. medicine, veterinary care, optometry, nursing, and clinical psychology. The previous incarnation was run as the premed advising center through CNAS, but was cut during the budget crisis. It has since been assumed and broadened by the SOM. This is sensible as approximately 1/3 of med school students majored in non-science files. The SOM, however, receives no funds from the campus to run this advising, which as increased by 300% over the last 2 years. The SOM is requesting campus support, and the CPB finds this to be reasonable.

The Medical Scholars Program (MSP) accepts disadvantaged students as freshman and tutors them to succeed throughout their undergraduate career. There are a total of 450 students over the 4-year program, and half of the 1st year medical students come from the MSP. MSP students are sought after by top medical schools across the country.

**Recommendations**

1. Joint appointments are critical for the campus to take full advantage of the School of Medicine; however, agreements with other units have been elusive and not all joint appointments have worked well in the past. We recommend these issues be confronted immediately by all stakeholders. There are complex issues involved, such as 9 vs. 12 month appointments, teaching expectations, and merit and promotion issues. These issues need to be solved not only for the sake of the SOM but because joint appointments are additionally crucial for the success of the School of Public Policy. As the first order of business, we recommend everyone study the relevant sections of the APM and that the new VPAP charge the Academic Personnel Office with taking the lead in examining the issues with joint appointments.

2. CPB noted some disconnect between the SOM and the rest of the campus. We recommend the Chair of the Senate meet with Dean Olds, discuss any underlying issues, and chart a course to further improve the relationship with the Divisional Senate. CPB feels that some issues discussed are due to poor communication, misinformation, and lack of understanding across the campus, rather than inherent problems.

3. Lack of the space is a major area of concern for both the education and research needs of the SOM. The campus must face space issues head-on across campus in the planning process.

4. The campus should help support the Health Sciences Advising Center.
5. The campus plans for faculty growth lack central funded positions in the School of Medicine. CPB recommends that in order to fully take advantage of the School of Medicine and fill the spaces between the SOM and the other Schools and Colleges, that the campus selection process includes strategically allocating joint positions.
Dean Stephen Cullenberg visited the Planning and Budget Committee on April 7, 2014. The Committee thanks the Dean for his visit.

Background

The College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences encompasses 288 faculty in twenty departments. It invests heavily in one of UCR’s Strategic Plan priorities, the creative and performing arts. The Center for Ideas and Society sponsors interdisciplinary research, which is yet another key component of the 2020 plan. In addition, many CHASS faculty have won prestigious awards and grants that are prioritized by the AAU. In general, CHASS is an essential component to the university’s research profile and academic standing. In recent years it has been hit hard by the economic crisis, by cuts in staff and by faculty attrition. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013, faculty separations outpaced hires, making it even more essential that the College succeed in its growth plan of 50 new faculty hires over the next 3 years.

Summary of Discussion Items

Vision
The Dean emphasized the College’s commitment to academic excellence and diversity. Diversity is not defined solely by ethnicity or race but by scholarly approaches ranging from scientific inquiry, to historical study, literary interpretation and creative expression. CHASS, in other words, displays, in his view, remarkable intellectual diversity.

The 2020 plan and AAU Admission
The University is slated for growth over the next few years, and the Dean expressed considerable concern about whether CHASS would get its fair share of future FTEs. This concern grew out of an administrative meeting attended by the Dean where one hypothetical strategy for AAU admission was floated. The hypothetical strategy granted CHASS only 10 new FTEs of some 200 awarded campus wide. While no one on CPB was at that meeting, from what we can gather, no one in attendance was actually proposing this as an official plan. However, the exercise does raise questions about whether the campus goal of attaining the profile of an AAU institution by 2020 is realistic. Such an unbalanced plan is unlikely to receive consensus and may be counterproductive.

Internal Distribution of Resources in CHASS
The Dean has identified six Departments in the College as centers in excellence, ones that will be heavily invested in. These are Creative Writing, Hispanic Studies, English, Philosophy, Political Science and Psychology. Selection of these six was based on faculty research, graduate program excellence, contracts and grants and good internal governance.
TA-ships and Graduate Student Support
TAs for the college are allocated according to workload. Currently, the College tries to maintain section sizes of approximately 25 students. But these students are not fully funded by the University. Three quarters of TA funding comes from the University, and the remaining quarter is derived from unfilled faculty lines within the College. Teaching Assistant-ships are the primary means by which CHASS supports its students as opposed to the lab-based disciplines which can rely more on contracts and grants. Consequently, limits on TA funding means limiting the College’s ability to meet its goal of growing its graduate student body by 20 percent. One of the problems, in the Dean’s view, is that central administration has not sufficiently prioritized the funding of TA-ships. CPB requested an accounting for TA expenses for 2012-13 so that we could compare it with campus allocations, however, we did not receive the data. Therefore, we cannot make a firm recommendation as there are some inconsistencies we were not able to resolve.

Unfilled faculty lines
The Dean depends on 50 unfilled faculty lines as a revenue source for many budget items, including lecturers, faculty and staff benefit costs, and as mentioned, TA-ships. Dependence on unfilled lines as a revenue source is not a preferred, predictable, or sustainable funding model, as noted by the Dean and the Committee.

Staffing
To deal with severe cuts in funding, the College adopted a clustering model which assigns FAO’s to more than one Department. The College has lost almost 31% of its staff since FY 2010. To cope with this, administrative support was consolidated into seven clusters whereby FAO’s split their time between two Departments, and report to both Chairs. The Dean believes that overall clustering has worked adequately, but is not without its problems. It has generated an exceedingly heavy workload for staff which has lowered morale, and it has raised concerns about maintaining internal financial controls. The College has priority needs for more staff, particularly in payroll, human resources (academic personnel), and production/event management. In light of the increasingly importance assigned to securing external grants, CHASS also prioritizes the hiring of a grant writer, who could work with faculty to identify and pursue contract and grant opportunities.

Recommendations

1. The CPB requests that CHASS provide an accounting of TA funds, and a table or chart indicating budgeted vs expenditures for major categories, e.g., faculty, staff, benefits, TAs, and lecturers.

2. The College, with central administrative support, should find some way to improve faculty retention given its having suffered too many separations in recent years. When CHASS faculty receive outside offers, at times, the College’s counter-offers have not been sufficiently attractive to win the bidding war. Ironically, the problem is exacerbated by the high caliber of CHASS faculty who grab the attention of top-ranked
Departments who then attempt to lure them away from UCR. The College and its Dean need the full support of the new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost when it comes to enhancing retention packages, recognizing that salary levels must be consonant with today’s academic market forces, and counter-offers must match or exceed those of our university’s toughest competitors.

3. TA-ships support must increase, and a greater proportion of the TA funding should be shifted from temporary to permanent budgeted lines. This will help graduate advisors in allocating TA-ships by knowing ahead of time what allotments they have at their disposal. This in turn will help reduce the anxiety felt by graduate students who do not know from quarter to quarter whether they will be funded, or at what level, since not all of the graduate advisors have a predictable, annual allotment of College-based TA funds.

4. CPB agrees with the Dean that the Cluster model for staff is only a stop gap solution to a problem of an inadequate supply of personnel. The Committee endorses the College’s request for more staff support which would eventually allow CHASS to return to a model where each Department has a dedicated FAO.

5. The Committee lauds CHASS’ recent successes in increasing its awarded contracts and grants, and incentivizing the writing of proposals through such programs as the Faculty Contract and Grant Incentive and Recognition Program, launched in November 2013. It also applauds the College for its plan to increase contracts and grants by 25% each year for the next three years. At the same time, the Committee acknowledges that success (in and outside of the AAU) is measured not simply in dollar terms but by the prestige of the awards themselves. In this respect, CHASS can point to its faculty success in winning MacArthur, Guggenheim, Fulbright, Ford Foundation and American Council of Learned Society Grants and Fellowships, to name a few.

6. Finally, the committee would like to emphasize that a balanced growth plan will be necessary to achieve a profile of an AAU institution, and CHASS has an important role to play. Additionally, partnerships with the School of Medicine and School of Public Policy should be central and necessary for the campus to take full advantage of these Schools. To this end, joint positions will be crucial. We encourage CHASS to have discussions with the other units, including the Academic Personnel Office and the Academic Senate to work through the issues associated with joint appointments (e.g. merit and promotion, and teaching expectations).
The Committee and Budget was largely excluded from the budget process this year. In particular, the Chancellors Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) was disbanded. In previous years, the Chair of CPB was on CBAC and the committee was invited to the campus budget hearings. CBAC was formed in an era of budget cuts, and in many ways it circumvented the normal Senate consulting process, so in principle CPB does not object to this change. However, the decision was made very late in the year and CPB was not invited to participate in the budget vision day or budget hearings. With significant key administrative changes this year, we take this as an anomaly. We were asked to submit a list of budget priorities (submitted report appended); however, formulating constructive priorities in the absence of discussions was difficult. At least a two priority items, growing graduate students and TAs, were added to the administration’s campus investment priorities as a result of CPB’s feedback. We do not know, however, how this impacted the budget allocations. We also submitted a list of budget principles (submitted report appended). We have discussed the budget process with the Chancellor and new VCPB, and are hopeful CPB will be included in the process in future years.

Additional Senate participation

There should be required Senate Participation in any advisory committee (standing or ad-hoc) convened to advise the EVC/P and/or the chancellor on budgetary issues. Senate participants will be named by the Committee on Committees.

As part of the Senate’s mission to consult with the University’s planning processes, CPB will continue to consult with academic units throughout the academic year to understand their budget proposals. However, this does not take the place of representing the Senate in formal budget presentations between the Academic Units and the EVC/P and VCPB, which we feel is crucial. Further, a set calendar for the budget process, including hear dates and decision points, should be established well in advance and made public.
BUDGET PRINCIPLES

Background

The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d): “The Academic Senate is authorized to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget and to select a committee or committees to advise the President concerning the University budget.” We look forward to collaborating with the administration to fulfill our mission.

Guiding Principles

- **Strategic Plan.** The budgetary decisions are to be guided by goals expressed in the 2020 Plan: The Path to Preeminence. However, the feasibility and time scale to achieve the goals of the plan need to be reexamined annually based on budget limitations and critical needs must not be neglected. Resources needed to maximize the productivity of current faculty and to insure the retention of faculty must be given a high priority.

- **Integrated Planning and Budgeting.** It is essential that the integrated costs for each goal be considered. For example, the support for new faculty (research space, initial complement, staff support, retention, and support for graduate students) needs to be fully evaluated.

- **Budget Transparency & Consistency.** Transparency of campus budgets and the budget process, including discussion of determining priorities with allocations from central administration to the college, from the college to the department and from the department to individual faculty is paramount. Consistency demands that common methodology be implemented for budget requests, reporting, and accountability.

- **Collaborative Budget Process.** Administrative collaboration with the faculty via the Academic Senate must be an on-going discussion throughout each academic year.

Comments and Recommendations

1) CPB supports growth aligned with the ultimate achievement of having a profile consistent with a premier research institution, e.g. AAU institution. However, the growth should be balanced and realistic. The resources, space, and initial complement needs must be fully considered. A sustainable initial complement policy must be developed and the budgeted.

2) In order to make the growth of the graduate student population realistic and to support the research needs of faculty:
   a) Changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that NRT remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, it should be centralized. The Graduate Division should work with

---

2 CPB Budget Principles were submitted to VCPB Anguiano on April 14, 2014
individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

b) Centralization of graduate student tuition for students on GSR should be evaluated. This would incentivize an increase of externally funded GSR positions, which is a step toward growing the graduate PhD population.

3) Transitioning unfunded students to funded status and replacing them with non-residents is of central importance.

4) The office of undergraduate education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population. Converting the Office of Undergraduate education an academic unit parallel to the Graduate Division should also be considered. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses.

5) A comparison of budgeted and expenditures must be made for all units. Disparities in funding for benefits need to be fixed. Increasing TA needs to align with workload should be made.

6) The campus should develop a more aggressive and positive retention policy.

7) The Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget commits to providing ongoing analysis and constructive ideas for all budget matters.
1. **New Faculty at actual costs**
   Increasing the percentage of filled faculty positions, which is low compared to other UC schools, should be a top priority. Actual costs, including rank/step, off-scale, and benefits, of these new faculty, must be taken into account. The full costs, including graduate students, space, initial complements (priorities 2-4 below), must be allocated in parallel.

2. **Graduate Students Support & Graduate Student Success**
   The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR-2020 and is intricately tied to the success of current and new faculty. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular: (1) Additional funds should be allocated to pay the tuition portion of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards. (2) The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will go away as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded students. (3) Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.

3. **Space**
   The lack of quality and quantity of space may be the largest hurdle to attracting top faculty and assuring their productivity. In the short term, additional funds to provide adequate space through renovations must be allocated in parallel with new faculty. In the long term, costs to provide adequate space through construction will be substantial and must be planned accordingly.

4. **Initial Complements**
   The full costs of Initial complements consistent with the recruitment of top faculty must be budgeted in parallel with new faculty. Initial complements should be fully funded centrally or should be a transparent budget line item in each college. The funding level should be based on a market rate analysis for the given field.

---
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5. **Undergraduate Student success**
   This includes support for students to graduate in 4 years, ease the transfer from CC, maintain diversity and support programs for a diverse student population, and online course access. Student success programs should be well balanced and not neglect the success of our students in upper division classes, and their efficacy should be regularly evaluated from all perspectives (student, faculty, and administration).

6. **Retention Support**
   Retention of our most productive faculty poses a great threat to our aspirations. Retention costs should be considered an anticipated cost of doing business. The retention process should be a strategic process and should including consideration of the costs associated with replacing existing faculty members, including initial complement. Anticipated costs should be explicitly budgeted and the process (both pre and post retention) should transparent as to not alienate current and future faculty.

7. **Strategic Software Investments**
   One-time investments, such as software to improve the budget process and reporting improvements, improvements to SARA, and the development and improvement of other campus applications such as GradSIS for enrolled students, CRAMS, as well as graduate and undergrad recruitment initiatives should not be neglected. They impact our ability to make strategic decisions, our effectiveness in recruiting, and efficiencies and productivity for students and faculty.
Committee on Planning and Budget (2013-14)

Kenneth N. Barish, Physics and Astronomy (Chair)
Bir Bhanu, Electrical Engineering (Fall quarter)
Kimberly A. Hammond, Biology
Dan Hare, Entomology
Barry K. Mishra, Area of Accounting
David S. Pion-Berlin, Political Science
Roger L. Ransom, History
Mike Vanderwood, Graduate School of Education