Challenges

**Enrollment growth with reduced state funding:**
- 24% reduction in state funds
- 7 out of prior 8 years with no tuition increase
- Re-benching initiative by Office of the President
- Enrollment growth without matching resources:
  - Worsening student / faculty ratios
  - Shift in teaching load from ladder faculty to lecturers
  - Growing deferred maintenance

**Recent trends that are likely to repeat:**
- Nonresidents cap for UCLA, Berkeley, & UCSD
- Low general funds revenue growth in FY19 & FY20
  - (FY19) tuition buyout as one-time funding even though expenses are recurring
  - (FY20) 1% year-over-year increase in general funds
- New assumptions for pension plan driving increased employer contributions over next 6-years

Strategies/Opportunities

**Prior strategies - less available now:**
- Continuous enrollment growth
- Consistent tuition increases
- Grow ratio of nonresident students

**New and emerging strategies:**
- Running a budget savings and reallocation initiative to both keep us in balance and to bring funds back to the center to reinvest in strategic priorities. This includes:
  - $25M in permanent reductions to administrative units;
  - $25M in a recapture of central unit reserves;
  - $25M in accelerated gift funds utilization; and
  - $25M in other budget-strengthening actions such as:
    - improving on our campus indirect cost rate recovery
    - capitalizing on OP’s new investment strategies
- On-line and hybrid degrees and certificates
- Summer Session
- Major philanthropic initiatives
- IP commercialization
- Business transformation
- Launching a new budget model to improve on resource allocation and provide incentives
As forecasted in both UCOP’s systemwide model and UCLA’s internal forecast, challenging, but manageable, years are directly ahead.

• Chart shows the results of a 4-year forecast for UCLA core funds prepared by the Office of the President compared to our internal forecast.
• Both show significant funding shortfalls even if Oakland’s forecasted revenue projections for state and student fees is accurate.
• More recently, the model has been updated to include:
  • The phasing in of cohort tuition – using OPs get to CPI like adjustment in 5 years; and
  • The impact of a 3% pension increase, phased in over the next 6-years.
• UCLA’s projected shortfall by 2023, prior to actions to close the gap, would be $127M which is 8% of core funds revenue.

### Key Budget Prior Model Assumptions and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UCOP Systemwide Model – UCLA campus</th>
<th>UCLA Revenue Model – Middle Case Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCOP model to assess budget policy implications</td>
<td>Internal model to help manage budget scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment plan</td>
<td>UCLA 4-year enrollment plan of &lt;1% annual growth</td>
<td>UCLA 4-year enrollment plan of &lt;1% annual growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State funding</td>
<td>Annual increases of ~3%</td>
<td>Annual increases of ~3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition increases</td>
<td>Annual increases of ~2.5%</td>
<td>Annual increases of ~2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE staff added</td>
<td>60 academic, 80 non-academic linked to enrollment</td>
<td>No new FTEs – other than already committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension increases</td>
<td>Increasing surcharge (above 14%) to reach +3%</td>
<td>No new surcharge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NEW BUDGET MODEL UPDATE**

**RECAP**

**Why a new model?**

1. Dramatic reduction in core funds revenue growth
2. Incremental model a poor fit for budget context
3. New model can outperform legacy model

**What can it do better?**

1. Match activities with funding
2. Add transparency and provide incentives
3. Restore and maintain funds in the center
4. Eliminate wasteful administrative recharges

**4 Year Process to Develop a New Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>• Peer research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>• UM engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>• Dean’s sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21 &amp;</td>
<td>• Fine tuning – based on feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2021</td>
<td>• Prepare campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution of Core Funds Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Activity-based</td>
<td>Tuition, ICR, Summer, PDST, SSDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Centralized</td>
<td>State, Investment income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What we have heard so far**

- Model as benchmarking tool
- Winners and losers
- 80% weight on teaching
- Faculty merits
- Interdisciplinary activities
- Self-supporting degree programs and tax rates

**KEY ASPECTS & WHAT WE HAVE HEARD**

- Dramatic reduction in core funds revenue growth
- Incremental model a poor fit for budget context
- New model can outperform legacy model

- Match activities with funding
- Add transparency and provide incentives
- Restore and maintain funds in the center
- Eliminate wasteful administrative recharges

**Each School receives:**

- Activity-based funding
- Supplemental funding, initially set to get to current baseline
- Other support (commitments)
APPENDIX SLIDES – MORE ON NEW BUDGET MODEL FROM SPRING 2019
Introduction: A new budget model for UCLA

Core funds revenue growth has dramatically slowed at UCLA – and that is likely to continue:

+ 5.4% = 5-year core funds\(^1\) compound annual revenue growth rate (CAGR) from 2012 to 2017

+ 1.8% = 3-year core funds compound annual revenue growth rate (CAGR) from 2017 to 2020

\(^1\) Core funds support UCLA’s educational mission and primarily include and include state, tuition and fees, and indirect cost recovery on sponsored research

Main reasons why lower core-funds revenue growth is expected:

State Funding:

1. FY08 to FY17, state funding declined by 24%  
2. In FY20, under a new Governor, general funds increased by 1% year-over-year

Enrollment and Tuition:

3. FY08 to FY19, UG FTE increased by +22%; our latest long range enrollment plan shows < 1% annual growth
4. Tuition has been frozen in 7 out of past 8 years

NRST:

5. FY08 to FY19 nonresident undergraduates increased from 6% to 23%
6. In FY18, Regents adopted a nonresident cap

Limitations of Incremental Budgeting:

- Does not incentivize unit revenue growth or cost control
- Difficult to maintain in periods of stagnant growth

A new budget model fit for UCLA:

Under the sponsorship of our Chancellor, EVC, and CFO, UCLA’s Office of Academic Planning and Budget has been leading a consultative process to design a new budget model - it has included:

- **Forming an advisory committee** staffed with 3 Assistant Deans, 2 members of the Academic Senate’s Council on Planning and Budget, 2 senior faculty members, and a senior central unit leader

- **Conducting interviews with each of our Academic Deans** where conversations focused on experiences prior to UCLA for newer Deans, and historical perspectives for longer-tenured Deans

- **Engaging in deep dive discussions with several peer institutions** that have implemented new budget models (University of Michigan, UNC, UW, Temple, and Florida)

- **Reviewing published research** on university budget models and engaged EAB’s top senior advisor for business affairs

We have developed a new model for UCLA that we believe will perform better than the legacy model in 4 areas:

1. Better aligning resources with activity cost drivers;
2. Creating incentives and support for units to be entrepreneurial (where there is opportunity) that could help drive non-traditional revenue growth;
3. Restoring and establishing a stronger central investment fund for the EVC to make strategic investments in academic and research programs; and
4. Replacing the costly internal recharge program that creates poor incentives for campus units to utilize centrally provided services.
UCLA has been working on a significant change to its budget model – the first time in many years

The main reason to proactively change our incremental budget model is because our current model will not perform well in the current and future budget context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current / Future Context</th>
<th>Main Factors</th>
<th>Why Not Status Quo / Incremental Budgeting?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Low revenue growth rate in</td>
<td>• At physical campus enrollment capacity</td>
<td>EAB Business Affairs Forum 2016: Common Limitations of Incremental Budgeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general funds</td>
<td>• Nonresident cap per Regents’ policy</td>
<td>• Does not incent unit revenue growth or cost control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong political opposition to fee increases</td>
<td>• Difficult to maintain in periods of stagnant growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Likely disappointing state funding outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Underfunded Chancellor and</td>
<td>• Chancellor’s discretionary funds fully committed over next 3-years</td>
<td>The campus permanent budget exceeds current and projected general funds revenue. In order to restore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC discretionary funds</td>
<td>• General funds revenue fully allocated to unit permanent budgets – no longer</td>
<td>discretionary funding to the Chancellor and EVC, incremental budgeting would require annual budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Chancellor’s share</td>
<td>cutting exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Increased pressure to find</td>
<td>• Revenue strategies will take time and actions to generate savings will be</td>
<td>Under the current incremental model:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new efficiencies and</td>
<td>required to maintain balance</td>
<td>• Unit ending balances have grown by 50% over the prior 10- yrs (resource allocation is not optimized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimize resource</td>
<td>• New ventures and strategic priorities will have to be funded through</td>
<td>• Even with flat general funds, Central units can increase spending through internal recharges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allocation</td>
<td>reallocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Defined set of revenue</td>
<td>Areas with high future growth potential:</td>
<td>Historically-set (less transparent) permanent budgets are a poor incentive for revenue growth at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth opportunities</td>
<td>• SSDPs; online; and summer</td>
<td>where we are asking for a significant faculty effort to realize new opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research/ICR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intellectual property monetization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Private philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Uneven campus distribution</td>
<td>• Revenue growth opportunities are not equally accessible by all Schools</td>
<td>Units that rely disproportionately on general funds will be highly constrained and will require a large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of revenue growth</td>
<td></td>
<td>central discretionary fund that the Chancellor and EVC can use to provide additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process has been informed by several internal and external consultations, including significant engagement with the University of Michigan

1. As part of this process, APB connected with several peers who run different hybrid models and also with EAB’s lead expert.

2. We selected Michigan to engage more deeply because: (1) their academic quality and positive trends; and (2) their version is closer to what we believe could be successful at UCLA – an alternative to pure RCM with a significant central fund for the EVC to invest in strategic priorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USNWR Program Rankings 2019</th>
<th>Rankings by R&amp;D Expenditures 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>UCLA Rank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. We have had an opportunity to learn from Michigan’s 25 years of model experience – and they have been very willing to share.

At Michigan in the past 10 years, General Fund allocations for academic units have grown 2X faster than central units:

**Average Annual Growth Rates through FY 2019**

- Total GF Budget: 6.2%
- Academic Units: 6.5% + 4.7%
- Central Financial Aid: 9.5%
- Central Units: 3.7% + 3.3%
- Mandatory University Items: 0.3%

Certain key findings from most recent Michigan internal budget model review process:

- External colleagues view U-M as a leader in budgeting
- U-M model incentivizes revenue growth and management of costs
- Units are encouraged to consider costs and margins on activities when evaluating changes to curriculum and programs
- Deans and directors have wide latitude to make strategic decisions appropriate to their units
- The system provides timely feedback to the EVC when spending and revenues are out of balance
- EVC has sufficient resources to bridge units through budget challenges
- University can support excellence & strategic innovation in units, even when a unit's revenues are constrained
- EVC has sufficient funds to support central initiatives
UCLA Proposed New Budget Model

**Today’s Model:** Mostly permanent budgets + incremental funding

**New Model:** Designed as a hybrid system of activity-linked, incremental, and centralized/initiative-based budgeting

We believe this system will perform better than the legacy model in 4 areas:

1. Better aligning resources with activity cost drivers;
2. Creating incentives and support for units to be entrepreneurial where there is opportunity and providing strong central support for where there is less opportunity;
3. Establishing a stronger central investment fund for the EVC to make strategic investments in academic and research programs; and
4. Replacing the costly internal recharge program that creates poor incentives for campus units to utilize centrally provided services

**Next Steps**

- **2018-19**: Model developed through consultations – presented at 3/1/2019 leadership retreat
- **2019-20**: Prototype of model built and shared with each Dean; Retreat(s) to focus on readiness to adopt
- **2020-21 – Anticipated**: Budget preparation to commence in January 2021 using the new model (and new multi-year Ascend tool)
- **2020-21 - Anticipated**: Model goes live with start of fiscal year (7/2/2021)

**Distribution of Revenue**

- **UG Tuition & UG NRST**: $400M
- **Grad Tuition & Grad NRST**: $120M
- **Indirect Cost Recovery**: $200M
- **Summer, PDST, SSDP**: $250M
- **State General Funds**: $400M
- **Investment Income**: $100M

0.8 teaching + 0.2 major (blended tuition rate)

**Chancellor/EVC**

$1.0B

**General Fund Supplement and Other Commitments**

- **20-25% Core Funds Tax ($250M)**
- **5-10% Core Funds Tax ($250M)**

**Schools (Core Funds)**

$1.0B

**Schools (Non-Core Funds), Med Center, Auxiliaries, S&S**

$5.0B

**Central Units (on Core Funds)**

$600M

**Academic & Student Support Units Commitments**

$100M

**Chancellor/EVC Commitments**

$50M

**Today’s Model**

Mostly permanent budgets + incremental funding

**New Model**

Designed as a hybrid system of activity-linked, incremental, and centralized/initiative-based budgeting

**Next Steps**

- **2018-19**: Model developed through consultations – presented at 3/1/2019 leadership retreat
- **2019-20**: Prototype of model built and shared with each Dean; Retreat(s) to focus on readiness to adopt
- **2020-21 – Anticipated**: Budget preparation to commence in January 2021 using the new model (and new multi-year Ascend tool)
- **2020-21 - Anticipated**: Model goes live with start of fiscal year (7/2/2021)
FROM
Permanent general funds budgets that re-appropriate each year

TO

Academic all-funds budget with 3 components:
1. Direct/earned revenue
2. Activity-based allocation
3. Supplemental allocation

Academic Units:
All-Funds Budget = Direct/ Earned Revenue + Activity-Based Allocation + General Fund Supplement (Chancellor) → Simplified Tax

- Gifts, grants, sales & service, royalties
- 100% or based on policy
- Core funds: Tuition, SSDP, PDST, Summer, ICR
- Based on activity driver
- Additional funds required to get to funding baseline
- Chancellor’s priorities
- Replaces recharges
- Core funds tax ~20-25%
- Non-core funds tax ~5-10%

Central Units:
All-Funds Budget = Direct/ Earned Revenue + Chancellor Allocation

- External or premium service internal only
- Set annually during budget process

Other Units (Auxiliaries, Medical Center, Athletic):
All-Funds Budget = Direct/ Earned Revenue + Simplified Tax

- 100% or based on policy
- ~5-10% of expenditures
- Replaces recharges

Advantages
- The activity-based allocation aligns revenues and costs
- Empowers the academic units
- Positions EVC’s Office as partner rather than parent
- Enables entrepreneurial approach to teaching/research
- Promotes culture of fiscal responsibility
- Establishes simplicity and transparency in UCLA budgeting

Challenges
- Necessary to have skilled unit leaders with strong financial management support
- Facilitating cross-unit collaboration may require adjustments to budget model

* informed by U-M shared takeaways from their model review
+ / - of Proposed Changes (tax replaces administrative recharges)

FROM

Multiple taxes (UCOP, UCPath, TIF) and central services recharges

TO

Two simple (reasonable) tax rates to cover nearly all central costs

Taxes align with unit activity:
- Units are taxed according to their activity levels
- Expenditures are used as the proxy for unit activity — expenditures are assumed to reflect activity levels
- Some expenditures are tax exempt:
  - To encourage particular uses (e.g., financial aid)
  - Because they are assumed to be a poor proxy for activity levels (e.g., capital)

Core Funds Tax: Estimate 20 – 25%
- Tax Rate
- Adjusted Expenditures
- Tax Assessment

Non-Core Funds Tax: Estimate 5-10%
- Tax Rate
- Adjusted Expenditures
- Tax Assessment

Advantages
- Simplifies UCLA tax system (currently there are multiple taxes combined with recharges)
- Eliminates administrative effort around internal recharges (millions of transactions to move dollars across the campus)
- Allows central service leaders to manage their funds more strategically
- Shifts the conversation with academic leaders from transactional costs to service needs and service levels
- Establishes a constraint for how fast central service budgets can grow in aggregate (no faster than academic or auxiliary resources)

Challenges
- There is likely to be an opening gap between desired service levels and funded service levels
- Will still need some recharge model for “premium services” but those should be minimized

* informed by U-M shared takeaways from their model review
+ / - of Proposed Changes (co-managed faculty funding account)

FROM
- All faculty funding on 19900 funds flows through a single central-account

TO
- 16 separate co-managed faculty funding accounts
  - Co-managed by APB and Dean's office
  - Turnover savings retained and base funding increases as primary source of funding
  - Additional support provided by EVC where needed

5-Year Average Faculty Funding Components:
- 3.5% Annual % Change in Faculty Comp
- 2.5% Annual % Change from Merits & Promotions
- 2.3% Annual % Change from Range Adjustments
- 1.9% Annual % Base Upgrades from Central Account
- 3.2% Annual % Turnover Savings into Central Account

Today: All faculty comp transactions flow through a single account
- Merits, range adjustments, and upgrades provided centrally from turnover savings and general fund revenue increases
- Turnover savings captured centrally

Future: Individual School faculty comp accounts – co-managed with APB
- Merits, range adjustments, and upgrades funded from turnover savings retained, base funding increases, and EVC support (if needed)
- Turnover savings retained by schools

Advantages
- Preserves core aspects of the faculty funding model of today
- Let’s Schools keep their own turnover savings to reinvest in faculty
- Connects faculty costs to resources of schools – a more sustainable model
- Allows EVC to invest in faculty where needed – not evenly across the board

Challenges
- Deans’ offices will have to work closely with APB to determine necessary faculty funding set asides each year and sources
- Current and future model relies on patterned turnover which can be uneven over years and difficult to predict
Budget Tool Simulation

UCLA NEW BUDGET MODEL INTERACTIVE DASHBOARD

Select one: ALL ACADEMIC UNITS

GLOBAL MODEL INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAA Rate</th>
<th>2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAL Distributions Weights</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Weight</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Increase</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Supplement</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenue Growth Rate</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAKING FORECAST OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Tuition Dollars</th>
<th>Net Grad Tuition Dollars</th>
<th>Net Undergraduate Tuition Dollars</th>
<th>Undergraduate Tuition Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>$412,873</td>
<td>$609,150</td>
<td>$526,851</td>
<td>$576,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>$435,851</td>
<td>$602,500</td>
<td>$548,825</td>
<td>$582,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>$450,562</td>
<td>$604,000</td>
<td>$560,125</td>
<td>$595,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>$458,23</td>
<td>$604,000</td>
<td>$560,125</td>
<td>$595,562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTIVITY-BASED REVENUE GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. UNIVERSE/ACADEMIC</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GA Resident Headcount</th>
<th>GA Non-Resident Headcount</th>
<th>University Revenues (Sum of D and E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>1,334,940</td>
<td>1,370,329</td>
<td>1,387,726</td>
<td>4,205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>1,387,726</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>1,400,350</td>
<td>4,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL FUNDING BASELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition Revenues</td>
<td>$580,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Session Revenue</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$87,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues Distributed</td>
<td>$707,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generated Revenue</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersegmental Transfers</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues Distributed</td>
<td>$798,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL ACADEMIC UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2019 - 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues Distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generated Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersegmental Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues Distributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Model Projection Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Model</th>
<th>Original Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The UCLA budget model is designed as a hybrid system of activity (level, incremental), and enrollment/revenue-based budgeting. The focus is on eliminating programmatic operations and expenses. The system also performs better than the legacy model in 4 areas: (1) better aligning resources with activity cost drivers, (2) enrolling (less than 2) students and support for units to be entrepreneurial (where there is opportunity) that could be used to drive non-traditional revenue growth; (3) ensuring and establishing a stronger control/investment fund for the UC system to make strategic investments in academic and research programs; and (4) reducing the required internal exchange programs that create poor incentives for campus units to utilize similarly provided services.
More on the New Model

Early feedback from conversations with Senate Leadership, Deans and their management teams and points raised at prior Leadership Retreats

• The new model must support and create incentives for interdisciplinary work (cross-School collaboration)
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ Today, interdisciplinary work is substantially funded by the EVC and a stronger “central fund” for the EVC will enable deeper investment
  ◊ Collaborative teaching and research activities will have a built in shared allocation of revenue that does not exist today

• The tuition allocation by student credit hour should not create the wrong incentives – for example a new program to create duplicative courses to keep all the credit hour funding
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ UCLA has exceptionally strong policies and layers of oversight (e.g. Senate, EVC) in place, which then creates proper boundaries and guidelines for the campus to adhere to
  ◊ Under the new model, each School relies on EVC funding through the general fund supplement and new commitments – it should discourage bad behavior

• The model should not overly weight teaching in funding allocations and support for research-focused organizations should be as strong
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ At Michigan – with a similar model, research performance has been outstanding (#2 in expenditures with strong growth in the past decade)
  ◊ Increasing ICR distributions for use as a research incentive and re-investment fund for Schools/Departments has been a changed asked for over many years

• The faculty merit process which runs without any financial considerations and constraints should be preserved to the extent possible
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ Today’s model is not sustainable and there is a need to make sure that all categories of expense commitments have a funding source
  ◊ The new model uses the same funding mechanisms to fund faculty merits – and recognizes and sets aside funds for cases where the EVC needs to invest, particularly related to key retentions

• The new model should not be an incentive for academic units to hire more lecturers or more junior faculty
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ Under the current model, undergraduate teaching by lecturers has gone from 47% to 58% in the past decade and student/faculty ratios have deteriorated dramatically – it is time to try something new
  ◊ Academic quality will always be a top priority and APB will work closely with units through the budget process to keep that as the focus

• Central services should be more accountable under the new model
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ At Michigan, academic budgets grew 2X the rate of central budgets in the past decade – this is not true at UCLA. The new model has dynamics that promote that.
  ◊ The new model is an opportunity to create and communicate “service level” statements for key central services – budgets will also be more transparent

• How can we go live with a new model when we are still discussing options and the best rules to apply
  APB thoughts on topic:
  ◊ It is expected we will be running reviews of the model post-live and we will be making adjustments to things that we didn’t get right. Michigan made several adjustments over a 25-year period and while we can learn from their experience, we also know that UCLA is unique and we should be continuously striving to make improvements to how resources are allocated to support our mission.