At its meeting on January 28, 2022, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the Academic Planning and Budget Office Bruin Budget Model White Paper and offers the following observations for the Executive Board’s consideration:

Members commented that the original response provided by the Council on Planning and Budget is still relevant and most of those concerns and questions were still not addressed in the latest iteration of the Bruin Budget Model White Paper.

Members mentioned that existing interdisciplinary structures, like IDPs and CIIs, are not always sustainable and the Bruin Budget Model White Paper does not address the fundamental issues associated with running interdisciplinary programs on campus. Instead, the report states that existing permanent and temporary budgets for interdisciplinary units and projects will continue with no impact under the new model. Members wondered whether and which organizational structures might be advanced to incentivize cross-disciplinary collaboration on campus. Members highlighted the fact that newer self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) are actively encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, but that there is no similar development structure or incentive for state-supported programs. Members wondered whether IDPs and SSGPDPs can potentially be used as test cases for cross-disciplinary collaboration for the purposes of this new budget model. Members agreed that if the new budget model only works to reinforce divisional boundaries, then interdisciplinary collaboration may become even more difficult.

Members emphasized the importance of consulting with business managers and other relevant staff in all units as these professionals need to be given an opportunity to advise whether the new model will simplify operations for departmental administration. Members were concerned that MSOs and CAOs are often left to implement university wide changes without proper consultation.

Members agreed with the recommendation to the Academic Senate by the Council on Planning and Budget that it have an active role with respect to reviewing any budgetary issues that might arise, especially in light of UCOP’s growing interest in trying to re-delegate approval of new master’s degree programs to individual campuses.

Members agreed with the Council on Planning and Budget’s assessment that non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) is not always a revenue source: for some departments it is a major, and burdensome,
expense. The Academic Planning and Budget office should address this issue in a future iteration of the document.

One member stated that it would be helpful for the Academic Planning and Budget Office to include a figure for revenue from graduate student FTE that parallels Figure 8 (Hypothetical Flow of Tuition/NRST Revenue), which only addresses revenue from undergraduate FTE, since distribution/flow of graduate student revenue may differ substantially from that for undergraduates.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our views on this matter. If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council’s Analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.