

# Council on Planning and Budget

## CPB's Budget Model Working Group Recommendations: Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan

### Table of Contents

<b>Exec Divisional Response</b>	1
---Dear VC/CFO Goldman,	1
---I am delighted to share two complementary reports by the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) concerning the Bruin Budget Model (BBM), which were endorsed by the UCLA Academic Senate's Executive Board at its meeting on June 3, 2021. The Reports, writt...	1
---The Bruin Budget Model Assessment Key Metrics identifies a dozen key metrics thought to be particularly useful in monitoring the impact of the BBM. The Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan uses these and other metri...	1
---As a model of shared governance, we thank you and your colleagues for your engagement and collegiality in this ongoing initiative to improve the efficacy, transparency, and assessment of the BBM. As part of this iterative process, we share the expecta...	1
---Sincerely,	1
<b>CPB CPB to EB_BMWG Cover Letter_5-26-2021</b>	3
<b>CPB CPB's BMWG Recommendations for the BBM Oversight and Assessment Plan_June 2021</b>	4
---Background	6
---Overview of Recommendations for Oversight and Assessment Plan	7
---Growth in Revenue from Non-traditional Areas	9
---Creation and Use of Provost's Central Investment Fund	11
---Change from Internal Recharge Programs to Central Services	13
---Global and National Rankings for UCLA	14
---Undergraduate Education	15
---Graduate Education	18
---Research and Creative Activities	21
---Appendix 2	23
<b>CPB BBM Assessment Key Metrics June 2021</b>	24
---Introduction	24
---General Fund Supplement	24
---Other revenue generation	24
---Impact on undergraduate and graduate education	25

June 8, 2021

Gregg Goldman  
Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

**Re: Council on Planning and Budget's Budget Model Working Group Assessment Report and Proposed Dashboards**

Dear VC/CFO Goldman,

I am delighted to share two complementary reports by the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) concerning the Bruin Budget Model (BBM), which were endorsed by the UCLA Academic Senate's Executive Board at its meeting on June 3, 2021. The Reports, written by CPB's *ad hoc* subcommittee, the Budget Model Working Group (BMWG), are titled *Bruin Budget Model Assessment Key Metrics* and *Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan*. Please visit the CPB Reports web page to review these important new analyses, as well as CPB's previous reports on the BBM.

The *Bruin Budget Model Assessment Key Metrics* identifies a dozen key metrics thought to be particularly useful in monitoring the impact of the BBM. The *Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan* uses these and other metrics to make recommendations for the construction of a broader set of dashboards to measure growth in revenue from non-traditional areas, use of the Provost's Central Investment Fund, the change from internal recharge Programs to central services, global and national rankings for UCLA, undergraduate education, graduate education, and research and creative activities.

As a model of shared governance, we thank you and your colleagues for your engagement and collegiality in this ongoing initiative to improve the efficacy, transparency, and assessment of the BBM. As part of this iterative process, we share the expectation that over time the dashboards described in the *Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan* would move from only being accessed by people with a UCLA logon to become public-facing dashboards. It is expected that the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) will prepare an annual report based on the dashboards. We strongly support administration's commitment to a robust annual evaluation.

Sincerely,



Shane White  
Chair  
UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Michael Beck, Administrative Vice Chancellor  
Gene Block, Chancellor  
Emily Carter, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate  
Aimée Dorr, Budget Model Working Group Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate  
Yolanda Gorman, Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Chief of Staff  
Tim Groeling, Council on Planning and Budget Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate  
Michael Levine, Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel  
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
Emily Rose, Assistant Provost and Chief of Staff  
Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget

May 26, 2021

Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate

**Re: CPB's Budget Model Working Group Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model and Proposed Dashboards**

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on May 3, 2021 the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed and unanimously approved the Budget Model Working Group's (BMWG) Recommendations for the Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan. CPB members offered a few suggestions, which were added to the report and proposed dashboards. Professor Aimée Dorr chaired the Working Group in 2020-21; its members thoroughly discussed the budget model's performance metrics and proposed a set of dashboards to evaluate its efficacy. Enclosed are the documents approved by the CPB and shared with the Executive Board.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at [groeling@comm.ucla.edu](mailto:groeling@comm.ucla.edu) or via the Council's analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at [efeller@senate.ucla.edu](mailto:efeller@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,



Tim Groeling, Chair  
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget  
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget



## Bruin Budget Model Oversight and Assessment Plan

### Recommendations from the Council on Planning and Budget

May 18, 2021

## Contents

Background .....	3
Overview of Recommendations for Oversight and Assessment Plan.....	4
<b>Growth in Revenue from Non-traditional Areas .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Creation and Use of Provost’s Central Investment Fund .....	8
Change from Internal Recharge Programs to Central Services .....	10
Global and National Rankings for UCLA.....	11
Undergraduate Education .....	12
Graduate Education .....	15
Research and Creative Activities .....	18
<b>Appendix 1.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Appendix 2 .....	20

## Background

In 2021-22 UCLA will implement a new budget model, the Bruin Budget Model (BBM). This system establishes annual and multi-year budgets for academic and administrative organizations at UCLA. It is a hybrid of commonly-used budget models since it utilizes activity-based, historical/incremental, and priorities-based factors to determine budget allocations. Compared to UCLA's longstanding incremental budget model, BBM is expected to be better suited to the current and likely future conditions in which UCLA must operate. For more information about the model see "UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021". Access the FAQ at <https://apb.ucla.edu/bruin-budget-model> to read online or to download the document. We have drawn freely from this document, as is the case for this paragraph (FAQ, March 2021, 1.2), and provide section numbers when we have copied or paraphrased from it.

Under the direction of the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, and the Vice Chancellor/CFO, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget has been leading the budget redesign and implementation efforts. The transition to this new budget model began in FY19. Reflecting UCLA's strong system of shared governance, the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost charged an internal committee comprised of Senate members and senior finance staff from academic and administrative units to participate in creating the new budget model (FAQ, March 2021, 7.3). The Council on Planning and Budget was, appropriately, represented on the committee; it also established its own active working group that continues to operate (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021, 7.3).

UCLA is now developing an oversight and assessment plan that will assist the campus in determining whether BBM performs better than the soon-to-be legacy model, and thereby supports UCLA's academic excellence in teaching and research (FAQ, March 2021, 1.6). This document conveys the Council on Planning and Budget's recommendations for the campus oversight and assessment plan.

## Overview of Recommendations for Oversight and Assessment Plan

The Bruin Budget Model (BBM) entails a massive restructuring of how UCLA constructs its budgets and carries out its financial operations. Will it perform as expected? Will it support, perhaps even enhance, excellence in UCLA's undergraduate and graduate education and its research and creative activities? Or might it contribute to degradation in UCLA's academic excellence—a concern among many faculty members?

The administration has committed to developing Tableau dashboards that will offer insight into what might be answers to these questions. A set of dashboards will be shared with users with a UCLA Logon ID and used annually to assess performance of BBM as well as the state of UCLA's academic mission under BBM (FAQ, March 2021, 1.6). The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) expects to prepare an annual report based on the dashboards and strongly supports the administration's commitment to a robust annual evaluation effort.

This document is part of the process of creating the dashboards and reflects the items that CPB has identified as most important in assessing the impact of BBM. As faculty, our concerns center on the effect of BBM on UCLA's standing in the greater academic community, the well-being of UCLA's undergraduate and graduate programs, and the nature and volume of research and other creative activity. We also have identified three aspects of BBM itself – non-traditional revenue, the Provost's Central Investment Fund, and the increase in central services – that have the potential to significantly affect the campus. See Appendix 1 for more information about the choices we made in developing our recommendations.

UCLA is organized into 16 academic units that are responsible for both teaching and research. They are of three types:

Four divisions of the College of Letters and Science: Humanities, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences,

Eight professional schools: Arts & Architecture, Education & Information Studies, Engineering, Law, Management, Music, Public Affairs, and Theater, Film & Television, and

Four health sciences schools: Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health.

These 16 units are the backbone of UCLA's academic life. They are diverse in terms of size, budget, undergraduate and graduate education, research and creative activity, intellectual domains, and more. They each are led by a Dean (FAQ, March 2021, 3.1). To measure how each of these academic units is faring under BBM, we considered three strategies:

- (1) the metric of interest in the most recent year available and the percent change from the (most recent) prior year;
- (2) the metric of interest for each of the 16 academic units considered for all 16 at the same time; and



- (3) a normalized metric of interest (for example, in an academic unit, Indirect Cost Recovery per ladder rank faculty).

We settled on the first strategy because it best recognized that each academic unit is unique and examining year over year change would indicate how each was faring. It also avoided the challenge of putting together academic units that operate on quite different scales and might invite invidious comparisons, as would be possible with the second strategy. Finally, the third strategy presented challenges of identifying the most meaningful denominator (e.g., for indirect cost recovery would the denominator be ladder faculty, all those able to serve as principal investigator, or something else?).

We are interested in watching how BBM unfolds over time and how UCLA's academic excellence may change under BBM. The BBM Oversight and Assessment Plan must include year over year data for up to 10 years, clear definition of each metric of interest, and a clear date when the metric first arose. For some—such as the Provost's Central Investment Fund—2021-22 will be the baseline for many metrics of interest. In contrast, for undergraduate student graduation the metrics of interest are well established and have been reported for many years. We recognize that changes might vary in direction and degree, and that some “negative” results might actually represent an improvement over more negative results in prior years.

We have learned that data for the recommended dashboards reside with different UCLA organizations that gather, analyze, report, and store it. Much is in Academic Planning and Budget (APB). Graduate Division has traditionally been responsible for statistics about graduate education, and the College Dean of Undergraduate Education and units reporting to her also manage several sets of data, most particularly the Center for the Advancement of Teaching. Other data locations may emerge as the campus identifies what it wants in the oversight and assessment plan. If so, there will likely need to be adjustments to the proposed plan.

The choices of topics, metrics, and dashboards are likely to be reviewed by several Senate committees under the Senate Chair's leadership, as well as by academic and financial administrative leaders. It is reasonable to expect more than one round of review and revision as a result of feedback from these various sources. APB is responsible for constructing and updating all the dashboards. In order to keep the APB workload as manageable as possible, all dashboards that we recommend are described in this document but not yet implemented.

## Growth in Revenue from Non-traditional Areas

UCLA recognizes that its traditional revenue sources, particularly state funds, have been diminishing, a trend that is unlikely to be reversed. The new Bruin Budget Model (BBM) seeks to incentivize and support entrepreneurial activity (where there is opportunity) and contribute to non-traditional revenue growth. The most recent written report on BBM (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021, 5.2, 5.5) identifies eight areas for non-traditional revenue growth; specifically:

- (1) Summer
- (2) Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP)
- (3) Research
- (4) New ventures
- (5) Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR)
- (6) Gifts and endowments
- (7) Patent income
- (8) Sales and services

The extent to which each is described varies, but it is clear that different types of new non-traditional revenue will be handled in different ways and will benefit from some different incentives and supports.

In order to assess over time whether non-traditional revenue growth is actually achieved under BBM, the campus will need to agree on what constitutes non-traditional revenue growth and how it is calculated. Consider the current description for ICR (FAQ, March 2021, 5.5, 6.1.):

ICR is a non-tuition activity-based component of BBM. There is a grandfathered fixed amount of ICR funds retained to support central infrastructure (details of how that is calculated are not provided in the March 2021 FAQ). For growth in ICR funds over the amount retained to support central infrastructure, 90% goes to the earning organization and 10% goes to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Creative Activity. As an activity-based core fund, ICR is taxed at 25% (details are not provided for what constitutes taxable ICR).

Contrast the ICR text above with the current description for SSGPDPs (FAQ, March 2021, 2, 5.5, 6.2):

Self-supporting degree funds are non-core funds. In today's model, these funds are already directly recorded by the earning organization, and there is no change in the new model. As a non-core fund, SSGPDP would be taxed at the lower 5% rule to maximize the department's financial benefit. Details are not provided for what constitutes taxable SSGPDP revenue. It could be total student fees or student fees net of all program expenses or something else.

It is important that BBM's strategy for increasing revenue from non-traditional areas succeeds. Clearly there is important work yet to be done to establish dashboards that can inform whether the strategy is working.

There is also much work needed to identify incentives and effective supports for the targeted eight non-traditional areas for revenue growth. To be effectively incentivized, we expect that non-traditional

revenue growth is retained by the academic unit (school/college division), functions as new discretionary funds, and does not lead to a corresponding reduction in the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost's (EVCP) General Fund Supplement to the academic unit (FAQ, March 2021, 2.3). When there is growth in non-traditional areas, the revenue should be sufficient to convince the academic unit that the effort to create and manage the new funds is worthwhile.

One can imagine many different incentives and supports to those seeking to increase a particular non-traditional area of revenue growth. Campus faculty and academic leaders are well aware of many incentives and supports. Academic Planning and Budget (APB) should consider whether it is worthwhile at the onset of BBM to create a document describing possible incentives and supports. Alternatively, campus leaders can look year to year across all eight areas, identify any areas that have not been as successful as expected, and target additional incentives and supports to them.

#### Recommended Dashboards for Non-Traditional Revenue Growth

1. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, new dollars in non-traditional areas in total and for each of the identified eight non-traditional areas by amount and percent of total new dollars, with a filter for academic unit (school, college division).
2. Annually, as part of the budget process, identify any academic unit that is not as successful as expected in increasing any one of the eight non-traditional targets for revenue growth and target incentives and supports to it.

## Creation and Use of Provost's Central Investment Fund

The new Bruin Budget Model (BBM) deliberately provides for the annual accumulation of discretionary revenue to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost (EVCP) and, to some extent, the Chancellor. Funds will be used to address UCLA's most pressing needs and to make strategic investments in academic and research programs. In BBM, funds accruing to the Central Investment Fund include taxes on core funds (Tuition, Non-resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST), Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR), and Summer Session) and taxes on non-core funds (Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), Grants, Gifts, and Sales and Service) plus state revenue and investment income. As outlined in BBM, the resulting accumulation is used for the General Fund Supplement, Central Units, Academic and Student Support Units, and Chancellor/EVCP Initiatives and Commitments (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021, p. 5 Flow of Funds). The EVCP oversees the Central Investment Fund.

Each budget cycle, there will be a letter from the EVCP outlining campus priorities (FAQ, March 2021, 2.4). Examples of previous years' investments (when no letter was provided) include teaching resources to support enrollment growth; student success initiatives and financial aid; diversity initiatives; deferred maintenance and seismic projects; research programs; and faculty recruitment and retention. With BBM there will also be strategic plans at the campus level and the organizational level that identify priorities and inform investments (FAQ, March 2021, 2.4). CPB recommends that the EVCP provide in each budget cycle a report on what campus and organizational level priorities have been funded, the funding levels, the recipients of the funding, the status of the funded work, and final reports.

The annual budget process will be used to review the EVCP's General Fund Supplement contribution to an academic unit's budget as well as any requests for funding for strategic initiatives. As part of this discussion, metrics and trends and the academic unit's strategic plan will be considered. We note that revenue growth or savings is expected to be reinvested by the academic unit (school, college division) and any material changes to the General Fund Supplement to an academic unit will likely be phased in over multiple years to create stability and allow for planning (FAQ, March 2021, 2.3). The EVCP plans to continue increasing campus-wide visibility into the process and also into the metrics and dashboards used to evaluate academic units' success under the model (FAQ, March 2021, 2.5).

### Recommended Dashboards for Provost's Central Investment Fund

1. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, dollars into the Central Investment Fund in total and by amount and percent for each of the fund sources (taxes on core funds (tuition, NRST, ICR, and Summer Session) and taxes on non-core funds (SSGPDPs, Grants, Gifts, and Sales and Service) plus state revenue and investment income (and any reserve or unexpended funds from prior years)).
2. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, dollars and percent of total EVCP Central Investment Fund allocated to General Fund Supplement, central units, academic and student support units, Chancellor and EVCP new initiatives and commitments, and the EVCP's funding choices from her letter identifying campus priorities, with a filter for focus on academics, research, other.
3. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, total and percent of EVCP Central Investment Fund allocated to salary plus administration costs above the dean level (e.g., Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts, and their offices).

4. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, total dollars and percent of allocation from the Central Investment Fund to the General Fund Supplement, with a filter by academic unit (school, college division).
5. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, allocations to academic endeavors and to research endeavors, with a filter for academic unit (school, college division).

## Change from Internal Recharge Programs to Central Services

UCLA's internal recharge programs annually create millions of small dollar charges, for which rates need to be developed and audited. The substantial work to move a dollar around the campus is an indicator that the current use of internal recharge programs is likely administratively wasteful. Replacing many recharges with central services is expected to be a cost saving under the new Bruin Budget Model (BBM). The recharge system does, however, serve as a way to ration scarce resources, so in its absence there might be far more demand for the common services. The administration's plan is to cap growth rates of non-academic budgets and keep the tax rate amounts stable for long periods. The 5% tax on non-core funds will replace central administrative fee charges (along with the UC Office of the President tax). The analytic work and decision making to implement these changes are in progress (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021, 6.1, 6.2).

UCLA currently has some central services. As BBM moves to more central services, it is worthwhile surfacing the common complaints about current central services so that such complaints may be avoided or minimized in the future. Complaints include the requirement that campus work must be done by campus central services, thereby creating a monopoly providing expensive and low-quality services, slow or delayed service delivery, and limited options.

### Recommended Dashboards for Change to Central Services

1. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, dollars spent on internal recharges and dollars spent on central services and the ratio of internal recharges to central dollars spent.
2. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, dollars spent on central services by all academic units and by all administrative units and the ratio of academic to administrative dollars.
3. For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, number and percent of central services with service agreements, advisory committee featuring user- and expert-centered committee members, and user satisfaction data every year.

## Global and National Rankings for UCLA

Academic Planning and Budget has developed a rich set of dashboards already. They cover four global rankings and two national rankings for five years (2016-2020), and provide from three to seventeen underlying metrics for the six rankings for each of five years. Per Executive Director Adam Sugano, 3/25/21 email to Professor Emerita Dorr, “Once the UCLA members’ site is created, I have no issue posting the rankings dashboard as it contains no student level data.” At this time, the rankings included in the dashboard are for UCLA as a whole. There are various other rankings that apply to specific units and programs; for example, preparation in some professions (e.g., law, medicine), U.S. National Research Council decanal assessment of research-doctoral programs, and other targeted endeavors (e.g., Social Mobility Index of CollegeNET). At some future time, the campus may choose to expand the dashboards to include rankings for different academic units.

### Global:

- ARWU, Academic Ranking of World Universities, released by Shanghai Ranking Consultancy
- QS, World University Rankings
- THE, Times Higher Education, World University Rankings
- US News Global

### National:

- WSJ/THE, Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education
- US News Best Colleges

## Undergraduate Education

By reputation, rankings, and many metrics UCLA offers an outstanding undergraduate education to a very large and diverse student body. It is among the best of U.S. public research universities and—along with the other UC campuses—a valuable asset to the State of California. The new Bruin Budget Model (BBM) is notably different from the longstanding soon-to-be-legacy UCLA budget model. The campus oversight and assessment plan includes acquisition of data that informs us of any changes in the quality of UCLA’s undergraduate education.

We recommend two different sets of dashboards. One set tracks student performance, starting with their application to UCLA and ending with graduation and plans for post-bachelor’s work or study. A second set tracks changes in undergraduate students’ academic opportunities. The 2019-20 Council on Planning and Budget’s Budget Model Working Group in its final report offered the following: “Recommendation 1: Given the role that course offerings will play under the new budget model, it would be good to track them in a more systematic manner than we presently do, so as to prevent damage to reputation, ‘pandering’ teaching, grade inflation, and cutting of teaching resources” (<https://dms.senate.ucla.edu/issues/document/10953.CPB.BMWG.Budget.Model.Analysis.06.16.2020>). The 2020-21 Council on Planning and Budget’s (CPB) recommended dashboards address those concerns. Note that cells with fewer than 10 students will be omitted for privacy.

### Recommended Dashboards for Undergraduate Student Performance

Items 1-4 can be handled with a filter for entrance as freshmen or transfers and a filter for academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate majors.

1. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, number of applicants for admission, number and percent of applicants admitted, and number and percent of those admitted who enroll in Fall Quarter.
2. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, number and percent retention from first year to second, and for academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate majors.
3. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, number and percent retention from first year to last year ever enrolled, for all undergraduates and for academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate major.
4. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, post-graduation plans, for all graduating undergraduates and for academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate majors.

Items 5-6 can be handled with a filter for entry as a freshman or transfer student, a filter for normative time to degree/normative time plus one year, a filter for academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate major, a filter for international, race/ethnicity domestic non-resident, and race/ethnicity domestic, a filter for gender, and a filter for Pell.

5. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, four-year and five-year graduation rates of all students who entered as freshmen; and variation by international,



domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, by gender, and by Pell; variation by academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate major.

6. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, two-year and three-year graduation rates of all students who entered as transfers; and variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, by gender, and by Pell; variation by academic unit (school, college division) offering one or more undergraduate major.

#### Recommended Dashboards for Undergraduate Student Experience

Among the filters to be used for one or more of items 7-17 are a filter for academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses, a filter for course level (lower, upper division), a filter for undergraduate course enrollment with five values, a filter for instructor of record with two values, a filter for two possible metrics: (a) percent DFW (received D or F grade in course or Withdrew) or (b) the arithmetic average of median grade in undergraduate course, and a filter for cross-listed courses with three values.

7. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, sum of SCH and proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH for courses with enrollment of five or fewer, 6-20, 21-50, 51-100, and more than 100.
8. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, sum of SCH and proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH for primary undergraduate courses taught by ladder faculty instructor of record.
9. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, sum of SCH and proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH for primary undergraduate courses taught by lecturer instructor of record.
10. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic unit (schools, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, ratio of number and of SCH of all primary undergraduate courses taught by ladder faculty vs lecturers.
11. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, sum of SCH and as a proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH of primary courses with TAs.
12. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, percent DFW (received D or F in an undergraduate course or Withdrew from the course).
13. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, arithmetic average of median course grade.

14. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic unit (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and for lower vs upper division courses, the arithmetic average of the course medians (unweighted and also by course SCH) for three items from online undergraduate course evaluations:
  - a. Overall rating of course
  - b. Difficulty (relative to other courses)
  - c. Workload/pace was...
15. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic units (school, college division), selected items from the Senior Survey. At present, have identified six items:
  - a. percent “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their UCLA academic experience;
  - b. Ability of faculty in major to challenge intellectually;
  - c. Accessibility of major faculty outside of class;
  - d. Academic advising by major faculty;
  - e. Availability of courses in major required for graduation; and
  - f. Access to small classes or seminars in major.
16. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for lower vs upper division courses, number and percent of all undergraduate courses and SCH and percent of total SCH for undergraduate courses not cross listed, courses cross listed within same academic unit (school, college division), and courses cross listed across academic units (school, college division).
17. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for academic units (school, college division) offering undergraduate courses and lower vs upper division courses:
  - a. Total number and SCH of courses identified as impacted.
  - b. Total number and SCH of courses identified as impacted as percent of all undergraduate courses and all SCH offered by that unit, and
  - c. Total number and SCH of courses identified as impacted compared to number and SCH of the same courses offered in the summer.

## Graduate Education

The California Master Plan for Higher Education established that in the State's public education system UC was responsible for graduate academic and graduate professional education. Of the UC campuses, UCLA offers the greatest number and variety of graduate degrees. Graduate Division, rather than Academic Planning and Budget (APB), accesses, analyzes, and reports on many features of graduate education. In its records, APB identifies eight different degree types or stages of doctoral degree progress: Undergraduate, Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program (SSGPDP), Academic Master's, Academic Doc 1, Academic Doc 2, Professional Master's, Professional Doc 1, and Professional Doc 2. See Appendix 2 for information on which types of graduate degrees are offered by each of the 16 academic units (school, college division).

We recommend that dashboards identify the following degree programs: Academic Doctoral (1 and 2 combined), Academic Master's, Professional Master's, and SSGPDP. Some SSGPDPs are professional doctorates; most are professional master's degrees. Because SSGPDPs are self-supporting and all other graduate degrees are state supported, we recommend that SSGPDPs always be treated as one group with professional master's or professional doctorate identified within the SSGPDP category.

The Master Plan designated UC as the only public system able to offer the PhD. UCLA offers approximately 400 different PhD programs. All academic units offer PhD programs. The median time to degree completion is 5-7 years, depending on the discipline. UCLA offers Master's degrees in over 80 academic and professional fields. Program lengths range from one to three years. As was done for the dashboards for undergraduate education, the recommended graduate student dashboards are divided into those about student performance and those about student experience.

### Recommended Dashboards for Graduate Student Performance

Items 1-6 can be handled together with a filter for academic unit (school, college division), a filter for degree sought with four options, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.

1. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by the academic unit, number of applicants for admission, number and percent of applicants admitted, and number and percent of those admitted who enroll; to the extent data permit, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.
2. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by the academic unit, number and percent retention from first to second year; to the extent data permit, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.
3. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by the academic unit, number and percent retention from first year to last year ever enrolled; to the extent data permit, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.

4. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by the academic unit, number and percent of students with timely degree completion; to the extent data permit, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.
5. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by an academic unit (school, college division), post-graduation plans, if available; to the extent data permit, variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.
6. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, number and percent of graduate degree programs that are not joint degree programs, are joint degree programs all within one academic unit (school, college division), and are joint degree programs across two or more academic units (schools, college divisions).

#### Recommended Dashboards for Graduate Student Experience

Items 7-14 can be handled together with a filter for academic unit (school, college division), a filter for degree sought with four options, identification of types of changes in admission requirements and also degree requirements, a filter for block grants and competitive grants, and a filter for funding sources (e.g., graduate student tuition, Provost's Central Investment Fund)

7. For academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each academic unit and for each degree program offered by the academic unit (school, college division), ratio of graduate students to ladder faculty and ratio of graduate students to all instructional personnel.
8. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree program offered by the academic unit, any adjustment of admission requirements; if so, nature of change.
9. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for each degree offered by the academic unit, changes to requirements or demandingness of requirements; if so, nature of changes.
10. For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for all ladder faculty in the academic unit (school, college division), number of faculty, and number and percent of all graduate courses (including seminars, independent study, etc.) taught by ladder faculty of record during the academic year (plus trailing summer).
11. For the academic year and as a percent change from the prior academic year, for all regular instructors of record in the academic unit (school, college division), number of regular instructors and number and percent of all graduate courses (including seminars, independent study, etc.) with instructors of record who are not ladder faculty during the academic year (plus trailing summer).
12. For the academic year and trailing summer and as a percent change from the prior academic year and trailing summer, for each academic unit (school, college division), number and percent of PhD students with confirmed support packages of at least three years and the range and average amount per student.
13. For the academic year and trailing summer and as a percent change from the prior academic year and trailing summer, for each academic unit (school, college division), total funding from block

grants and separately from competitive grants, and funding sources and amounts for block grants and competitive grants.

14. Selected findings for UCLA from the UC Office of the President “Findings from the Graduate Student Survey: Trends in Comparability of Graduate Student Stipends” survey conducted every 3-4 years:
  - a. Table 4: Enrollment Choice by Top-Choice UC Campus (UCLA, with UCB provided as a comparison item)
  - b. Table 12: Trends in Net Stipend and Cost of Living Differences, by Campus. Key measure: UCLA Total Advantage (Disadvantage) of UC over Non-UC Net Stipend Offer. Note that the tables present CPI-adjusted values for prior years, so those would need to be deflated and re-inflated to new values as we add new data.

## Research and Creative Activities

UCLA has an extraordinary range and variety of outstanding research and creative activities. Usual measures of UCLA's excellence include external funding of various types and publications. We made special efforts, ultimately not very successful, to identify measures of excellence that are useful for creative activities such as the visual and performing arts. Items 1-4 below are amenable to quantitative measures that should be available for each academic unit (school, college division). As item five, we recommend annual review of selected factors in some rankings for UCLA as a whole. The factors are more varied than items 1-4 and cover the last five years. They help assess how UCLA's research and creative activities are faring under the new Bruin Budget Model.

### Recommended Dashboards for Research and Creative Activities

Items 1-4 can be handled together with filters for type of financial award and a filter for academic units (school, college division).

1. In the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, total new gifts and donations, for UCLA and for each academic unit (school, college division).
2. In the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, direct costs going to research teams with contracts and grants and indirect cost recovery revenue from contracts and grants, for UCLA and for each academic unit (school, college division).
3. In the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, revenue from patents, licenses, commissions, and royalties, revenue for each, for UCLA and for each academic unit (school, college division).
4. In the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, scholarly impact as measured by one or more of H-factor, impact factor, citation index, or other, and for each academic unit (school, college division).<sup>1</sup>

### Selected Factors from Rankings for UCLA

From US News Best Global Universities Rankings

- Conferences
- Global research reputation
- Regional research reputation

From Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings

- Research

From Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU)

- Highly cited researchers in 21 broad subject categories

From QS World University Rankings

- Citations per faculty

---

<sup>1</sup> A Council on Planning and Budget member who signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (<https://sfedora.org/read/>), does not endorse the use of the *Impact Factor*, or related measures such as the *H-factor*, to assess the scientific output of institutions.

## Appendix 1

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) established a variety of standards to apply to the Oversight and Assessment Plan it has recommended, as follows:

1. All recommended dashboards should be available to UCLA members on a website they can access with their UCLA Logon.
2. Because Deans are the designated responsible leaders in the Bruin Budget Model (BBM), all UCLA members' dashboards will not go below the level for which a Dean is responsible (decanal level). Most often Academic Planning and Budget (APB) will be responsible for deciding when and to whom to provide access to dashboards that go below or outside the decanal level (e.g., department, major research center, CPB) (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).
3. Academic units that will be included in dashboards will have a Dean as the leader and offer formal instruction to UCLA enrolled undergraduate and/or graduate students.
4. There will be differentiation between lower division and upper division undergraduate courses.
5. There will be differentiation between undergraduate and graduate courses.
6. For undergraduate students, there will be no differentiation by type of undergraduate degree; for graduate students, there will be differentiation of four degrees (academic doctorate, academic master's, professional master's, and self-supporting graduate professional degree program).
7. For each dashboard, there will be both visualizations and access to the tabular data being visualized.
8. For dashboards which consider different academic units (schools, college divisions), there should be a filter that allows each of the 16 academic units to be selected for examination. There should also be the possibility of examining some or all of the 16 academic units at the same time, although the emphasis is year-over-year changes for each academic unit, not comparisons across academic units.
9. When people of particular type (e.g., students, ladder faculty) are the data point, at least ten individuals must be in a cell before the value is included in a dashboard.
10. Dashboards need to be constructed so that year-to-year change or lack of change can be identified. To the extent possible, there should be 5-10 years of data so that year over year comparisons can be easily made.

## Appendix 2

Types of graduate degree programs offered in UCLA's 16 academic units (schools, college divisions). Note that all Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs are included in that column. They are all either professional master's programs or professional doctoral programs, and they are not also included in one of those two other columns. (Academic Planning and Budget, April 2021; <https://registrar.ucla.edu/fees-residence/self-supporting-degrees>).

Academic Unit	Has Academic Doctoral Program?	Has Academic Master Program?	Has Professional Master Program?	Has Professional Doctoral Program?	Has Self-Supporting Program?
Anderson School of Management	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
David Geffen School of Medicine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Dentistry	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes <sup>3</sup>
Education & Information Studies	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>3</sup>
Henry Samueli School of Engineering & Applied Science	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Herb Alpert School of Music	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
L&S Humanities	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
L&S Life Sciences	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
L&S Physical Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
L&S Social Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Luskin School of Public Affairs	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
School of Arts and Architecture	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
School of Law	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School of Nursing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>3</sup>
School of Theater, Film & Television	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
UCLA School of Public Health	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

<sup>2</sup> The Doctor of Juridical Science (SJD) is the equivalent of the PhD in other fields

<sup>3</sup> Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs offering a professional doctorate; all others offer professional master's degrees



## Introduction

For the last several years, the Academic Senate's Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) has been working to better understand the implications and impact of the Bruin Budget Model (BBM). As with any major, complex change to an institution, there are risks of unintended consequences or adverse incentives. To help monitor the impact of the BBM, CPB formed a Budget Model Working Group (BMWG) in 2019. Since then, this group has issued several reports on the BBM and made recommendations concerning how to understand the impact of the BBM on UCLA's mission.

There are several limitations to this effort, including the difficulty measuring many of the aspects of UCLA's mission (e.g. creativity, rigor, and the student experience, etc.), important resources or parts of the university that lie outside the model (e.g. space and physical plant, auxiliaries, etc.), and externalities that might take years to manifest (e.g. reputation, alumni connection, etc.).

However, based on careful study of the BBM, CPB has developed a series of metrics that we believe will help capture the impact of the new model on key aspects of UCLA's mission. We followed a two-prong strategy, creating a broader set of metrics ([link](#)), and then identifying a dozen key metrics that we think are particularly useful in monitoring the impact of the model (presented below).

We have worked with APB (in partnership with other campus units) to develop these dashboards. Access to these dashboards will be restricted to UCLA logins in the first year of the model. Our key dashboards are presented [[link](#), or on the same document], along with a brief introduction to each.

## General Fund Supplement

In June 2020, CPB issued a document titled "[Discussion of New Budget Model, along with Recommendations](#)." Recommendation 5 of that document urged public documentation and academic justification for the use of strategic funds, as well as the adoption of accountability mechanisms on the central administration's use of these funds. Later that same year, CPB [issued a report](#) specifically addressing the need for transparency, predictability, and accountability in the General Fund Supplement.

1. **For fiscal year, and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, dollars and percent of total EVCP Central Investment Fund allocated to General Fund Supplement, central units, academic and student support units, Chancellor and EVCP new initiatives and commitments, and the EVCP's funding choices from her letter identifying campus priorities, with a filter for focus on academics, research, other.**
2. In addition, in light of concerns related to administrative costs: **By fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, total and percentage of EVCP Central Investment Fund allocated to salary plus administration costs above dean level (e.g., Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors, Vice-Provosts, and their offices).**

## Other revenue generation

One of the chief justifications of moving to the BBM is to help incentivize the pursuit of additional revenue.

3. **For the fiscal year and as a percent change from the prior fiscal year, direct costs going to the research teams with contracts and/or grants and Indirect Cost Recovery from contracts and grants, for each total school-wide, and also by each academic unit (school, college division).**

4. **For the fiscal year and as percent change from the prior fiscal year, new dollars in non-traditional areas in total and for each of the eight identified non-traditional areas by amount and percent of total new dollars, with a filter for academic unit (school, college division).<sup>1</sup>**

### Impact on undergraduate and graduate education

In our June 2020 report, we also noted concerns that the new budget model might affect incentives to invest in high-quality teaching, potentially leading to "damage to reputation, 'pandering' teaching, grade inflation, and cutting of teaching resources." After further discussion, CPB recommends the following specific dashboards, with **data reported by each academic year and as percent change by year, UCLA-wide, upper- and lower-division, and also by each academic unit (School or college division at the decanal level).**

5. **The arithmetic average of median grades for undergraduate courses offered**
6. **Undergraduate primary courses taught by ladder faculty instructor of record: sum of SCH and as proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH.**
7. **Undergraduate courses with enrollment of 1-5, 6-20, 21-50, 51-100, and more than 100: sum of SCH and proportion of total UCLA undergraduate SCH for courses.**
8. **From the Senior Survey, percent "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with Availability of courses in major required for graduation.**
9. **Four-year and five-year graduation rates of students who entered as freshmen/Two-year and three-year graduation rates of students who entered as transfers; variation by international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, and domestic race/ethnicity, by gender, and by Pell.**

In addition, because the BBM might impact the incentives for units to share courses across budgetary units, we recommend monitoring the availability of cross-listed courses... particularly courses offered across units:

10. **For the academic year and as percent change from the prior academic year, for undergraduate courses not cross listed, coursed cross listed within same academic unit (school, college division), and courses cross listed across academic units (school, college division), number and percent of courses and SCH and percent SCH.**

At the graduate level, we would add two additional measures. The first would measure the admissions statistics of the programs and the second would measure timely degree completion. These data would again be **reported by academic year (and percent change from the prior year), UCLA-wide, and also by each academic unit (School or college division at the decanal level).** In addition, the data should offer a filter for type of graduate degree.<sup>2</sup>

11. **Number of applicants for admission, number and percent of applicants admitted, and number and percent of those admitted who enroll**
12. **Number and percent of students with timely degree completion.**

---

<sup>1</sup> The most recent written report on BBM (UCLA New Bruin Budget Model (BBM) FAQ, March 2021) identifies eight areas for non-traditional revenue growth; specifically, summer, Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP), research, new ventures, Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR), gifts and endowments, patent income, and sales and services (FAQ, March 2021, 5.2, 5.5).

<sup>2</sup> The four types of graduate degree we are using are as follows: PhD, academic master's, professional master's, and self-supporting professional graduate degree program. Three of the SSGPDP programs offer a professional doctorate and all the rest offer a professional master's. Ideally, these would allow filtering by **international, domestic non-resident race/ethnicity, domestic race/ethnicity, and by gender.**