



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **Undergraduate Tuition Allocation - Version 3**

**May 4, 2012**

The Undergraduate Tuition Allocation version 3 lays out the current thinking on the issue as of March 7, 2012 (the date of this posting).

# Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

May 16, 2012 12:44 PM

Dear Professor Bisson,

The L&S Executive Committee has reviewed the Undergraduate Tuition Allocation Working Paper—Version 3, and has many concerns about the proposed allocation model. Those include:

- The model appears to reward policies and actions that do not encourage faculty engagement in or students' experience of the quality of undergraduate education we wish to preserve or attain. Larger classes, easy courses and majors, reduced time-to-degree, and more courses taught by non-ladder faculty, for example, are just a few of the approaches that could be considered desirable financial strategies in this new allocation environment. On the other hand, there would be clear disincentives for faculty or departments to offer small or experimental courses, to develop or implement instructional techniques designed to individualize the classroom experience, promote “capstone” courses, or invest time in one-on-one interactions with undergraduate or graduate students. The Executive Committee wishes to emphasize that the greatest care must be taken to ensure that the model allocating resources reinforces, rather than weakens, those educational and intellectual principles we most value.
- The much-desired transparency in the budget appears to stop abruptly at the level of the Deans. While in the best of all possible worlds the Deans will naturally consult freely, openly and often with the faculty, there in fact seems to be little motivation for them to do so.

Sincerely,

Abigail Thompson, Chair  
Executive Committee  
College of Letters and Science

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (AGRICULTURE)**

**May 18, 2012 1:54 PM**

We have two concerns. First is the level of transparency, which stops at the Dean. In one sense this is not much of a concern since the executive committee for the college will be active in communications with the dean relative to flow of support dollars from the dean to individual departments.

A bigger concern is the impact on smaller programs and classes. Critical and vital areas of instruction (majors and programs) that are small may be unintentionally impacted in negative ways. The CA&ES does have a commitment to the State of California and has developed new programs to meet changing needs. We would be discouraged by a lack of ability to service those programs needs simply because the size of the programs were smaller than other programs. There needs to be some consideration as to quality of the academics and the needs of the State of California.

# Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (ENGINEERING)

March 9, 2012 8:40 AM

From: College of Engineering Executive Committee

While the College of Engineering Executive Committee appreciates the efforts to move toward a more transparent, incentive based budget model, we have the following concerns with the model put forth in the current (V3) white paper.

1) The budget model does not sufficiently take into account the variable cost of each college which is driven by differences in faculty pay scales. Other universities, as noted in the white paper, take this variability into account by charging variable tuition – but we do not charge variable undergraduate tuition at UC Davis. Therefore, variable tuition should be replaced by a weighting factor based upon the average faculty salary per college.

2) The model does not take into account the future value of the education, with respect to the individual (salary), the state (tax revenue) and the University (fund-raising from alumni). The model seems overly simplistic in just considering student credit hours and number of degrees issued, when the value of each degree in future financial terms is clearly not equivalent.

3) The model does not reflect the push of the 2020 initiative to bring non-resident undergraduates to UC Davis nor does the model reflect the potentially higher cost to educate international students. Instead it blends the non-resident and resident tuition together and distributes it evenly. Why is there no monetary incentive built into this model to attract non-resident students?

4) The revenue to the various colleges generated by this model has not been compared to the current budgets of the various colleges. This step must be taken (and compared to the graph in Appendix III) and the results of this analysis made available, and used for further refinement.

5) The model puts perhaps too much trust and power into the hands of the provost who is in charge of distributing the 30% assessment. This comes back to point 4. If the model was applied to the current funding year, how would the 30% assessment be parceled to meet the costs of each college? In addition, would the provost have more or less power with this model in comparison to the current situation?

6) The model does not take into account how it might be “gamed” at UC Davis. Apparently this occurred at Michigan, which is why they changed the allocation percentages. UC Davis may have its own particular issues that should be considered carefully to limit “gaming”.

7) Who is writing this white paper? Why have they not attached their name(s) to it? In addition, who is giving direct input to the writer(s)? For example, on page 8 it is stated, “In response to *concerns* that not enough consideration was being provided in support of the major, the SCH component was reduced by five percentage points (from 65% to 60%), and the degree major was increased by five percentage points (from 25% to 30%).” Making this information plain would certainly help the transparency of the process to build a more transparent budget.

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**May 4, 2012 8:42 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Planning & Budget**

**May 4, 2012 8:41 AM**

CPB has reviewed the white paper "Undergraduate Tuition Allocation - Version 3". The plan presented seems reasonable and in keeping with the goals of the new budget model. However, CPB remains concerned that there may be consequences that are currently unforeseen and possibly unacceptable in this plan. CPB recommends that a methodology to track and assess the impact of the changes caused by the new budget model be developed and described, with specific measurable rubrics and also believes that the planned budget and actual expenditures at the unit level should be presented in a clear fashion for timely review by CPB.

# Research

**May 4, 2012 8:42 AM**

*No response at this time.*

# **Undergraduate Council**

**May 14, 2012 1:20 PM**

Undergraduate Council expresses its desire that any allocation of Undergraduate Tuition work in the service of maintaining excellence in undergraduate education at UC Davis and not incentivize behaviors that would undermine the collaborative strength of undergraduate education across campuses. The Undergraduate Council further recommends that the Provost Allocation be thought of as a resource to explicitly support cross-college initiatives and undergraduate education projects that may be central to the mission of the university even if they are not currently central to the work of an individual college.

The Undergraduate Council would also like to take this opportunity to strongly support the desire for transparency at the unit level. One step toward accomplishing this goal is having the chairs of the Faculty Executive Committees present at meetings between their dean and the Provost.