

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)**  
**MINUTES**  
**NOVEMBER 18, 2025**

**PRESENT:**

David Oglesby, Earth & Planetary Sciences, CPB Chair  
Bahman Anvari, Bioengineering  
Richard Debus, Biochemistry  
Anthony Grubestic, School of Public Policy  
Scott Pegan, Biomedical Sciences  
Liz Przybylski, Music  
Jade Sasser, Gender & Sexuality Studies

**ABSENT:**

Vyjayanthi Chari, Mathematics, CPB Vice Chair  
Meng Chen, Botany & Plant Sciences  
Cathy Gudis, History  
Steven Helfand, Economics  
Hyun Hong, Area of Accounting  
Cong Liu, Electrical & Computer Engineering

Chair David Oglesby called the meeting to order at 11:05am.

CPB members voted unanimously to approve the October 28 meeting minutes.

**CHAIR UPDATES / COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

Chair Oglesby has been asked to serve on the Search Advisory Committee for the new Vice Chancellor of Planning, Budget, and Administration (VCPBA). A local UCR Academic Senate task force (UCR-UCAD) is being formed to address campus-specific responses to potential disruptions, and Professor Sasser has agreed to serve as CPB's representative on this UCR-UCAD task force.

Chair Oglesby attended the November 4 meeting of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). At the November 4 UCPB meeting, the following topics were discussed

- UCAD Plus—the [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions \(UCAD\)](#) is being succeeded by the [Joint Academic Senate Administration Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions, or UCAD Plus](#). Building on the original UCAD Senate task force's July 2025 [interim report](#), the UCAD Plus Joint Task Force will conduct analysis and make recommendations for sustaining UC's academic and research enterprise across five primary focus areas: research activities and infrastructure; academic personnel evaluations; academic program planning, evaluation, and alignment; instructional opportunities and course offerings across modalities; and the future of graduate

education. Preliminary recommendations will be delivered to President Milliken and UC chancellors in Spring 2026.

- UAW Contract—negotiations with the UAW are ongoing and are moving from "recognition issues" to "dollars". Labor Relations is optimistic that a strike will be avoided before the contract expires at the end of the year, but contingency plans are in place.

A key grant funding concern raised by CPB members is how salary increases for GSRs will be funded, as current research grants are budgeted without accounting for unexpected, large pay increases. This could place a significant financial burden on Principal Investigators (PIs)/faculty grants.

- Self-Supported Graduate Programs—There was a discussion about the pros and cons of replacing state-supported master's programs with identical self-supporting programs (which generate more revenue) in cases of duplication. Chair Oglesby raised the concern that eliminating cheaper, state-supported programs would create a huge equity issue.
- UC System Budget—The UC system has a structural deficit of about \$300 million, with six out of ten campuses currently in deficit (UCR is not one of them, but is building toward one). The UC is planning a "big ask" to the state, arguing the state has not provided the promised funding under the Compact despite the UC upholding its commitment to enrollment growth.
  - External Risks: The governor is likely to lowball the budget in January. A major uncertainty is that if the federal government cuts healthcare funding, the State of California may backstop it, leading to cuts in other areas, potentially affecting the UC. Increased revenue is currently coming from income taxes and bonuses related to the AI industry. The UC Retirement Plan is healthier than expected.

Chair Oglesby shared with committee members information received from a recent Campus Finance Committee meeting. This information pertained to preliminary, high-level financial scenarios for UCR; and Chair Oglesby noted that the biggest drivers are student enrollment (revenue) and labor costs (expenses).

- *Scenario A (Flat Enrollment/Flat Staff): If UCR maintains current enrollment and staffing levels, the current \$35 million deficit (covered by reserves) would grow to a \$94 million deficit by FY 2027-28, which would be difficult to cover.*
- *Scenario B (Enrollment Growth/Flat Staff): If UCR increases enrollment but keeps faculty and staff at current (FY 2025) levels, the increased tuition and fees would offset salary increases, leading to a small surplus of around \$770,000 by FY 2027-28. This scenario assumes the university accepts a growing student-to-faculty/staff ratio.*

- *Scenario C (commensurate faculty and staff growth): This would result in a \$73 million structural deficit.*

CPB members emphasized the importance of considering revenue improvements alongside cost-cutting measures. They agreed that examining the scope of work and identifying unnecessary tasks would be more productive than focusing solely on numerical targets. CPB members raised questions about smaller revenue items, and the group acknowledged the need to improve these areas to address structural deficits. They also discussed the challenge of balancing staff reductions with maintaining the ability to grow in the future, particularly in areas critical to long-term success.

#### **DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL JOINT DEANS/CPB ROLE IN RECOMMENDING FACULTY/STAFF/STUDENT RATIOS FOR CAMPUS PLANNING**

CPB discussed the Provost's proposal for CPB to work with the Deans to make recommendations on faculty/staff/student ratios in the coming years. The Provost is inviting CPB to participate in a joint Administrative-Senate subcommittee of the Campus Finance Committee to study and make recommendations on faculty ratios at UCR to incorporate into UCR's campus budget operating model for academic planning purposes.

By faculty ratios, the Provost is referring to both student: faculty ratios as well as ratios among types of faculty instructors (professor series, professor of teaching series, and lecturer series). The Provost fully recognizes that there is no one-size-fits-all set of ratios that can cover all disciplines. The Provost also recognizes that the joint subcommittee should not try to specify an "ideal" ratio for any particular discipline – what is "best" depends on preferred pedagogies, available technologies, resource constraints, student demand, and other factors that change through time and are not entirely under UCR's control. So, the Provost is asking that the subcommittee provide guidance on reasonable ranges that UCR should strive to maintain in different disciplines (perhaps at the school, college, or division level). These ranges will not be treated as absolute limits but instead will help administration evaluate the feasibility and desirability of different planning scenarios: for example, does a scenario stay within the desired ranges, or not? If not, is there a path to bring the ratios back into range in a short period of time? Ideally, these ranges will be evidence-based and also informed by the professional expertise and judgment of the subcommittee members.

Teaching assistants also constitute a critical component of UCR's instructional ecosystem at the university. Therefore, the Provost asks the subcommittee also to consider and make recommendations on reasonable TA: student ratios in different disciplines.

Third, the Provost invites this subcommittee to study and make recommendations on reasonable staff: student ratios within the schools and colleges. The majority of UCR's staff are employed in non-academic units, so those leaders will be engaged during the budget review process in an evaluation of their staff numbers to help inform campus-level planning, as well.

The Provost proposes that the CPB Chair (Professor Oglesby) and BCOE Dean (Chris Lynch) co-chair the subcommittee. Stephanie Flores, Executive Director of Financial Planning and Analysis, and Scott Heil, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research, will be available as senior staff support. The Provost would request the subcommittee's recommendations by June 2026.

CPB accepts the Provost's invitation and looks forward to working on issues related to faculty/staff/student ratios for future planning.

**[SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PRESIDENTIAL POLICY ON EDUCATION LOAN PRACTICES**

Legal counsel recommended that UC's current Education Loan Practices Policy be updated to include programs that provide extension of credit, namely deferred tuition plans. At present, UC has one deferred tuition plan, a pilot program at UC Davis, that meets the definition of a private educational loan.

The federal Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued guidance on 1026.46(b)(5) Regulation Z clarifying that their supervisory authority extends to school entities when they offer private education loans as defined in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. 1650. Private education loan includes "billing plans" with extension of credit longer than one year, even if there is no interest charged. As loans, these "billing plans," also known as deferred tuition programs, would need to follow all the various relevant provisions and guidance surrounding Regulation Z.

The purpose of UC's Educational Loan Practices policy is to ensure the protection of students through the UC's systemwide assessment of educational loans. UCOP conferred with outside counsel who advised of the risk to the system if these types of plans were not addressed in current systemwide policy.

The proposed policy changes include:

- *A deferred tuition plan definition is inserted under the "Definitions" section.*
- *The William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program is apparently crossed out (reason unknown).*
- *New policy language (Section D on page 20) outlines rules for deferred tuition plans, stating:*
  - *Any program/campus offering a deferred tuition plan must report regularly on performance to UCOP.*
  - *Deferred tuition plans must be offered in a non-discriminatory manner.*
  - *Any litigation, regulatory inquiries, or complaints related to the program must be referred to UCOP (not addressed by the campus/program).*

CPB members generally agreed that the inclusion of the program in the loan policies is reasonable and expressed favor for any program that helps students with financial hardship. There were,

however, questions about the program's mechanics and its practical operation. CPB members had questions about the UC Davis program itself, including:

- *How does the deferral interact with future student loan eligibility (especially given recent changes to the financial aid system, which are impacting medical students)?*
- *Are the deferred fees paid back in a lump sum or gradually (like a traditional loan)?*

**[CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSED INITIATIVE FOR UCR 2030: INCREASE THE ENROLLMENT OF CALIFORNIA RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATES—RESPONSE TO SENATE FEEDBACK**

CPB reviewed/discussed administration's response to Senate feedback during the first round of review for the proposed initiative. CPB thus far has the following comments:

- *The plan does not include any mention of the often cited looming “demographic cliff” which will impact California, though in smaller impact numbers than other states. Are administrators incorporating an accounting for reduced high school graduates in their plans to boost enrollments? If so, how?*
- *Point 5 refers to “new educational models” that will be tried in order to respond to increased undergraduate student to TA or graduate student ratios. What are such models? How are these being evaluated for pedagogical efficacy?*
- *Point 4 acknowledges the “very real concerns” that arise when admitting students with less academic preparedness. How does the conversation about increasing staffing and maintaining faculty-to-student ratios, both of which would be necessary to bring underprepared students up to speed, interact with the conversation about flatlining staff and faculty for financial reasons? What plans are in place to address the increased needs of less prepared students, and will these or will these not generate cost savings without decreasing student learning outcomes?*
- *If faculty will be teaching higher courseloads and will likely have less TA support, how will faculty's shifting needs for pedagogical support be addressed? In other words, how faculty do their jobs will change fairly significantly over time. How will faculty be supported in those changes so that faculty can continue to provide a high quality education for students?*

The meeting was called to a close at 12:13pm.