

Masters Incentive Program (MIP) Fund Guidelines

Program overview

- In January 2014, the campus implemented an incentive funding model (MIP) to promote graduate student enrollment growth and doctoral program development. The program is in essence a revenue sharing model by which programs that offer masters-level degrees (i.e., academic masters, professional masters, and MFAs) and their academic divisions receive a portion of campus tuition revenue and non-resident supplemental tuition revenue based on the three-quarter average (fall, winter, spring) enrollment in such programs. In addition, the model provides \$5,000 per non-resident three-quarter average headcount in such programs for graduate student aid (as non-resident waivers).
- The revenue sharing allocations are as follows:

- *Tuition* [per FTE student]

Program	Division
\$2,600	\$800

- *Non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST)* [per FTE student; per headcount for waivers]

Program	Division	Grad Division (waivers)
\$2,600	\$800	\$5,000

PDST revenues — programs approved to charge Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) will retain those revenues, consistent with the campus's policy on PDST, in addition to their share of the tuition/NRST under MIP.

- MIP funding is intended for use in strengthening doctoral/MFA programs (supporting doctoral/MFA student success, improving research and instructional capacity in doctoral/MFA programs), enriching graduate curriculum, and enhancing UCSC's relevance to regional industry by increasing masters-level enrollments and degrees granted. As with all tuition and fee revenue, ***MIP funds should be spent in the year received.***
- Other fees assessed to masters-level students (e.g., student services fee, mandatory campus-based fees, etc.) are *not* subject to revenue sharing.

Intended MIP fund uses (in order or priority)

1. ***Doctoral/MFA student support.*** Programs, disciplinary divisions and the graduate division should use MIP funding a) as part of their contribution to the 5-year funding commitments for doctoral students (and 2-year commitment for MFA students); b) in direct support of doctoral/MFA students towards their progress to degree; and/or c) in support of doctoral/MFA student research and/or professional development (e.g., for lab/fieldwork, conference presentation, artist exhibitions/performances, etc.).
2. ***Support of graduate-level curriculum.*** MIP funds can be used to provide instructional support (IS) in the form of instructor and TA-ship resources to support graduate level-courses. MIP funds can also be used, in consultation with the Graduate Division, in support of new graduate program development.
3. ***Improving research capacity.*** MIP funds can also be used to invest in research support that will yield/build capacity for additional extramural funding in support of doctoral/MFA student research.

FAQ

- **What are the funding assumptions about Senate (ladder rank) faculty graduate-level course load?**

UCSC's [instructional workload policy](#) sets five courses (or five course equivalents, based on lab courses, heavy independent study commitments, etc.) as the normal teaching load for ladder faculty. Courses offered at the graduate level typically serve graduate students within the department, while courses at the undergraduate level may serve students from majors across the campus.

- *Undergraduate instruction*: The campus' *Instructional Support (IS) Allocation Model* includes assumptions about the teaching capacity of Senate faculty (i.e., number of *undergraduate FTE* taught — as measured using student credit hour enrollments in courses) and, for projected enrollments beyond that teaching capacity, provides funding for additional instructors (e.g., lecturers) to deploy the curriculum.
- *Graduate level instruction*: Graduate teaching capacity is *not set at the campus level* — as part of their five-course workload, Senate faculty are responsible for the graduate curriculum.

Both undergraduate and graduate instructional needs are considered as divisions/departments set teaching expectations (aligned with the five-course equivalent). Campus [guidelines](#) expect that departments will express Senate faculty teaching commitments by student level (i.e., lower-division, upper division, and graduate courses; supervising/mentoring graduate students).

- **Since instruction and supervision at the graduate level takes more Senate faculty time, why aren't additional funds provided under campus allocation methodologies?**

With few exceptions, State funds pay the salaries of Senate faculty and, in recognition that graduate instruction requires additional faculty effort, UC allocation formulas are weighted (i.e., doctoral FTE are weighted at 2.5; masters and undergraduate FTE are weighted at 1.0). I.e., that additional effort has already been factored into how Senate faculty salaries are funded.

- **Why isn't the cost of masters- and doctoral-level instruction folded into the campus's Divisional Funding Model (DFM) (including IS/TA resources) formulas?**

In light of the campus instructional workload policy and how Senate faculty are funded, the campus's funding models leave curricular planning (and allocation of Senate faculty time) for graduate-level instruction up to departments/divisions.

- **However, in practice, all instruction at the graduate level is *not* handled by Senate faculty — what funding options do departments/divisions have to address this reality?**

In addition to State funds, the instructional mission is also funded by tuition (and NRST). At the undergraduate level, these additional funding streams (after subtracting funding set aside for financial aid) and State funds combined support instruction (*as well as other campus support services*).

- Through MIP revenue share, these funds are also provided to departments/divisions to cover these graduate-level expenses to the extent that masters-level instruction is deployed using non-Senate faculty (and requires teaching assistants).