

**MINUTES  
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET  
Meeting of March 31, 2005**

**Present:** Chair Paul Koch, Faye Crosby, Margaret Fitzsimmons, Wentai Liu, Ray Gibbs, John Lynch, Margaret Morse, Onuttom Narayan, Don Rothman, Marina Sarra, Mary-Beth Harhen

**Absent:** (with notice) Alison Galloway

**Guests:** VC Planning and Budget Meredith Michaels

**Members' Items/Committee Business**

The minutes for 3/3/05 were approved as written, for 3/10/05 approved with corrections.

The committee reviewed the process for the divisional FTE requests. CPB will receive the academic division budgets and the FTE requests for the academic divisions as usual. Since the initiative process (1998) the committee has also reviewed the budget requests of the academic support units. This year the administration is considering also submitting a proposed campus-wide budget for consultation, to be prepared by the office of Planning and Budget.

**Q-Course Analysis**

With the possible loss of the Q-designation for many courses due to CEP's ongoing review, CPB will analyze the following: how enrollments (and resultant resources) may shift if the Q-designation is lost for a large number of classes; if there will be enough seats for students to satisfy Q requirements in a timely way; and if there will be a need for additional resources (TAs and faculty) to deliver Q-instruction.

CPB found the data on pass rates to be selective, and not inclusive of all Q courses. The committee was uncertain why the subset of courses from Astronomy, Earth Sciences and Ocean Sciences was selected, whereas failure rates for Mathematics were excluded. Concluding that other data provided were also incomplete, CPB agreed to request additional information from the office of planning and budget.

**Sub-committee status report - Writing funding**

The sub-committee reported that there are still contradictions of fact on the funding of writing among the central administration, the Humanities Division and the Writing Program. Through an iterative process, the sub-committee has come close to getting an accurate view of the funding of writing and the demand for courses. Additional funding issues have surfaced, such as funding for Temporary Academic Staff (TAS) merits and benefits. The sub-committee expects to have a completed report within two weeks.

**Indirect costs, Start-up funding models**

CPB had a brief discussion about how indirect costs (overhead) are collected and distributed. On campus, the allocation of university opportunities funds is distributed as follows: 40% to academic divisions, 40% to central administrative resources, 15% to the Vice Chancellor Research and 5% to the Committee on Research. When this split was originally established under EVC John Simpson, the rationale for the large percentage to the central administration was that they would use the funds to equalize distribution of overhead across divisions. CPB agreed it is now time to understand if this allocation model has fulfilled its intended purpose and will request of the EVC a reporting of how the funds are used. The committee concluded it was not clear about the formula for establishing start-up packages. What funds are contributed from the center, the division and the VCR?

### **LRDP**

The draft analysis will be re-distributed and taken up at the next meeting.