

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of March 2, 2006

Present: Chair Paul Koch, Faye Crosby, Onuttom Narayan, Ray Gibbs, Quentin Williams, Ravi Rajan, Don Rothman, Emily Honig, Marina Sarran, Saurabh Mishra, Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: (with notice) David Evan Jones

Guests: CPEVC Dave Klinger, Assistant Provost Charlotte Moreno, VC Business and Administrative Services Tom Vani, School of Engineering Interim Dean Michael Isaacson, Assistant Dean Glen Winans, VPAA Alison Galloway, VC Planning and Budget Meredith Michaels

Member's Items

(none)

Consultation with Acting SOE Dean Michael Isaacson

Acting Dean Isaacson described the SOE process for updating their plan as fairly comprehensive. It included a full faculty retreat in September and many meetings with department chairs who assumed significant responsibility in assembling the plan. He likened the state of the School to that of a start-up company. SOE is just eight years old, so the measures used to gauge a more mature division should not be used. He cited several examples. First, the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBS) has forty full time researchers, SOE only has four, therefore, to make the target for external funding similar would not be fair. Next, as a start-up enterprise, there is a much higher percent of Assistant Professors, just ramping up their research programs and only beginning to draw funding.

The Acting Dean stated SOE's target of becoming a top quartile Engineering school in the next ten years. SOE wants to establish large-scale federally funded research centers. This allows the School to increase stature despite the small size of some departments. It is a strategy that has succeeded at other campuses. To develop a research center, a core of faculty in that area is required.

For example, half of the faculty doing research in material sciences are in EE with the rest (6-10) spread through other departments. The next federal call for material sciences is Fall 2007. If Engineering believes this is important, they will put together a viable bid for a center. CPB noted the lack of connection between the plans of SOE and PBS material science, that each reads as if they were doing material science separately. Acting Dean Isaacson stated that he and Interim Dean Thorsett agreed that material sciences must be driven by the applications (engineering) so that physics and chemistry will participate, but are not the major drivers.

He cited space constraints as a serious obstacle for SOE's ability to implement their plans. Renovations in Baskin Engineering Building are vital for their ability to hire. Currently SOE only controls about 50% of the building. The ability to hire in clusters is impeded by lack of space. 2300 Delaware could be used as expansion space for research.

Responding to a CPB question, Dean Isaacson acknowledged that Engineering is aware of problems with retaining students (including those of underrepresented groups). The current strategies for addressing it are; developing more 80 level courses, faculty taking more responsibility for advising, encouraging students to take better math preparation (pre-calc in summer) and putting more efforts into outreach.

He reported that AMS and TIM department proposals would be submitted by the end of the academic year.

Consultation with CPEVC Dave Kliger and VC BAS Tom Vani

CPEVC Kliger requested that CPB withdraw the resolution to be presented to the Senate at the upcoming meeting. The resolution calls upon the administration to refrain from transmitting the LRDP/EIR to the Regents for approval until such time as errors and omissions (as listed in the "whereas" section) were addressed. The resolution was based on the past work of the committee. CPB submitted comments on the draft EIR questioning the adequacy of the traffic analysis and analysis to determine the number of employee housing units required.

CV Vani briefly reviewed the EIR process and stated that campus should receive an update in the next two weeks about the status of the reply to comments on the draft EIR. UC policy is that the release of the responses must be ten days before the Regents meeting at which it will appear. He stated that the LRDP/EIR could go to the Regents for approval as early as July or September; he was unclear when the actual submission deadline for those meetings is.

CPEVC Kliger acknowledged that although there are no legal restrictions under CEQA on engaging the Senate on these topics, University Counsel has advised him not to do so. He is willing to work outside of the LRDP process to answer CPB's concerns. But if the administration deals with it inside the process, UCOP indicates that it could jeopardize LRDP processes on all the campuses. Whatever happens here (should the administration respond early to CPB's draft EIR comments) will set precedent for other campuses.

CPEVC Kliger listed his specific concerns with the resolution. Although the introduction says that CPB does not oppose growth, this statement is not included in the "whereas" section nor in the actual resolution, on which the Senate votes and which would be forwarded to the Regents. He perceives the resolution as ceding the authority of the administration to the Senate. The EIR is still "draft". CPB has no basis for findings of omissions or errors, language should be changed to CPB "believes" there are omissions or errors. It should be acknowledged that financial analysis is outside the LRDP/EIR process.

CPEVC Kliger suggested that CPB could do a resolution that specifies how we address issues of growth such as: request the administration provide certain types of analysis to the Senate, put constraints on the administration for acceptable conditions for growth.

VC Vani warned that if the LRDP is delayed and not approved for a sufficient period of time then it will have to be redone, costing millions in campus resources. Without an approved LRDP, there will need to be an extensive EIR for every single project once the campus grows beyond 15,000 students. No full EIR has been re-circulated due to omissions, but a chapter could be re-circulated for comment for 45 days if agencies (or individuals) request it.

CPB responded that this resolution does not take authority from the administration, but advises them to deal with these concerns before forwarding the LRDP/EIR. The Senate has given comments at various stages of this planning process that have not been addressed, and the resolution reports to the Senate that CPB can not make recommendations on whether this LRDP is a viable plan (or window or envelop) for campus growth.

In the post consultation session, CPB agreed to withdraw the resolution for now to deal with the basic problems in prose and to consider strategy. If the concerns are not quickly addressed, it can be modified and/or resubmitted for the Spring meeting on April 26 or May 19.

Consultation with CPEVC Dave Kliger and VPAA Alison Galloway

Initial discussion concerned the recent American Studies External Review closure meeting. This led to a wider discussion of building interdisciplinary programs. The VPAA stated that interdisciplinary programs are becoming more prevalent, but are difficult to establish without a strong contingent in a single department. Her office will be providing leadership, clarity of roles (MOUs), and seed and glue money.

CPB had anticipated reviewing the divisional FTE requests in light of a completed campus plan. Given the state of that planning process, they discussed with VPAA Galloway how to proceed with the review.

The CPEVC looked at the academic plans and considered what themes emerged that reflected the university's mission and what would be useful to society. VPAA Galloway looked at the plans for common themes. Both came up with the same approximate six areas:

- Human health, biomedicine
- Environment
- Technological advances
- Communications (including visual studies)
- Identity studies
- International/global studies

At least four divisions are involved in each area.