

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of April 10, 2008

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Michael Brown, Emily Honig, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Herbert Lee, Olga Najera-Ramirez, Karen Otteman, Grant Pogson, and Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: Quentin Williams (with notice) and Kyle Simerly

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels and Dean Sheldon Kamieniecki

Member Items

CPB member Otteman provided an update on the recent School of Public Health meeting with the dean and the planners. They are moving forward, and have assigned another committee to work on the Masters in Public Health.

CPB Chair Gillman reported that she and Senate Chair Williams attended a meeting with the VPAA Galloway. The three discussed the status of the professional school proposals and strategies for moving them forward.

CPB member Larrabee reported on a recent field trip the campus leadership program took to the Silicon Valley Center (SVC). CPB expressed regret that they were not able to receive such a tour in the winter quarter, as they had requested.

Environmental Toxicology Name Change Request

CPB did not see any significant budget implications, and finds the request unproblematic. CPB did discuss the memorandum of understanding (MOU) being negotiated with Molecular, Cell and Developmental (MCD) Biology, because Environmental Toxicology (ETOX) teaches microbiology for MCD Biology on an *ad hoc* basis. ETOX cover three classes per year, and the MCD chair's letter states ETOX will take over the undergraduate microbiology curriculum. CPB encourages formalizing the arrangement between the two departments with a MOU which will help provide the necessary resources to ETOX to mount the curriculum. CPB feels the resource agreement needs to include: space for labs, staff support for the labs, and a lecturer to cover the curriculum.

Faculty Recruitment Plan Discussion (continued)

The committee discussed the Social Sciences request. CPB has a number of questions and comments including:

1. Last year's request was justified on the need to strengthen three key departments. This year the justification is based on the themes of the academic plan. CPB questions this inconsistency and would like to know why the emphasis has shifted.
2. Some FTE seem focused towards a School of Public Health. If a different school were to appear on the horizon how would that shift these hires?

3. Are the requests reflective of the department's priorities? Or is it the dean's will? Procedurally, CPB is growing increasingly uncomfortable with their lack of understanding the consultative process is between the dean and the departments. For example, the Community Studies request in the division's 2008-09 request was actually the third priority for the department. How can the EVC be confident dean's process of consultation with departments is transparent and collaborative?
4. CPB is unclear on the Community Studies FTE request and how it would resolve problems in social documentation.
5. There are two requests for economists outside the Economics Department which appear to overlap. How are they different than the positions in the Economics Department? How do they augment current strengths and address weaknesses?
6. How many total FTE are available to Social Sciences?
7. How does the dean decide if he is going to request a spousal hire or a TOE? There appears to be confusion in the requests as to why the Division has requested waivers via one avenue versus another.

Review of BOARS' Revised "Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy" (continued)

CPB noted the line between eligible and ineligible is unclear and should be transparent. The committee can not make sense of the additional data, and believes some of it is quite dated. The proposal's simulations are not connected to the proposal, and do not show what the effect of the proposed changes will be on the pool. Overall the proposal reduces the guarantee for UC admission and increases the campus discretion.

The proposal still does not state the problem, so it is hard to discern if their solution is viable. The effects are to increase the pool, so that there are more referrals to Merced. It is also a way to keep enrollments up as the state population declines. The proposal asserts that UC is losing students because of technicalities. If this were the case, as has been noted in the review of the earlier proposal, there are already mechanisms to remedy it.

CPB has questions about the revised set of eligibility criteria, the nature of the guarantee, and the cost for the comprehensive review. Response to the Senate Chair will be forthcoming.

QB3 Academic Program Review

CPB Chair Gillman will work on the review with a small CPB subcommittee. VC Michaels will help with the background information.

Consultation with EVC Kliger and Dean Kamieniecki

The consultation began with the Politics TOE request. CPB likes the choice of a person at mid career; this matches the department plan for recruitment in this area. It also fits the department profile and diversity issues in the department.

Next discussed was the 2008-09 Social Sciences recruitment request. The dean updated the committee on the current searches, and described effective communication between the departments and the dean.