

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of May 1, 2008

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

Absent: Emily Honig (with notice)

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels

Member Items

The committee discussed the campus Strategic Budget Committee draft plan. The draft plan is the second phase of the whole academic planning exercise. CPB would like to know the status of the document. CPB understands that there is going to be one more iteration before it comes to the Senate for review, but does not know when.

Pre Consultation Deans and Divisional FTE Requests

CPB discussed general questions for all the deans and formulated with the following:

- CPB would like to begin with a general statement about the problem of hiring in a period of budget cuts. The committee feels several of the plans are almost too conservative, given the long term planning picture.
- CPB would also like to make a statement about more realistic estimates for start up costs. The committee is concerned about a pattern of asking for more start up funds after the new hire has arrived, which is almost becoming common practice in some divisions.
- Another general topic for all the deans is the mechanisms used to make hires outside the normal recruitment cycles. CPB would like to know the deans' understanding of the use of Target of Excellence (TOE) and partner hires.
- Accountability, what are the criteria for identifying strong departments and departments that the deans want to grow?

The committee then discussed various questions for the individual deans.

Physical and Biological Sciences

- Is the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRUM) program planning and hiring a director?
- Does the planned hiring adequately address the enrollment question in biology?
- What happens if the 2008 off cycle searches fail?

Humanities

- Questions about the diversity of the Philosophy department (as mentioned in the external review).
- Questions about the survival of smaller departments.
- What is the fate of the hiring in languages?

Arts

- Major questions about the Digital Arts and New Media (DANM) program. CPB finds the abrupt shift and restructuring of DANM disturbing.
- What is the status of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the School of Engineering (SOE)?
- Why is the Art department replacement FTE for a senior position now a junior position?

Engineering

- What is the status of the MOU with Arts.
- Questions about the failed junior hire searches.
- Questions about start up cost estimates.

Social Sciences

- How are priorities set?
- What is the process for consultation with departments?
- Question about the policy of no recruitments while the department is undergoing an external review.
- Are the proposed economist hires in Environmental Studies and Latin American and Latino Studies overlapping?
- Some of the proposed hires appear to be related to a proposed School of Public Health. What happens if the proposed school does not move forward?

Review of Committee on Educational Policy General Education Points

CPB discussed the general education (GE) points and had a number of questions. CPB would like to know how to ensure that TAS funds go with the courses that most need them. CPB noted the subsidy to upper division that comes from large lower division and general classes; the committee does not necessarily agree with this practice. CPB feels the basic principle that TAS should go in direct support of instruction should not be compromised.

The committee would like to know the overall cost of GE to the campus. CPB questions if this can be clearly carved out and quantified. There is now a shared responsibility of delivery between departments, colleges and the administration to assure there are enough seats. The requirements must also be coordinated between departments as well as within departments. CPB feels GE's are a package and there needs to be assurance that they are coordinated.

Overall the committee had trouble deciphering the document, CPB found it preliminary to the point that it is difficult to understand.

Post Consultation Professional Schools

CPB discussed its recommendations for each pre proposal.

School of Management

CPB strongly feels for this proposal to move forward, there must first be a major gift associated with it. CPB wants to avoid the start and starve method, and absent the large gift, the committee fears that is exactly what will happen.

CPB does appreciate the greater sense of incremental development in the revised plan, including the proposed two year part time MBA program.

CPB will be clear in its recommendations that the Senate will not approve the proposal without a major gift in hand, not just a commitment, but possession of the gift.

Environment

CPB discussed the lack of interest in an incremental approach, starting with a masters program. The campus does need something to coordinate the interdisciplinary research and graduate offerings, but a school is not necessary. CPB thinks this may be coordinated through the STEPS Institute. There seems to be no grassroots enthusiasm for a School of the Environment. CPB will not endorse moving forward with this proposal.

Education

While the planning and incremental steps are not clear, there are some compelling arguments for a School of Education. CPB will recommend that some level of resources, to be determined by the department's response to the process thus far, be provided to those working on the full proposal. CPB believes there needs to be more firm data on the resources they would receive (grants, etc.) as a school. CPB found the scope to be very large and is uncertain about the estimated number of FTE.

Public Health

The pre proposal laid out a very clear benefit and a possible incremental approach. The committee was relieved to learn there is support from the faculty.

TIM M.S./PhD Proposal

CPB expressed concern about the curriculum and leave plan. If any faculty member takes a leave between 2008-13, the curriculum cannot be delivered. There needs to be a better plan, half the current graduate curriculum is taught by adjunct professors. The curriculum is not leveraged against other department's curriculum, making it heavily dependent on their own minimal faculty and temporary staffing. Also, the revised proposal does not really address the issues expressed in the last Graduate Council (GC) letter.