

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of May 15, 2008

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

Absent: Kyle Simerly

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger and VC Meredith Michaels,

Members Items

CPB member Larrabee reported on the miscellaneous fees meeting which she attended. There was discussion about ensuring that when fees are charged, units go through the proper channels to implement the fees. All fees were approved, including retirees having to pay to use Office of Physical Education, Recreation, and Sports (OPERS). CPB discussed the possibility of reviewing all campus fees next fall.

Information User Model Costing Proposal

CPB had an initial discussion on the Information User Model Costing Proposal (IU). The committee determined it needs more clarity on the definition of a charge versus recharge and the principle of the campus having to share in the costs for a central infrastructure such as Information Technology (IT). CPB would like to know what other units offer central infrastructure and how units are assessed.

VC Michaels commented that IT is trying to create a rational, justifiable, and predictable way for paying for IT. This is a revenue neutral proposal; it does not increase the IT budget.

CPB also has questions about the weighting of different units and how it was determined. The committee decided to ask Troy Lawson, Planning and Budget, to attend a consultation. Questions for Analyst Lawson include: explanation of the weight formula; is the basis for the weight formula reasonable? How were the students calculated, and the principle of differentiation among units.

Faculty FTE Post Consultation

Arts

CPB determined a number of follow up questions for the acting Arts dean. The committee would like to know the status of the memorandum of understanding (MOU) for current DANM faculty. Also, where in the division is the .5 Game Design FTE? And how will the division and department address the problem of no new faculty during the lag time, especially if the acting dean considers this a crisis situation.

Given that the acting dean's letter mentions the lack of qualified faculty, how will the department deliver instruction next year?

School of Engineering

Next the committee discussed the School of Engineering (SOE) consultation. CPB felt the acting dean answered all the committee's questions. CPB will once again recommend delaying the Technology and Information Management (TIM) hires until a chair is in place. CPB will also insert a sentence that states the committee will continue to refer to TIM as a program rather than a department. The committee found the rest of the SOE 2008-09 requests unproblematic.

Humanities

The committee is concerned about having only one writing replacement and about the survival of smaller departments. CPB is eager to hear about developments in these areas.

Physical and Biological Sciences

CPB found the request well thought out and justified. CPB made a note to follow up on STEPS and the issue of its structure.

Social Sciences

CPB would like to include a statement about the need for more transparency in the ways priorities are set. The committee still finds the economics positions unclear, and does not understand why it can not be a joint appointment. CPB finds the fact that the relevant chairs have not talked to each other extremely problematic. The searches should not go forward until the relevant departments meet and discuss the issue.

Politics External Review

CPB has questions about the make up of the external review committee. CPB's letter will highlight the administration of Legal Studies.

Professional Schools Discussion

CPB discussed its plan for responding to the VPAA with its recommendations. CPB members will submit their comments to Chair Gillman who will work on the overall response.