

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of September 27, 2007

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Michael Brown, Emily Honig, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Herbert Lee, Karen Ottemann, Grant Pogson, Quentin Williams, Lora Bartlett, Kelvin Cen and Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: None

Guests: Meredith Michaels

Member Items

Chair Gillman welcomed the 2007-08 Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) and after introducing herself asked committee members for self introductions. It was noted that CPB does not currently have a Graduate Student Association (GSA) representative and a second Student Union Association (SUA) representative for 2007-08.

CPB's Role in the Senate and Campus

Chair Gillman explained that research and shared governance are the key functions of CPB. While certain Senate committees have plenary authority over curriculum, admissions and graduation, the CPB role is not plenary but rather advisory. One of the major roles CPB has in relation to the Senate is to enhance cooperation and coordination among committees. An example of this is the work of the 2006-07 CPB with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) concerning the writing intensive requirement (W).

In 2007-08 CPB Chair Gillman would like CPB to do more data gathering and analytical analysis, building on work the 2006-07 CPB committee produced.

CPB Resources Confidentiality, Consultation Procedures and Guest Protocol

The committee reviewed and approved the 2007-08 confidentiality statement and consultation procedures and approved inviting Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget Meredith Michaels to attend 2007-08 CPB meetings.

Assignments: Committees and Reviews

CPB briefly reviewed the external review and committee assignments. Members will individually review the list by next week's meeting and inform Chair Gillman either by email or at next week's meeting if they have a conflict. CPB will discuss at a later date where it provides the most value added to external reviews and strategically plan the time allotted to those reviews.

Chair Gillman explained to all members the committee's voluntary recusal process. If an issue arises where a member feels that s/he may be compromised by participating or that the work of the CPB could potentially be compromised, the committee member may remove him/herself from the discussion or vote. Chair Gillman invoke the principle of

not taking part in a decision in two different venues. That is, if a committee member voted on a topic as a department member, s/he should recuse him/herself from a CPB vote. When committee members recuse themselves, it will be noted in the committee's formal response and minutes.

CPB noted the lack of Arts representation on both CPB and CEP this year. CPB will schedule a consultation with the interim Arts dean for the fall quarter.

CPB Agenda 2007-08

VC Michaels joined the meeting.

Chair Gillman stated that in addition to regular business, CPB takes on its own proactive items for the year. CPB balances its watchdog role by initiating areas of research. This proactive effort helps CPB to define its own agenda. In 2006-07 CPB took an extended look at the status of professional schools on campus. Following up on that work, the Senate is holding a professional schools forum on October 10. Anyone who has been involved in any professional school effort is invited.

CPB discussed University Extension (UNEX), a 2007-08 agenda item involving EVC Klinger and the Interim Dean of UNEX, VPAA Alison Galloway. The administration will open the discussion by providing the Senate an update on UNEX at the November 9 Senate meeting, as requested in the Senate resolution of spring 2007. CPB will invite VPAA Galloway for consultation on UNEX a couple of times during the fall quarter. Another 2007-08 agenda item related to the financial status of UNEX is other campus auxiliary or support units with deficits.

An issue that overlaps with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is faculty salaries. VC Michael informed CPB that Office of the President (OP) Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs Rory Hume presented the four-year plan to increase faculty salaries and restore the salary scale, which showed that the sources of funding the increase are uncertain after the first year. In the first year OP plans to shift \$13 million ordinarily used for faculty start-up to fund the increase in salaries. VC Michaels further explained that one option for funding years three – four of the salary increases is to use some fraction of the general fund increase negotiated with the governor .

Another continuing issue is the 2006-07 CPB report on conditions for growth, which focused on enrollment management and the effectiveness of undergraduate education. In the report CPB called for much more nuanced data. VC Michaels has the data available but CPB must first form a subcommittee to determine what is needed and how best to format the data. CPB will consult with VPDUE Ladusaw and CEP Chair Padgett, who are both working on issues concerning retention.

Other issues related to conditions for growth are educational effectiveness and capacity for delivery. CEP is working on several other major issues that intersect with CPB including the W requirement, the general education requirement, an honors program, and campus use of merit based scholarships for Regent scholars.

CPB discussed the 2006-07 CPB report on research funding and decided that before a research subcommittee is formed this year, the committee must determine questions that can actually be answered. CPB also discussed the need to look at the bigger picture of campus funding now that there have been changes at OP.

Fundraising and University Relations are another issue that CPB would like to take a closer look at this year. Issues related to fundraising include: childcare, regents scholars, FTE augmentation and research institutes in the divisions. CPB would like to consult with University Relations on their priorities, especially regarding the comprehensive campaign.

Professional Schools Academic Senate Forum

CPB identified a number of questions that should be asked of the proposers of professional schools at the Senate forum.

1. What is the relationship of your program to the others being considered?
2. What is the rationale for creating stand-alone schools?
3. Can certain schools or programs be combined?
4. Have we best tailored the potential portfolio of professional schools?

BOARS UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal

CPB had an initial discussion of the proposal. CPB commented that in principle the proposal offers the benefit of a larger pool, but in practice it is going to have unpredictable effects on the bottom-tier campuses. The proposal in general is designed to increase access to the University of California (UC) and to make UC visible to the level of students who are not currently applying. It also builds greater discretion into the admissions process. The “reform proposal” consists of four separate proposals which are being presented by BOARS as one package. CPB expressed concern that eligibility will no longer be as transparent as it is now and that the proposal masks what may be one of its principal effects: to substitute the current pool of the top 12.5% with a 4% eligibility pool from each high school. Students who attend stronger performing high schools are at a disadvantage because even with the requisite GPA and SAT scores, as well as the A-G courses, if they are not in the top 4% of their class, they are not UC eligible.

CPB will consult on the issues with the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) and continue the BOARS discussion at its next meeting.