

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of December 3, 2009

Present: Chair Brent Haddad, JJ Garcia-Luna, Gildas Hamel, Lori Kletzer, Piero Madau, Marc Mangel, Cindy Pease-Alvarez, Warren Sack, Gene Switkes, Rob Wilson, GSA Rep Kevin Shlaufman, SUA Rep Jennifer De La Torre, SUA Rep Kalwis Lo, and Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: None

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger, Interim VC Planning and Budget Delaney, and Capital Planning Director Robin Draper

Member's Items

CPB member Cindy Pease-Alvarez reported on a recent Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) continues to run a deficit, although the deficit has been slightly reduced. CPB will review all campus unit deficits in further detail in the coming weeks.

Academic Programs and Units: Policy and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment, and Change

Some CPB members expressed concern about language stating that the overseeing dean may be able to circumvent Senate consultation by stating there is a fiscal emergency. After a discussion the committee determined the current language does allow Senate consultation, and additional comments are not necessary.

Joint Senate – Administration Task Force Report for Education Abroad Program (EAP)

CPB summarized the conflict of EAP's expense and that the Office of the President (OP) does not want to fund the program anymore. So the administrative question is if the program should be supported centrally or by individual campuses. CPB discussed whether or not EAP is fundamental part of the educational mission of UC and if there is a cost savings if EAP is moved from a centralized to decentralized program. The consensus was that certain EAP centers will no longer be funded, and the programs will cease there. Also, there will be some cost accrual to campuses who participate in the program.

CPB briefly discussed the possibility of EAP having a research component as part of its mission. A suggestion is to enrich the student's experience abroad, whenever possible, by developing connections with UC faculty who are frequently doing research abroad and might share aspects of their research with EAP centers.

CPB noted the relative lack of discussion of the decision regarding transition from central funding to a student-fee model. The impact of the new EAP fee structure on students' ability to participate in EAP programs must be closely monitored. CPB would like to see

more information regarding the return to aid component. CPB concluded that the document lacks sufficient information on funding and fee issues, but agreed that EAP's economic inefficiencies of the past need to be fixed.

Policy Review: Waiver of Open Recruitment, Target of Excellence

CPB noted the differences between the current policy and the proposed policy. In the current policy the Target of Excellence (TOE) budget authorization and the waiver of an open recruitment are blended. The proposed policy takes the two steps apart, and removes CPB from the waiver of recruitment step. The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) is still included, but CPB has been removed. CPB finds this particularly troubling at this time, when the only hiring that is taking place is being done through TOEs. Also CPB noted that CPB reviews annual recruitment requests, and removing committee review from the TOE process is inconsistent with the annual FTE review process.

Consultation with EVC Kliger and Interim VC Planning and Budget Delaney

CPB asked the EVC how he plans to deal with future campus building occupations. The EVC indicated that the administration is considering how to deal with occupations in the future. He is working with certain faculty members on how to engage faculty more productively. The administration is reconstituting the Demonstration Advisory Group with oversight by the chancellor instead of the VC Student Affairs.

Responding to a question from a previous CPB meeting, Chair Haddad informed the EVC that CPB does not think it is the right group to study potential mergers and consolidation of academic units. CPB suggested it might be the work of the VPAA with input from the divisional deans.

Interim VC Planning and Budget Delaney provided CPB with budget handouts. The handouts are based on a number of assumptions including: no restoration of the \$305 million to UC's budget, no changes in the methodology of fund distribution to campuses, enrollment numbers as distributed to the state, return to aid fees, and the end of the furlough program.

The committee, EVC, and interim VC Delaney discussed the estimated 2010-11 budget reductions, a proposed budget consultation map, and planning template for 2010-11. The template asks principle officers how they would meet a range of targets, and the effects. CPB noted with consternation that since the end of the quarter was so near, there was not time to give substantive recommendations on the documents provided.

Capital Planning Consultation with Director Draper

Director Draper explained the annual capital planning process. Campuses have been asked to provide a ten year plan to OP (previously it was five years). Within the text of the plan the campus must provide the full list of needs, and what capital investments have been made over the past ten years. The campus will make a presentation to the Regents in March, but a draft must be submitted by mid January. Interim VC Delaney said the academic scenario emphasizes the need for as much academic space as possible.

Infrastructure projects usually have to happen, regardless of whether the campus receives state funding for the project.

External Review Discussion – Chemistry and Biochemistry and Earth and Planetary Sciences

The committee developed a number of questions for each review. Earth and Planetary Sciences questions and issues included a need for a detailed recruitment plan and if their administrative structure is right in light of the current budget situation. Chemistry and Biochemistry questions and issues included a need for a space plan and how a relatively small department should plan for excellence given the ranking of their department.