

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of December 10, 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, Associate Dean Paul Koch

**Member's Items**

Chair Haddad and CPB discussed the working relationship with the committee would like to have with the interim Vice Chancellor (VC) Planning and Budget. The committee recognized the importance of communicating regularly with the interim vice chancellor. The committee determined that the CPB chair will meet with the interim VC regularly, and the committee will set up a standing meeting time every other week for an hour. CPB agreed to revisit the issue at the end of the winter quarter to determine if adjustment should be made.

Chair Haddad reported on the Legal Studies external review closure meeting. It was determined that the department will write a letter to the divisional dean requesting Legal Studies either be suspended as a major or disestablished.

**Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force Report**

Following a discussion about potential costs, CPB agreed that the information would be useful and potentially necessary for accreditation needs. The committee expressed concern about resource needs, and did note that the School of Engineering (SOE) already has a similar model in place. The question is if the SOE model can be implemented campus-wide, and at what cost. Committee members also believe this could be a useful tool for President Yudof to take to the legislature, and use as part of his argument that UC is a good investment.

**Campus Unit Deficits**

CPB reviewed the report which is provided to the committee annually by Planning and Budget. Based on the report CPB developed questions for the interim VC of Planning and Budget about short term interest and the campus recharge economy, and would like to follow up on the transit fee, printing services, admissions and education partnership deficits. CPB is concerned that units are not held accountable for their deficits, and the deficits take funding that could be used for instruction and research.

**2010-11 Budget Process**

CPB reviewed the template and timeline provided by the EVC's office. The committee noted the changes CPB requested were not included in the revised documents. CPB

discussed the proposed process and are apprehensive that the process as it is unfolding will lead to across the board cuts. CPB Chair Haddad stated CPB is trying to move the process to a way that does not arrive at those outcomes. CPB reviewed the information it needs to make recommendations and the possibility of measures that gauge how close an activity is to research and instruction. How do various activities across campus fit into the larger mission of the university?

Finally CPB reviewed the unit review assignments list, and added a second CPB member to review each unit.

**Consultation with EVC Kliger (with Associate Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences Koch)**

CPB asked about the committees suggested changes to the template, the EVC said it was an oversight and CPB's changes will be incorporated before the first budget meeting of principle officers.

Chair Haddad discussed the principles CPB hopes to emerge from reviewing the documents. CPB would like all budget planning documents to clearly state that not every unit will receive the same percentage cut.

Next CPB discussed the Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) retention issue/partner hire with Associate Dean Koch. The hire will allow Physics to teach courses that were previously cut. This will help reduce the number of lecturers needed, and the hire can potentially teach in Math and Astronomy too. CPB will send a letter to the EVC with its recommendations.

**Resolution Referred by the Senate**

CPB determined that the resolution, as written, is flawed. CPB is not sure how to make the resolution meaningful, because the committee is not entirely sure of the original intent. Committee members feel it is about transparency, but does not believe asking for large amounts of data will help the campus.