

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of January 19, 2012**

**Present:** Lynn Westerkamp, *chair*, Sriram Shastry, Robert Boltje, Deanna Shemek, Andy Szasz, Daniel Friedman, Patty Gallagher, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Jessica Greenstreet, SUA, Matthew Mednick, Committee Analyst, Mary-Beth Harhen, Senate Director

**Absent:** Susan Gillman, David Draper, Alexander Hirsch, GSA

**Guests:** CP/EVC Alison Galloway

**1. Members Items**

CPB member Robert Boltje who sits as the CPB representative to the Campus Planning and Stewardship Committee (CPS) reported that at a recent meeting CPS discussed the campus debt capacity. The capacity limit is quite generous at 6% of total campus operating expenses. The campus now carries a \$371 million debt with yearly payments of \$27 million. The CPS Safety and Security Management Workgroup presented an extensive plan for improving safety in buildings, new key systems, administrative infrastructure and so forth. A budget for the plan was not presented at CPS and CPB agreed to monitor this project. CPB member Joe Konopelski agrees to serve as alternate at the next CPS meeting of February 21.

**2.Total Cost to Students**

CPB agree to form a subcommittee on the total cost to students, work begun by last year's committee. CPB discussed the work of the Student Fee Advisory Committee. The committee was struck by how much of the student experience is funded by student fees; radio, gym, learning support, and they now include environmental and sustainability efforts. Students have taken the lead in voting these fees for themselves, but it is unclear if there are old fees that should be repealed. In recent years, students have been more savvy in putting sunset dates on fees (i.e. library hours). CPB will inquire if this is work that SFAC does.

The committee considered the non-resident cost of \$55,866 and the resident cost of \$33,000. Going back to the mid-nineties, and adjusting for inflation it is apparent that these figures are going up much more quickly than the rate of inflation. But it is not clear why this is so. It is especially so in the case of housing, which is self-funded. There is discussion at the sytemwide level of changing the way capital projects for housing are funded by extending the repayment period to 30 years from 10. Paying off in 10 years creates larger fees for current students. CPB agreed it is important to understand housing costs since this is a significant portion of expenses to students.

CPB identified several areas where more information is needed. Financial aid comes in the form of federal and state grants and scholarships, which do not have to be repaid, accompanied by subsidized and unsubsidized loans. Part of a student's financial aid package may include work-study, but there is a shortage of work-study positions on campus as well as the federal matching funds, so although students may be eligible for this program, and they are told so, this

employment is often not available. CPB will seek to understand how much of an aid package is free and clear, and how much must be repaid and at what rate.

### **3.Consultation with EVC Alison Galloway**

EVC Galloway reported on the first meeting of the Student Services Advisory Committee noting that the realignment of Student Services out of Student Affairs is not a big topic for the students on the committee. The students are more interested in aligning student services with the colleges to create a “one stop shop” for doing paperwork and getting advising. The places where students get advising are dispersed and not uniform and they expressed the need for more consistency. EVC Galloway noted that these issues have existed for quite a while and were not caused by the realignment.

EVC Galloway reported that UCOP has changed the reporting lines of Student Health Services. It is not clear how this will affect Health Services on campus, or how they are consulting with students about potential changes. Her office will monitor this change.

CPB raised the broad issue of curricular management; specifically for interdisciplinary programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. Faculty do a lot of interdisciplinary research across departments and divisions. Accepting the principle that innovative curriculum follows research, what are the appropriate structures to support them, given that the model of creating small departments seems to be failing.

EVC Galloway noted that this failure is a result of the budget crisis. Departments are now struggling to meet the course load of the disciplinary majors, and there are fewer options for faculty to offer courses for programs outside the home department. When she served as VPAA she required programs to develop charters and MOUs so that small interdisciplinary programs would be sustainable. Charters, bylaws and joint appointments were established. Likewise the External Review process was changed so that these programs would be reviewed during the hosting department’s review.

There was general agreement that since it is unlikely there will be significant ongoing resources to put into these programs individually, models other than creating a small department must be sought. Interdisciplinary programs frequently have unique core curricula that must be taught; support for these courses must be identified. The degree to which a program can leverage courses taught as part of other majors to augment that curriculum provides a degree of stability, although the budget crisis has meant that even saving slots for those students might pose a problem. Housing such programs within existing departments whose faculty have a vested interest in the program can be successful, but programs that are solely dependent upon the good graces of the hosting department are at risk. Various models were discussed. For programs hosted by History, the program director in consultation with the department chair gets resources for the program. Legal Studies with the department of Politics, has its own faculty governing body. With this structure, the governing body must be kept distinct and active.

Looking forward to a potential Critical Race and Ethnic Studies program, the EVC stated she has agreed to put some permanent money towards it. But any new hires will all be made in existing

departments. There seems to be enough faculty support across campus that the program would be sustainable through substantial cross-listing of courses. How to keep faculty affiliated with these types of programs will need attention. The EVC noted that charters and MOUs generally commit a number of courses, not FTE. So sometimes faculty have to adjust their teaching load and service in their home department, which could negatively affect their personnel actions. Hiring faculty for interdisciplinary programs is difficult and there is a weak link in the academic personnel process in dealing with split appointments. We do have outside members on the search committee for these type of appointments. CPB recommended that for these types of searches, the VPAA should review the composition of the search committee, rather than just the dean.

#### **4. Post consultation discussion**

CPB noted that program charters are only partially effective. They are easy to get around and there is little consequence for breaking the commitments. Governing boards of programs don't have money, FTE or resources to bargain with the hosting department. Programs that are driven by the interest of faculty have the loosest structures and are more amorphous. Faculty and students need to understand the useful lifetime of these, and let go of those that are no longer viable.

Interdisciplinary programs are a product of pedagogical innovation, not just research innovation. Establishing programs takes considerable time, as does disestablishment. Perhaps some interdisciplinary programs just have a shorter lifespan than traditional disciplines. Although CPB did not recommend the disestablishment of Community Studies, they noted that it spawned both the LALS and the Social Documentation programs, and considered whether it is realistic to expect that it be maintained at the same level.

#### **5. Five Year Perspective**

In this annual review of the Five Year Perspective, CPB had no comments.

#### **6. Faculty Workload**

CPB identified faculty workload policies as a possible area for subcommittee work and discussed what scope the work should take. It will include an examination of existing workload policies, but must encompass more than just faculty course load.