

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**

**January 22, 2015**

**Minutes**

**Present:** Dan Friedman (Chair), Don Brenneis, Ólöf Einarisdóttir, Suresh Lodha, Loisa Nygaard, Eric Porter, Rick Prelinger, Abel Rodriguez, Danilyn Rutherford, Bruce Schumm, Jin Zhang, Whitney De Vos (Grad), Guillermo Rogel (UG), Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Matthew Mednick (ASO)

**Guests:** VCUR Brandt, Chair Gillman (SCDF), CPEVC Galloway

**Member's Items**

The strategic academic planning workgroup began working in fall, but according to workgroup member and CPB Chair Friedman, it stopped meeting shortly thereafter with no clear output. CPB will inquire with the CP/EVC as to the status of the process.

Member Nygaard reported that the Miscellaneous and Course Fees committee would begin meeting in March.

Member Einarisdóttir reported that the Graduate Growth Task Force is having trouble getting off the ground, with relevant administrators still not selected for appointment. CPB is hopeful this happens in short order, so that progress can be achieved this academic year.

**Consultation VCUR Brant**

(w/ Special Committee on Fundraising and Development (SCDF) Chair Gillman)

As requested, Vice Chancellor of University Relations (VCUR) Brant provided a large amount of information for CPB review, which details both divisional organizational planning, and strategic direction for the division. The information was very useful for CPB members to contextualize the status of the University Relations division as well as prepare useful inquiry for VC Brant.

Additionally, VC Brant elaborated that this is an exciting time, with the campus 50th anniversary that gives the campus an opportunity to tell our story. Between the promotions and events planned, UR is doing a lot. As for the Capital Campaign, there have been some issues due to staffing absences, and the turnover in deans is disruptive as well. UR continues to need investment, to tell our story, and improve the reputation of the campus. We can also do more to enhance our alumni relations process, prospect research, etc. These areas also require investment.

On the topic of engagement of faculty in university relations outreach and strategy there is a lack of connection between UR staff and current initiatives with faculty research activities. With better coordination, the campus could likely attract more and better financial support for the new and exciting research faculty are currently engaged in. VC Brant said that it may be useful to reinitialize the UR training session for faculty who want it. a CPB member noted however that we had 24 faculty who went through it previously, but there was no follow-up with the faculty afterward. Feedback is essential for the faculty to understand the benefits of their time investment.

Chair Gillman informed the committee that the SCDF is working with UR on the Faculty Initiated Group Hire (FIGH) proposals. The current plan is to leverage topics presented by FIGHs and use them as communication items as possible development opportunities.

It was clear through the discussion that a priority for UR should be to lessen the administrative burden on faculty working with UR. When faculty are engaged in university relations outreach, UR often wants to “take ownership of the donors” which may be personal contacts of faculty. Additionally, often faculty are left with administrative duties associated with finalizing the prospective grant or donation. CPB was clear that this could be handled better.

CPB also raised the concern that we do not do a good job closing the loop on “nearly there” donations, and often faculty are aware a donation is close to being finalized and never hear back as to the status.

CPB also questioned the UR business model, and whether it creates the right incentives for staff. CPB was also interested in industry standards for the marginal return on (staff) investment. We currently have 25 people doing fundraising out of approximately 80 UR staff, although units within UR work on other campus priorities (Government Relations, etc.). CPB asked the Vice Chancellor if there were other support models or staffing best practices that could be investigated. VC Brant committed to look into the matter which could be more fully investigated through the SCDF process.

CPB appreciated the high degree of background provided by VC Brant on the operations in his informational packet. They were curious how the proposed restructuring within UR will impact the campus, especially the academic divisions. VC Brant’s current plan is to move development officers into the field more. Additionally, the campus hasn’t had a Chief Communication Officer in 4-5 years, and we have just filled the position. VC Brant articulated that the way our campus tells stories now is outdated, we produce press releases to the media, and we don’t have a high degree of visual capability. All this needs to change for the better and we will begin production of more 1-2 minute videos which media outlets will likely host on their existing platforms.

### **Consultation with CPEVC Galloway**

The EVC reported that although the “final” campus long range enrollment plan (LREP) is due to Office of the President (OP) tomorrow, there are still ongoing conversations with OP, and that the due date will very likely be pushed back to accommodate additional campus analysis. Financial modeling based on the LREP is still murky, given that the “committee of two” meetings between the UC President and the California Governor have not yet given an indication of where tuition will likely end up. CPB argued that our plan should reflect campus aspirations, which can be moderated later with system-wide directives if any. The internal benefits of the LREP will be for the campus to project our own size, shape and budget so we can accurately gauge latitudes for investment and divestment.

The EVC did not yet know if the International Education Office Director had been hired from the recent search. She did update the committee that she soft-funded two internationalization positions, a faculty writing director to assist with the writing curriculum and a position in Languages and Applied Linguistics supporting English as a second language learners.

The EVC then provided an update on the TA allocations for 2015-16, for which the funding memo was just distributed. There will be \$1.6M put into additional positions this year, and the allocations have been weighted differently to support graduate student enrollment growth. Based on these data, departments are deciding on admissions for their programs. CPB reported that it is aware of some situations where departments have been fearful that TAs will decline, and have curtailed growth for next academic year. The allocations to all the divisions increased, but the flow through to the departments is determined by the deans, and in many cases the undergraduate enrollment. This issue is one that CPB is very concerned with, and will look into in more detail in the coming weeks. It seems likely that the growth allocations may not be creating the desired effect, and this should be reported on and fixed in future cycles. CPB will work with the planned Graduate Growth Task Force to identify a stronger incentive structure(s) to make the best use of graduate growth resources.

Related to graduate growth, the committee continued a discussion focused on factors which limit our ability to reach the 12-15% graduate goal. In the absence of leveraging externalities, the campus is merely paying for each additional graduate enrollment. This is unsustainable and we cannot reach the goal in this way, there simply isn't enough funding. More strategic planning and incentives will be required.

### **Capital Planning**

The committee discussed how best to consult on this critical topic, which has been identified as a process which can be streamlined for cost savings, and enhanced with additional faculty input. The committee is concerned with the process by which capital projects are prioritized. Academic space continues to be prioritized, though perhaps not in the most advantageous order, new classroom buildings have not been prioritized, and several housing projects are in unknown status despite previous prioritization.

As for the capital planning process, CPB has noted that the Capital Planning & Stewardship committee has not been meeting in 2014-15. The committee will check with the VC Planning & Budget to determine the status of the current capital planning process and how this matches up with systemwide planning, if any.