

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET  
MINUTES  
April 20, 2017**

**Present:** Abel Rodriguez (Chair), Adrian Brasoveanu, Kimberly Lau (*ex officio*), Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Elizabeth Abrams, Cormac Flanagan, Lindsay Hinck, Lourdes Martínez-Echazábal, Rick Prelinger, Carl Walsh, Graeme Baird (Graduate Rep), Tias Webster (Undergrad Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

**Absent:** Tracy Larrabee, Allyson Guo (Undergrad Rep)

**Member's Items**

Senate Chair Einarsdóttir provided an update on the Senate Executive Committee meeting of April 18. She summarized topics of discussion, including an update on the COLASC report for the upcoming Senate meeting, and a discussion facilitated by the Graduate Council Chair on GC's in-progress statement and report on graduate growth. Members asked if the GC report could be made available for CPB review.

Member Prelinger reported that the Bookstore committee is continuing its work, but there is no substantive information to report at this point.

**Systemwide Review: Proposed Revised APM 285, 210-33, 133, 740**

CPB reviewed proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Sections 285, Lecturer with Security of Employment Series; 210-3, Instructions to Review Committees that Advise on Actions Concerning the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series; 133, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles; 740, Leaves of Absence/Sabbatical Leaves. Revisions are intended to clarify the role played by LSOE faculty. Proposed revisions modify language intended to make the title more accurately reflect the requirements for advancement in the series and make hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices more consistent across the UC system. The committee will continue discussion of this item at the next meeting.

**Consultation: Capital Planning**

CPB consulted with Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Delaney and Director Draper on capital planning, with the goal for CPB members to receive an orientation to and discuss the process for review and approval of capital improvement projects, the Capital Financial Plan (CFP) process, the role of the Advisory Committee for Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS), and summary of the most recent CFP.

Members began with a request for an overview of how the capital planning process, and specifically the Capital Financial Plan process, has changed. VCPB Delaney began with an overview of the P-W-C-E document, which she noted is what UC and the state call the various phases of a capital project. Members expressed interest in learning about the best time during the phase of a project for meaningful Senate input. Director Draper indicated this would be during the Business Case Analysis (BCA), which is something new UCOP is requesting for capital projects over ten million. She also reported that the BCA is produced a year into the pre-design studies (P phase), and is one of the deliverables of the program committee. VCPB Delaney noted early stage influence is best. Members made clear that the committee had no interest in micromanaging this work, but would like to have more communication for the larger projects (i.e. over ten million) with awareness and planning for the fact that specific projects might have implications for larger numbers of stakeholders, and therefore campus community implications that should be considered in the early planning process.

VCPB Delaney noted additional concerns, including issues raised in consultation with CPB last year, including lack of ability to “gate” projects, investment of staff time in preparing a large number of projects—only a few of which can be developed.

On the CFP, VCP Delaney noted this year is a “bookkeeping” year. Every other year, there is an evaluation year and the following year is a bookkeeping year. CPB reviewed project summaries last year. Members asked about the plan overall and timeline for the year, and when the committee should expect to review the CFP. Director Draper responded that her unit would update the project summaries after the DAC meeting of April 27. The goal would be for CPB to review the project summaries first week of May, prior to the CPS meeting in which they would be reviewed. According to the proposed draft timeline provided by Director Draper, CPS would review and recommend approval at the June CPS meeting, for Chancellor approval and submission of CFP to UCOP during the summer. The CFP is expected to be presented to and accepted by the Regents at the November meeting.

### **Consultation: iCP/EVC**

The committee consulted with iCP/EVC Lee with the goal of covering the following topics: campus budget, P3 public private partnerships, FTE allocations for 17-18, and the framework for UC Growth and Support. Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Delaney attended the consultation.

iCP/EVC Lee began with two issues for discussion. First, he noted he has been working on the Special Salary Practice (SSP) at the systemwide level.

The second item for discussion related to the structure of the EVC office and communication with the Senate. He noted that he has reduced the number of direct reports, now at sixteen. He also asked that if there is clear delegation, the Senate should work with principal officers. He noted that decisions that come up to the EVC are leadership issues, operational decisions are below level. VCPB Delaney added that on other campuses, respective CPBs work more directly with VCPBs. The committee acknowledged this and noted the Senate works directly with principal officers, and elevates to the CP/EVC level when needed. However, the committee also noted that CPB specifically values direct contact via consultation with the CP/EVC and made clear that the committee does not want to lose this direct connection.

On the subject of P3, iCP/EVC Lee asked the committee to work directly with VCBAS Latham. Chair Rodriguez reminded the iCP/EVC that this item on the consultation agenda was prompted by the iCP/EVC’s request for specific points of feedback around student family housing, and managing feedback on these topics. iCP/EVC Lee responded that plans are shifting and VCBAS Latham is the best point of contact. Members asked iCP/EVC Lee about his willingness to make a statement on P3 at the next Senate meeting, which has raised concerns from a general principle standpoint among some faculty.

On the Framework for UC Growth and Support, iCP/EVC Lee reiterated this was a visioning exercise, and that the campus was working on re-framing of the discussion, shifting towards what the campus can do in terms of growth with resources provided. The discussion centered on the recent system-wide meeting, also attended by Chair Rodriguez, and included campus differences, internal differences of perspective within the campuses, how the information will be used, and contesting discourses of “efficiency”.

iCP/EVC briefly touched on the FTE process and timeline. The campus budget was not discussed.

### **Summer Session**

With the previous CPB meetings (April 6 and 13) of the Internal Audit and Management Advisory Services (AMAS) review of Summer Session operations as context, the committee more broadly considered summer session, with the goal of moving toward planning aspects. Chair Rodriguez provided preliminary analysis

of data provided by Undergraduate Education. The committee discussed composing a subcommittee with participation of CEP and perhaps input of other Senate committees.

**Bio-Education Concentration Proposed Discontinuance**

CPB reviewed the proposal to discontinue the Bio-Education concentration in the Biology B.A. program, administered by the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Department. The proposal for discontinuance was set in motion by the department faculty, based on the desire to replace this program with the proposed Science Education B.S. CPB supported the request to discontinue the concentration.

**Planning: April 27 Meeting**

The committee briefly discussed planned items for the next meeting.