

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
MINUTES
January 18, 2018**

Present: Carl Walsh (Chair), Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Kimberly Lau (*ex officio*), Elizabeth Abrams, Doug Bonett, Matthew Clapham, Cormac Flanagan, Jonathan Kahana, Tracy Larrabee, Nirvikar Singh, Maxine Jimenez (Undergrad Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

Absent: Jie Qing, Dan Oliver (Graduate Rep)

Members Items

Chair Walsh provided members with the committee's planned timeline for the 2018-19 FTE review process.

Members commented on the proposal to discontinue the Science Education concentration within the Earth Sciences major. CPB supported the request.

External Reviews

Stage 2: Comments on External Review Committee (ERC) Report (for closure meeting)

Astronomy & Astrophysics

The committee commented on the external review report documents for the Astronomy and Astrophysics Department's review. CPB members noted the ERC visited in April 2016, the Department's response was provided in December 2016 but the Dean's response was not provided until January 2018. Members noted that the long time between the self-study and the ERC's visit on one hand and the Dean's letter on the other made it more difficult to review the report, as some of the original concerns may no longer be relevant and the department might be dealing with new issues that require attention.

Members raised several issues for discussion at the closure meeting, including: current and proposed initiatives/centers, fundraising, teaching and workload policy, graduate student/faculty ratio and graduate student targets, and recruitment of international students.

The committee also decided to send a separate letter to VPAA Lee to express concern over the excessive delay introduced in the external review of the Astronomy and Astrophysics department by the more than 12-month gap between the department's response to the ERC report and the dean's response. The campus process calls for the dean to prepare a divisional response within two weeks of receiving the departmental response. CPB expressed support for efforts by the VPAA to ensure reviews proceed in a timely fashion and suggested that the VPAA introduce a mechanism to ensure delays, such as the case with the Astronomy and Astrophysics review, do not occur for future external reviews.

Systemwide Review: APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740

CPB discussed the second set of proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740 at its meeting on January 18, 2018. The committee appreciated the ongoing efforts to revise APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740 to recognize and reward research for L(P)SOE faculty, and stated that it fully supports all efforts to address the often-overlooked fact that L(P)SOE faculty may have active research programs. The committee also raised a number of questions and concerns related to the proposed revisions, including lack of clarity as to the rationale for two Senate faculty series (ladder and SOE) now that distinctions are diminished (and concern this may inadvertently introduce a two tiered system that negatively impacts SOE faculty) as well as rank and salary for the two series (with potential implications for equity).

Consultation: Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Delaney

The committee consulted with VCPB Delaney on her annual presentation: “Operating Budget Review: Academic Support Divisions, Institutional Support Units, Auxiliary Units.” Members reviewed VCPB Delaney’s powerpoint slides and the 2015-16 “Birds Eye View” ahead of the consultation.

Members began the consultation by asking VCPB Delaney about areas she recommends CPB examine more closely, given there will not be a spring budget review this year. VCPB Delaney noted that CPB spends more time than any other faculty group thinking about the campus as a whole, and therefore it is helpful to have its advice on a range of issues. She raised several areas as examples, including capital needs, Student Housing West, Strategic Academic Planning, as well as suggestions for review of specific units, and expanded conversations with divisional deans.

VCPB Delaney informed CPB that her office is working on various policies and procedures, including policies around budgeting for the divisions. She also noted that her office was preparing the campus deficits report, which will come to the committee for review. In addition, she noted she would share a presentation on faculty resource models with the committee. VCPB Delaney suggested there should be a CPB subgroup to help vet her office’s ideas about reworking the Birds Eye View.

Members cited the recent AMAS audit report, “Divisional Carryforward/Deficit Balances” (2017) and noted that it would be helpful to get a better sense of several issues, including carryforwards, but also more broadly accountability measures. Members raised the need to have a clearer picture of revenues and expenditures, including trend data to capture how different data and unit revenue/expenditures have shifted over time. CPB noted that the committee is able to provide the most meaningful advice with more complete data.

Systemwide Review: Senate Bylaw 128

CPB reviewed a proposed addition to systemwide Senate Bylaw 128 to add a new section governing conflicts of interest on Senate committees, subcommittees, and task forces. Though CPB spent some time discussing the issue, it ultimately did not suggest any substantive change to the amendment. Members did, however, have one suggestion: to introduce the word “excuse” when discussing the potential of the Academic Council Chair’s (or Vice-Chair’s) intervention in a potential conflict-of-interest case. CPB discussed the difference between “recusal” (in which the party with the potential conflict of interest opts to exit discussion) and “excusal”, in which another party (the Chair or Vice-Chair of Academic Council) could make a “final determination” to remove a committee member perceived to have a conflict of interest or appearance thereof but not opting to recuse.

Unit Budget Review

CPB discussed a potential review of the Office of Research (OR) as part of its annual budget review of specific units. Members discussed potential questions to raise and information that would be most helpful to review.

Revised: Art Design: Games & Playable Media B.A. Updated Charter and Bylaws

With Senate Vice Chair Lau recused, CPB reviewed the revised charter and bylaws for the Art Design: Games and Playable Media B.A. The committee supported the process of revising the charter and bylaws, and had no additional comments for this revision. However, members noted that the Principal Faculty continue to consist of 4 faculty from Arts and 4 from Engineering, while CEP had suggested, for governance reasons, that a 5:4 ratio would be preferred. CEP’s concern was that under the previous bylaws, a 4:4 ratio might require the Dean of the Arts to intervene frequently to break tie votes. The new bylaws now give the

Program Director an additional vote in case of a tie. The committee therefore recommended that at the next external review, the External Review Committee (ERC) weigh in on this governance structure and evaluate how well it is working.

Planning January 25 Meeting

The committee briefly discussed planned items for its next meeting.