Annual Report: Academic Year 2011-12
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Planning & Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 16</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: biweekly; as needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: members: varies. Chair: 5-8 hrs/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals/items reviewed: 75 (TOEs-6, POPs-2, Endowments-8, others-59)</td>
<td>Total deferred proposals from the previous year: none</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year: Three (two TOE proposals, one endowed chair proposal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** none

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:** none

**Issues considered by the committee:** see Committee’s Narrative below

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year, or general carry-over items:**

**CPB recommendations for 2012-13:**

- **New Budget Model:** It is strongly requested that CPB be involved in both the funding streams and new budget model projects at UC Davis. The committee feels strongly that faculty participation and input is critical to help fulfill the UC Davis Vision for the Future.

- **Allocation of FTEs:** CPB should have a role in the allocation of FTEs. For planning purposes, CPB recommends that departments have a target size, understanding that due to the current budget situation, this may be a goal not a reality.

- **Faculty Appointment Data:** CPB would like to request data on all appointments (including TOEs and POPs) and retentions on an annual basis. These data must include information on salary, research support, start-up and retention packages, and teaching responsibilities.

- **College/School Budgets:** CPB would like to request overall budgets from the Deans for each College and School on campus including the Office of Research. CPB previously requested this information from the Provost and didn’t receive a response. In requesting the overall budgets for each college and school, CPB would also like the Deans to include a summary of the impact of the budget reductions over the last three years for their college or school including undergraduate enrollment, course cancellations, FTE reductions including staff, closed/cancelled majors and programs, etc. In addition, CPB would like to have an idea of the academic program impact associated with current campus planning efforts and the new budget model.

- **Consultation with the Academic Senate:** To establish a more collegial and productive relationship with the administration, CPB requests that each substantive matter sent for committee review be accompanied by a cover letter from the relevant administrator(s) providing some background. Ideally, CPB would be told candidly whether our suggestions could possibly have any effect, or whether the Senate is simply being informed of what the administration plans to do. When CPB provides suggestions, the committee would like to know how they were implemented or why they were ignored.
COMMITTEE’S NARRATIVE

The Academic Senate Davis Division Planning and Budget Committee (CPB) considered matters regarding policy on academic planning, budget, and resource allocations according to Davis Division Bylaw 48. Ann Orel, the Chair of CPB, also served as CPB’s representative to Representative Assembly and as a member on Executive Council. CPB member Chris van Kessel served as the Committee’s representative on the UC Systemwide Planning and Budget Committee (UCPB) and provided regular updates to the Committee. The two members appointed to CPB’s Instructional Space Advisory Group Subcommittee (ISAG) were: Susan Keen and Kent Wilken.

This section outlines the Committee’s activity in 2011-2012 regarding the following review items:

I. GUESTS WHO ATTENDED CPB 2011-12 MEETINGS

- Ralph Hexter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Kelly Ratliff, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- Dave Maddox, Budget Consultant
- John Meyer, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- Chris Carter, Budget Director, Administrative and Resource Management
- Harris Lewin, Vice Chancellor, Office of Research
- Harold Levine, Dean, School of Education

II. ENDOWMENT, PARTNER OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, AND TARGET OF EXCELLENCE PROPOSALS

Endowment Proposals Reviewed (8 reviewed):
- Susan P. Baker and Stephen P. Teret Chair in Violence Prevention
- Helen Marian Bart Endowed Professorship in Burn Care
- Charles and Patricia Fullerton Endowed Chair in Pain Medicine
- Joel Keizer Endowed Chair in Theoretical and Computational Biology
- Victor and Genevieve Orsi Endowed Chair in Alzheimer’s Research
- Julian R. Youmans Chair in Neurological Surgery
- Molecular Imaging Administrative Chair in Radiology
- School of Medicine Vice Chancellor's Chair in Violence Prevention

Partner Opportunity Program Proposals (2 reviewed)
- Dennis Hartigan-O’Connor, Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology
- Susan Lott, Department of Evolution and Ecology

Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed (6 reviewed)
- Paul Allen, Department of Molecular Biosciences
- Carol Hess, Department of Music
- Johanna Schmitt, Department of Evolution and Ecology
- Carl Schramm, Graduate School of Management
- Dr. Robert Seiringer, Department of Mathematics
- Jerry M. Woodall, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

III. BUSINESS ACTION REVIEW ITEMS FROM AS CHAIR AND/OR SYSTEMWIDE

1. Campus Email Committee Report
2. Revision of PPM 200-25 (Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs)
3. Updated Proposal to Reconstitute the Department of Spanish and Classics
4. On Line Degree Certification Proposal
5. PPM 200-45: Campus Asset Management Planning and Information System
6. Proposal to Establish 3 New Chemistry Degree Programs
7. Proposal to Establish the Department of Design
9. Proposed Revision to APM 670: Health Sciences Compensation Plan
10. UCAAD Salary Equity Study
11. BOARS Transfer Policy Revision Proposal
12. Systemwide Senate Regulation 610: Senior Residency
13. Systemwide APM 200 (General) and APM 205 (Recall for Academic Appointees)
14. UC Davis APM Revision: APM 120 and 140
15. Draft Guide to Research Compliance
16. PPM 200-45: Pre-Purchasing System Review
17. PPM 230-10: Sponsored Programs (Publication Rights)
18. UC Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs & Policy on Implementation of Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs
19. Proposed Minor: Materials Science
20. Proposals to Establish New Minors: Biomedical Engineering and Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
21. Departmental Merger Proposal: Textiles/Clothing and Biological/Agricultural Engineering
22. Report from Consortium of Women in Research
23. Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Applied Science
24. UC Davis Athletics Strategic Audit 2011
25. Proposal to Discontinue the Electronic Materials Engineering Major
26. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Reports
27. Proposal to Temporarily Delete and Revise PPM 220-01: Organized Research Units
28. Campus Research Investments in Science and Engineering (RISE) Program Proposal
29. Interdisciplinary Frontiers Program (IFP) Proposal
30. Self-Supporting Degree Program Task Force Report
31. Systemwide Review of UC Observatories
32. BGI Master Agreement
33. Academic Masters Tuition Pilot Program
34. Special Committee on Athletics Report
35. Faculty Salaries Task Force Report
36. UC Davis Off-Scale Task Force Report
37. Optical Science and Engineering (OSE) Major
38. UC Davis Federal Relations Update
39. Funding Streams Executive Summary and Working Paper
40. Incentive Based Budget Timeline
41. Indirect Cost Return Memo 2011-12, Executive Summary, and Whitepaper
42. Undergraduate Tuition Allocation Whitepaper
43. Korea University Exchange Agreement
44. Benefits Decentralization Issues Whitepaper
45. Departmental Status Report: Religious Studies
46. PPM 200-45: GradHub Concept
47. PPM 200-45: GSM Registration and Payment System
48. 2011-12 Budget Planning Document
49. LBNL Joint FTE and MOU
50. Admissions Closure Request: Textiles and Clothing
51. 2012-2013 Budget Planning Letter
52. Provost Allocation Executive Summary and Whitepaper
53. Target of Excellence Process Draft
54. MS in Pharmaceutical Chemistry Proposal
55. Joint Senate/Administration Task Force on the Future of Graduate Education at UC Davis
57. Frontiers in the Humanities and Arts Grant Program Proposal
58. Proposed Revisions to Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) Section 230-05: Public Health Services Regulations on Objectivity in Research
59. CPB *Principles* regarding consolidating and merging departments and academic units
IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

a. **Discussions with AVC Ratliff and Provost Hexter:** CPB discussed budget/planning with AVC Kelly Ratliff and Provost Hexter several times throughout the year. Discussion items included, but were not limited to, the following:
   - Discussed the New Budget Model and Funding Streams Proposal
   - Reviewed several versions of New Budget Model Whitepapers including Undergraduate Tuition Allocation, Indirect Cost Return, Benefits Decentralization, Provost Allocation, and Master's Revenue Sharing Pilot Initiative
   - Compared the New Budget Model whitepapers, Funding Streams proposal, and systemwide rebenching documents with the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) reports from 2008-09

b. **Department Chair Survey:** In April 2012, the Division conducted a survey of Department/Program Chairs to better understand resource allocation and academic costs at the departmental level. This on-line survey originated based on concerns raised across campus by Department Chairs that instructional and mandated compliance and administrative costs were not being covered by allocations, and that the situation was worsening due to projected increased costs being passed along to departments and programs in the absence of any new resources. CPB was asked to compile and analyze the data with the hope of gaining a more comprehensive view of the gap between mandated costs and resource allocation for academic units and to identify best practices for resource management. Although the rate of return of the surveys was relatively small, CPB’s analysis noted several common themes that deserve scrutiny and suggest the need for reforms in the current way of doing things including the merit and promotion system, resource allocation and communication between departments and Dean’s offices, and a better understanding of how and why decisions are made centrally by the administration including the concern that departments have no sense of a common UC Davis culture.

c. **Funding Streams/ New Budget Model:** CPB discussed the systemwide funding streams project, new budget model, and rebenching at the systemwide level with Provost Hexter, AVC Ratliff, and Dave Maddox (budget consultant). CPB must continue to be involved in funding streams discussions and discussions regarding constructing the new budget model. Having faculty input and participation is critical to the new budget process.

d. **Revised TOE Procedures:** CPB was asked to review revised procedures and best practices regarding the TOE process on campus. The Chairs of CPB and CAP-Oversight worked with the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs to develop a revised process for the TOE process. Overall, CPB strongly supported the documentation of the procedures as outlined in the draft. CPB requested that a statement be added to the document that states that at all levels of review (including the department and Dean’s office), the review be done efficiently and as quickly as possible.

e. **Consultation with CPB/ Academic Senate:** CPB sent a letter to Senate Chair Bisson in February 2012 outlining concerns regarding Senate consultation on three important initiatives. These initiatives include (1) a TOE request from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, (2) the Master Agreement between BGI and UC Davis, and (3) the RISE and IFP proposals from the Office of Research. In each of these cases an unreasonable turnaround time was requested. Taken together, these events seem to suggest, variably, that CPB is being asked to rubber stamp decisions in which the committee has no actual part to play, or being provided with complex documents at the last minute (and sometimes after the last minute) which the committee has no hope of digesting properly in time to render an informed opinion. CPB’s main concern is that neither option seems to honor either the spirit or the letter of shared governance. In these specific cases, CPB was in a position where the consultation occurred ‘after the fact’ when all decisions had been made and/or the request for consultation was not sincere. It seems that CPB is expected to rubber stamp decisions in these cases so the administration can say they have consulted the Academic Senate.

f. **Department Merger/ Disestablishment Principles:** During the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years, CPB reviewed a number of proposals to merge and in some cases disestablish academic departments and
programs. These proposals, in many cases, seem not to originate from academic planning in the Academic Senate, but from the Dean’s level, usually in response to budget issues. CPB acknowledges that in this time of budget crisis, there may be a need to prune academic programs. In response to the requests, CPB drafted principles to guide the process of merging and disestablishing departments and academic units. CPB revisited the principles in June 2012 and agreed that they still remain accurate.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Orel (chair), Greg Clark (member), Tom Famula (member), Jack Gunion (member), Jerry Last (member), Jonna Mazet (member), David Simpson (member), Michael Turrelli (member), Chris van Kessel (member), Linda Bisson (advisor), Bruno Nachtergaele (advisor), and Christophe Morisseau (Academic Federation Representative)