



## PLANNING & BUDGET

January 17, 2018

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Christian Shelton, Chair   
Committee on Planning and Budget

RE: Appendix Review: Revisions to UCR Appendix 7

Planning & Budget discussed the proposed changes to Appendix 7. The committee was generally supportive of the efforts to clarify the procedures. However, the committee felt that the restructuring fell short in a couple of aspects:

1. The distinctions among proposing a TCDD, recommending a TCDD, and deciding on a TCDD are not entirely clear. As a suggestion, perhaps these three could have a short, one-sentence description in the set of definitions and the information could be organized temporally according to the process (e.g., first listing who can propose and how, then how it is routed, then who can recommend, and finally who decides)?
2. The added material regarding moratoria and suspensions is not clearly distinct from TCDDs. Non-definition information is included in the definition section, and it is not clear that a moratorium or a suspension of a program is not included in the discussion of TCDD. It would appear that moratoria and suspensions follow a different procedure (or at least have a different set of possible proposers, recommenders, and deciders). For that reason, we would suggest that after the section on TCDD, there should be a separate section for moratoria and suspensions.

Minor comments:

- A. The committee would also suggest that the definitions be given a logical ordering (either starting with units and programs and then proceeding to terms which depend on those terms, or an alphabetical ordering).

- B. In the paragraph beginning "In most cases....," point ii is unclear. As written, it seems that if UCR had an undergraduate program that was unique in the UC and wished to transfer it from one college to another, the transfer would require system-wide consultation. Perhaps this point also only applies to discontinuances or disestablishments (as point i does)?