UCR’s Committee on Planning and Budget met 46 times in 1999-2000, including meetings in July and September. The average length of each meeting was more than two hours.

Protocols for consultation with each dean, Executive Vice Chancellor Warren, Associate Chancellor Bolar, and Chancellor Orbach had been developed during the 1998-99 academic year. These protocols had culminated in the development of 5 year rolling plans by each dean; consultation with each dean and CPB concerning his or her FTE and other resources requests; consultations between EVC Warren and CPB concerning each dean’s submissions; and recommendations to the administration about the allocation of FTEs and other resources to each college and school. In addition, CPB was represented at the Budget Hearings, a forum in which each major unit presented its budget requests, including not only the schools and colleges but other units, e.g., the Library, University Extension, Office for University Advancement, Office of Vice Chancellor for Research, the Graduate Division, and the Office of Vice Chancellor for Administration. Each unit made its presentation to the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Associate Chancellor, Senate Chair Sherman and the chair of CPB or his designated representative.

In 1999-2000 CPB enlarged the scope of its inquiry to include the Library in its purview while continuing to review requests for additional FTE by the six schools and colleges. In addition, CPB was consulted and offered advice on a variety of academic program and budget issues either to the UCR administration or to UCOP, including, but not limited to the following:

- UCR’s Plan to Develop a School of Law
- UC budgets--1999-2000, 2000-01
- UC/Governor Partnership Agreement
- UC Compendium
- high ranking administrators’ salaries
- Governor Davis’ “service” requirement
- 10th campus chancellor
- UC enrollment plans
- “year-round operations” plans
- conflict of interest statement
- UC’s Budget Handbook
- establishment, review, and disestablishment of Centers
- Long Range Development Plans
- UC Research Initiatives Call
• Proposed name change of Department of Neurosciences
• Capital Budget for UCR, in Regents Budget 2000-2001
• proposal for a New MFA Degree in Dance
• proposal to establish a Department of Mechanical Engineering
• Physical Resources issues
• graduate and undergraduate academic programs
• distance learning and satellite campuses
• Academic Computing and Information Technology
• the deans’ Declaration of Cooperation

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCERNS:

1. At the end of June 1999 CPB initiated a review of its role in the planning process and advised EVC Warren of the need to (a) clarify aspects of campus planning that should involve CPB that may go beyond FTE allocation questions, (b) articulate the emerging vision of the campus, (c) review the successes and failures of the consultation process. We also urged that an annual status report be prepared that would cover some of the following questions:
   • what FTE commitments have been made to units, and what is their relationship to 5 year plans?
   • what searches are in progress, in which departments, what research plans, and what is their relationship to 5 year plans?
   • what centers (and Centers) and professional schools are being planned, being established, what is their cost, rationale, and their bearing on 5 year plans?

   Many of these suggestions were adopted, and at the end of the 1999-2000 rolling plan process it was concluded between CPB and the administration that, for the next year of the rolling plan, no additional FTE resources should be allocated to any school or college because we lack a coherent conception of the relationship between the incremental FTE allocations made and their role in defining the UCR campus at maturity, in 2010.

2. It also is important to remember that the schools and colleges differ considerably in mission, size, age, stability, and maturity. The largest proportion of students and faculty, by far, are housed in two units: CHASS and CNAS. CPB has argued for the past two years, without much success, that the two largest units ought to consider seriously, during this period of unprecedented growth, the opportunity to enhance UCR’s standing and visibility—within UC and beyond—by augmenting a few, selected departments and programs, at least initially, whose reputational rankings could be improved dramatically in rankings surveys, such as those found in the NRC survey (due in 2003) and *US News and World Report*. The temptation to succumb to the view that a rising FTE tide floats all ships has not been resisted with marked success in all quarters.
3. The number and pace of opportunities for serious resource commitments that present themselves have occasionally threatened to overwhelm the planning process. Adequate consultation and, therefore, the very idea of shared governance have been bruised on a number of occasions. For example, the administration embarked on four major initiatives this year without any consultation with CPB, initiatives whose size and scope could well have a major impact on the shape of the campus and available resources for years to come: (1) the Haddon hire in nanotechnology which required approximately $10 million + 10 FTE; (2) the proposed James hire in structural biology which requires approximately $5 million + 10 FTE for an Institute of Structural Biology; (3) the Clegg retention which required $2 million and a Genomics Center plus an unspecified number of FTE; and (4) the recent California Industry and Science Institutes initiative (the so-called Governor’s Science Institutes), a competition which, at this writing, will fund 3 of the 6 remaining proposals. UCR and UCD have submitted a proposal for a joint agricultural genomics institute, presumably sited primarily at UCR. Under the Governor’s proposal, enacted by the legislature, $25 million per year for four years (i.e., $100 million) will go to each of the three successful applicants. However, a 2 to 1 match is required from the campus. Thus, if the UCR/UCD submission succeeds, $300 will become available over a four year period, $200 million of which will have to come from the campus in non-state funds. If, as we understand it, UCR will play the lead role (in a 60%-40% split), UCR would have to commit to and guarantee raising $120 million over the next four years for this project alone.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. Each of these initiatives, considered in isolation, may well be exciting and fully worthy of support. Our complaint is simply that it is disappointing, to say the least, that none of these projects were officially brought to CPB’s attention for comment, at a minimum, let alone serious consultation.
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