To be received and placed on file:

The divisional Committee on Planning and Budget met 15 times between September, 1997 and April, 1998, with two additional meetings scheduled to take place in May and June after the submission of this report.

Because of the large number of items of business addressed at these meetings, the issues considered by the Committee during this academic year are sorted in this report by topic, beginning with issues of concern to the entire campus, and turning later to business affecting individual colleges and departments.

1. Campuswide planning

The Committee met with Executive Vice Chancellor David H. Warren and Associate Chancellor Gretchen Bolar a total of six times, with a seventh meeting scheduled to take place in June.

Much of the time with the EVC and AC was devoted to discussions of planned increases in the share of centrally-funded FTE that will remain unallocated in future years. At the start of 1997-98, allocated FTE (463.7) exceeded budgeted FTE (450) by 13.7, or 3%. When the budgeted enrollment of the campus rises from the current 9,025 to the Office of the President's projection for 2005-6 of 11,968, the share of unallocated FTE is projected to rise to 13.1%, or a total of 81.32 out of 620.32 budgeted FTE. The administration intends to allocate a small portion of the FTE that are held in reserve on programmatic grounds, but seeks always to keep at least 10% of FTE unallocated (i.e., 62 of the 81 positions). The Office of the President recommends leaving a similar or higher portion of FTE unallocated as a source of funding for new initiatives and short-term contingencies, and this is said to be a standard budgetary practice among all the UC campuses. In anticipation of future growth, UC Riverside has stood out from other campuses in recent years by allocating a high fraction of its budgeted FTE. The campus administration is advising deans of schools and colleges that as the allocation of FTE within schools and colleges is decentralized in the future, deans should keep another 10% of the FTE at their disposal unallocated for similar reasons, bringing the total share of FTE to be left unallocated to 19% or higher.

This increase in the share of unallocated FTE will be felt by UCR faculty in the form of increased student/faculty ratios and rising class sizes. The student/faculty ratio is budgeted systemwide at 18.7. In 1996-97 at UCR it stood at 18.2, but it is now projected to rise to 21.87 when budgeted enrollment reaches 11,968 by 2005-2006. FTE left unallocated at the college level could raise the actual workload in some colleges to 23 to 1 or higher.

These projected increases in workload will have a different impact in each college. In the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, the student/faculty ratio had already climbed by the fall of 1997 to 22.5, and the administration has announced an intention not to let this figure go higher than 23. In the other college and the professional schools, student/faculty...
ratios are projected to rise substantially: in CHASS, from 17.47 in 1996-97 to 21.84; in the Anderson Graduate School of Management, from 18.79 to 22.83; in Education, from 16.67 to 20.882; and in Engineering, from 11.22 to 18.15.

These plans for FTE allocations and workloads have serious implications for other aspects of planning and growth. During a period in which UCR's budgeted enrollment will grow by 32.6% (from 9,025 to 11,968), the faculty is projected to grow by only 16.2%, or even less if additional FTE are left unallocated at college levels. Diminished opportunities for growth will be felt particularly keenly in CHASS, where the total of allocated FTE excluding English Composition is projected to remain flat at 229.93 throughout this period.

The administration has sought to soften the impact of this discouraging news by distributing projections of what the UCR faculty would look like if UCR can grow to a budgeted student body of 15,000. Because the planned increases in the student/faculty ratio will have occurred during the period of growth from 9,025 to 11,968 budgeted students, subsequent growth in the size of the student body would lead to proportionate increases in the size of the faculty throughout the campus.

To the Committee on Planning and Budget in 1997-98, these hoped for better times seem a long way off, while the immediate future poses many challenges. Growth plans throughout the campus may need to be scaled back, especially within the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences. Academic units at all levels must confront trade-offs between growing class sizes, increased teaching loads, and expanded use of temporary instructors.

Because of the threats that these budgetary stresses pose to the quality of education at UCR, the Committee on Planning and Budget has asked the EVC and AC to assist it in monitoring long-term trends in class sizes and in the use of nonladder faculty. From 1993-94 to 1996-97, mean class size rose from 37 to 39, while median class size rose from 20 to 21. The portion of classes taught by faculty of regular rank has been close to 55% throughout the decade.

2. Plans of Colleges and Professional Schools

On three occasions, the Committee considered proposals to establish new research centers within colleges. These were a proposal to establish a Western Center for Archaeology and Paleontology within CHASS; a Center for Research in Intelligent Systems (cRIS) within the College of Engineering; and a Center for Conservation Biology in CNAS. The Committee's advice regarding these proposals is on file in the Senate office.

The Committee was also consulted about the establishment of degree programs within the College of Engineering leading to Ph.D. and M.S. degrees in Chemical and Environmental Engineering.

The Committee gave advice regarding proposals to establish endowed chairs in two professional schools. These were a proposed Vernon Eady/Irving Hendrick Endowed Chair in Curriculum and Instruction within the School of Education; and a proposed Ely Callaway Endowed Chair in Social Responsibility within the Anderson Graduate School of Management. The Committee's advice on all these matters is on file in the Senate office.
The Committee had meetings with three deans for detailed discussions about the plans of their colleges. These were Deans Michael T. Clegg of CNAS, Carlos Velez-Ibanez of CHASS, and Satish K. Tripathi of Engineering.

3. Departments and Programs

In the fall the Committee was consulted about proposals to establish an endowed chair in Molecular Plant Pathology within the Department of Plant Pathology, and to establish the Salma Haider Endowed Chair in Biomedical Sciences within the UCR/UCLA Program in Biomedical Sciences. In the spring, the Committee reviewed a proposal to establish an interdepartmental graduate program within CNAS leading to M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Cell, Molecular, and Developmental Biology. Throughout the year, the Committee was also consulted about proposed changes in the names of a number of departments and programs. The first was a proposal from the School of Engineering to rename its programs in Electrical Engineering and in Chemical and Environmental Engineering as departments. Other proposals involved renaming the UCR/UCLA program in Biomedical Sciences as the Dr. Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences; renaming the Department of Computer Science as the Department of Computer Science and Engineering; and renaming the Department of Soil and Environmental Science as the Department of Environmental Science.

4. Allocation of FTE

On two occasions, the Committee was asked for advice on proposals to transfer an FTE from one unit to another within a college. These were a proposal in the fall to transfer an FTE from the Department of Spanish and Portuguese to the Department of Sociology, and a proposal later in the year to transfer a position from the Department of English to the Department of Spanish and Portuguese.

Much more frequently, the Committee received proposals to return FTE that had recently been vacated to the units to which they had previously been assigned. The Committee considered such proposals involving the Departments of Political Science (two positions), Psychology, Mathematics, Biology, Biochemistry, Women's Studies, Dance, and Economics.

While the Committee recommended in favor of all eleven of these proposed FTE allocations, on one occasion it recommended that a position be filled at a lower rank than was initially proposed. The administration proposed to the Committee to fill only five of these eleven positions with faculty of junior rank, but at the Committee's recommendation, this total was increased to six. Committee members were concerned about the need to maintain a mix of ranks in all departments, and felt that in departments in which all but a small proportion of faculty are tenured, this consideration outweighs the attractions of having a senior person in the position.

5. Shared governance

At the beginning of the academic year, the Committee and the EVC agreed to try to meet more frequently than in the previous two years. The six meetings so far this year have indeed been very helpful. The earliest meetings served largely as briefings in which the
Committee was informed but not actually consulted about campus plans. Later in the year the flow of information slowed, allowing more opportunities for the Committee to express its own concerns and to solicit information regarding them. No request for information from the Committee to the EVC and AC was ever refused.

The Committee made less progress this year in improving its communication with deans about the plans of their colleges and professional schools. All colleges and schools filed 5-year plans in spring of 1995. The deans of CNAS and CHASS have each submitted one written update of their plans for their colleges in the ensuing three years. It has become a custom of the Committee to hear an oral update of college plans from deans of the two major colleges at least once a year, but these presentations are often too brief to be as informative as the Committee would like them to be, and in many years the Committee has no meetings at all with the deans of professional schools.

The Committee is currently working with the EVC to develop a set of policies and procedures designed to improve communications between the Committee and the deans. We view these steps to be particularly necessary, because as campus decision making is increasingly decentralized, the plans made by deans will carry increasing weight, making it more important than ever to make sure that they are subjected to Senate review.

The Committee has proposed two amendments to the divisional Bylaws that are intended to facilitate the role of the Committee in reviewing the plans of colleges and professional schools. A proposed amendment to Bylaw 8.18.1 would expand the Committee from six to eight members, providing for three representatives from each of the two major colleges, and raising the representation of the professional schools on the Committee from one to two members. The amendment proposed for Bylaw 8.18.2 would add "deans" to the list of administrators whom the Committee is authorized to advise.

In addition to seeking to play a greater role in the review of general college plans, the Committee has also recently requested the assistance of the EVC in making sure that deans consult the appropriate faculty bodies before making other major resource commitments, such as the allocation of FTE, and the establish of new research "centers" within ORU's.

6. **Universitywide issues**

The Committee advised the Universitywide Committee on Planning and Budget about plans in the Office of the President to participate in the California Virtual University, and to establish a 10th UC campus.

When UCPB met at UCR on March 10, the Committee requested the advice and assistance of UCPB in dealing with three issues: (1) communications between divisional committees on planning and budget and college deans; (2) how to maintain excellence in less lucrative specializations at a time when budgetary decisions within UC are being increasingly privatized; and (3) how to fund UCR's current over-enrollment and future capital needs. Regarding relations with college deans, UCPB recommended that we give proportionately less attention to FTE allocations, and schedule more time for annual reviews of college plans. For the other two problems UCPB had no ready solutions, but listened sympathetically to our concerns.
7. **Other**

The Committee adopted the previous year’s Conflict-of-Interest statement as its policy for the current year as the first item of business at its first meeting of the academic year.

In response to requests, the Committee submitted nominations to the Senate of UCR faculty who might serve on a universitywide review of the MICRO program, and on a divisional task force on professional schools.
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