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Introduction

This document has been prepared by the UCR Academic Senate Planning & Budget committee. It provides separate reports for 13 Academic and Administrative/Service units that are integral to the general educational endeavor and responsibilities of the University of California Riverside for the fiscal year 2002 – 2003. These reports are preceded by a Summary Statement that iterates in three defined categories of priority (A, B, & C) the topics that P&B considers to of the highest priority from the senate/faculty perspectives for consideration by the senior Administration of UC-Riverside.

It should be noted that this collective report represents an inaugural approach by the Planning & Budget Committee to its shared governance responsibilities that are defined in our Academic Senate By-Laws. Given the rapid expansion that UCR is currently undergoing, the P&B committee feels that it is critical for the faculty to actively participate through the Academic Senate in the many planning and budget decisions that will implement the changing scenario of UC-Riverside. We expect that the advice and suggestions of our several reports will be seriously considered by the Administration when arriving at final decisions.

P&B will discuss this report and our committee’s recommendations with the Acting Chancellor David Warren, the Acting Executive Vice Chancellor Satish Tripathi and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Budget Gretchen Bolar on Friday June 14, 2002. It is also the understanding of P&B that after final decisions have been made on the budget allocations for fiscal year 2002-2003, that there will be a follow-up meeting scheduled with the Chancellor, EVC and VC for APB to explore the rationale for the details of the final budget decisions for FY2002-2003.

---

1 “The Planning & Budget Committee shall provide advice to the Chancellor and represent the Division on matters concerning the distribution of resources on campus. It shall also be the duty of the committee to consider, provide advice and report on such matters of academic planning and resource allocations which may be referred to it by the UCPB, the Academic Council, the Chancellor, the vice Chancellors, the Deans, The Division or by any committee of the Division. [From UCR Senate By-Law 8.18.2]
The Riverside Advantage

At a time of a troubled state of the California economy and definite budget cuts in the Legislatures' and Governor's financial support for the University of California, P&B recommends that special emphasis should be placed on identifying and building those departments and programs which are strong and where there is likely to be a good foundation to build on. Stated alternatively, P&B does not support the uniform across-the-board budget cuts to solve UCR's financial problems.

The advantage of hiring in such departments and in complementary areas of strength, is that the new faculty member comes into an environment that is supportive of their research. This encourages collaborations, and the results are likely to be more immediate. The chances of a successful hire are greater as well. This, contrasts to a situation, where a program/department is being built from scratch. These require enormous investments of time and money, commitments of multiple hires, and they can take away resources from the rest of the campus. The time frame for judging of success of such ventures is much longer, and in difficult times squeezing good programs to do this could lead to lasting damage.
*** CATEGORY A TOPICS ***

P&B Advice Concerning the Library

A well-regarded research university cannot exist without a decent library. P&B insists that the campus act in fiscal year 2002/2003 in order to organize a plan to upgrade the quality of the Library’s collections and services. This is our top priority, meaning that the Library urgently requires immediate and massive funding for its capital projects and programmatic needs. P&B proposes a minimum allocation to the Library for FY 2002/2003 of $1,000,000. The plan should create a budgetary arrangement that would allow for the sustained growth and development of the Library in the coming years.

P&B’s position is that the Library’s sustained growth and development necessitates linking growth to index allocations of one sort or another. The Library, for example, could receive a percentage allocation/flat fee (say $800) per each new undergraduate student or a percentage allocation/flat fee per each new faculty hire or some combination of both. The administration is urged to consider such options (or others) that will strengthen and enhance the quality of the Library’s collections and services. The Library requires generous funding in the coming years in order for it to achieve a status comparable to other UC campuses of equivalent size.

P&B Advice Concerning the Classroom Shortage

Classrooms are badly needed on this campus. There are just not enough of them, particularly small (10 – 30 seats) and medium sized (150 – 250 seats) rooms. Scheduling a review session before the exams is virtually impossible. Faculty and TA’s have great difficulty finding space to meet with students. During exam/midterm time there are up to 20 students in the TA’s offices, all needing help. Since several TA’s share offices, this means that they are unable to do any research related work in the office, which is bad for the research atmosphere in the department. Arranging a seminar at short notice is very difficult.

Also the shortage of classrooms, make the scheduling of classes rather arbitrary and unfriendly to students. Students are often in situations where their first class is at 8 am and they have discussion at 6 pm or later. We need to have mechanism in place, which is flexible enough to
allow students to actually attend the classes that they are enrolled in, since many of our students need to work.

**P&B Advice Concerning the Anderson Graduate School of Management**

P&B has serious concerns about the academic viability of AGSM. Although the School has been in existence since 1970, we note that after a total of 32 years this academic unit still has not yet received validation in the form of academic accreditation. How can the goal of accreditation be pursued in the absence of a Dean? It appears that this goal will be ‘on hold’ for at least the next year.

In times of financial stringency, P&B does not support other segments of the campus taking larger budgetary cuts so that AGSM can be expanded or possibly even maintained. P&B separately will comment (in another report) on the Heckmannn Center and its present status. It is also the view of P&B that AGSM should not, particularly in the absence of a permanent Dean, be involved with any aspect of the Heckmannn Center. P&B has not yet had the opportunity to review any budget or plan for the Center for Entrepreneurial Management, we were unanimous in our disapproval of the AGSM proposed Program of Graduate Study in Financial Management for the Master’s of Science Degree.

Based on this grim assessment, P&B recommends that AGSM be placed in receivership for a significant interval of time. If receivership is implemented, then a strong UCR faculty person from another department should be appointed as the Interim Dean. UCR should also carry out over the next academic year a comprehensive review of AGSM. The objective of P&B is to support an academic plan and budget that have real creditability so that UCR’s professional School of Management is operated in a manner to provide our students with an academically sound educational experience. In addition, P&B insists that the UCR School of Management be operated with academic standards, scholarship, a level of extramural funding and research accomplishments of the faculty as well as fiscal creditability, which will enable this UCR academic unit to earn the respect of our fellow UC campuses and, in addition, one worthy of academic accreditation. If these steps are not taken immediately, then P&B regretfully concludes that AGSM, in its present form, should be a candidate for closure.
P&B Advice Concerning the Heckmann Center

In this current academic year 2001/2002 the Administration has entered into serious financial commitments to create the Heckmann Center. Ground will be soon be broken to initiate the building of the Heckmann Center. All of these decisions have been made in the absence of any formal consultation with the Academic Senate or the Planning & Budget Committee.

P&B requests that the Administration create a joint administration/faculty oversight committee with a very significant faculty membership. Also we request that the Administration submit their plans for the Heckmann Center for review and critique by the P&B committee.
*** CATEGORY B TOPICS ***

Of equivalent Priority

P&B Advice Concerning CHASS

Of all the major administrative units, CHASS is one of the keys to the fiscal and intellectual health of UCR. The factors affecting CHASS necessarily affect the entire campus due to the way its curriculum is needed by all UCR undergraduates. In that sense, CHASS is a litmus test—or perhaps one could say fills the role of a canary in a mineshaft—for the campus as a whole.

We urge the administration to bring CHASS out from behind the starting line by first absorbing the budget deficit and second, by allowing CHASS to stay abreast of undergraduate enrollments by supporting its request for faculty and teaching assistant FTE. The enrollment boom will ultimately be steep but short-lived; if CHASS can grow along with it, the entire campus will enter the 2010 decade in a position of real strength.

Too many of UCR’s major administrative units are so far under the bar (e.g., the Library, the Anderson Graduate School of Management) that only extraordinary measures will ensure excellence and fiscal solidarity by 2010. CHASS is in a very different position, and we urge swift and assured budget decisions to ensure its pivotal place in UCR’s continued development.

Finally, we do not believe that CHASS should be saddled with responsibility for providing remedial classes, particularly Subject A. This is a problem for all academic units which have undergraduates, and there should be a collective solution not one focused on CHASS. P&B separately comments in its Extension report, on some alternative approaches to this problem.
P&B Advice Concerning CNAS

P&B’s top priority is our request that the Higher Administration increase its contribution to the funding of initial compliments for faculty hires in CNAS.

The Higher Administration should facilitate the collaboration between the Division of Biomedical Sciences and CNAS with respect to hiring 7 biomedical research oriented faculty FTE to present multiple tracks of an undergraduate Human Biology or Premedical Sciences tracks.

The higher administration in collaboration with CNAS should initiate a project to evaluate the success of high “cost” hires since July 2000. Have they been successful with regard to their extramural funding since they joined the UCR faculty. Are they playing leadership roles: Would we hire them again?

P&B Advice Concerning the College of Engineering

The vision of the College is to become a nationally recognized leader in engineering research and education. The College interprets a “leader” as a institution with the “profile” of the top 25 schools in the U.S. The profile consists of measurable parameters, such as faculty funding and graduate student GRE scores, used by *U.S. News and World Report* to rank schools. The profile differs from actual ranking because of the weight placed on the subjective evaluation of the school by prominent engineers in the relevant field. This aspect of evaluation is likely to favor much older, established colleges.

The College will strive to achieve the following goals over the next five years:

- Create selective “fields of strengths” in each department that support the interdisciplinary research initiatives within the College and across the campus.
- To be ranked in the top 50 PhD granting Engineering Schools by *U.S. News and World Report*.
- Develop new centers in Communication Networks and Bio-Engineering and have at least one center become a NSF Engineering Research Center.

The plan has not identified the “fields of strengths” in each department that the College wants to focus on. It is unlikely that the
College will be ranked in the top 50, if the research is not focused in selected niche areas. There is simply too much competition from much older, established schools. There is some indication that the College plans to focus on Nanotechnology, but there is a need to be more explicit to set academic priorities. It is not clear what specific steps will be taken to convert CE-CERT to an NSF research center. The research center support requests are directed towards setting up the Communication Center and the Bio-Engineering Center. But, the budget requests of an average of less than $100 K a year do not appear to represent major investments in these centers.

The budget requests for graduate student support and initial complements appear to be reasonable and uncontroversial. However, the budget needs to clearly identify where investments will be made to establish College leadership in selected fields. The relationship between the budget and the achievement of the major goals is weak.

**P&B Advice Concerning the Division of Biomedical Sciences**

The top priority is to take whatever steps are necessary with respect to support for the DBS to ensure that the Division of Biomedical Sciences functions as a “place-holder” for UCR with respect to possible acquisition of a medical school at some time in the future.

An equivalent priority is to fund the 7 faculty biomedical researcher FTE to allow DBS to reorganize its undergraduate phase so as to allow multiple tracks of premedical majors; this project must be implemented in collaboration with CNAS.
P&B Advice Concerning the School of Education

P&B recommends that Priorities 1, 2, and 5 be given the highest preference in the budgeting process. It is important to the GSE to maintain and expand current programs, particularly in light of projected increased enrollments and the initiation of the Joint Doctorate/Ed.D. program with the California State University system. The community college initiative is also important, but should be given lesser priority in light of the aforementioned rankings.

P&B Advice Concerning the Graduate Division

It now appears that, despite the last two years of ambiguity over whether or not to lodge the functions of the Graduate Division within the colleges, it is clear that a Graduate Division will continue to exist. Even though members of P and B disagree over the role of the Graduate Division, there is agreement on the need for the Graduate Division, colleges, and departments to work together at generating more funding for graduate students. Those who favor a strong Graduate Division would also support the top three priorities of the Division's budgetary proposal, as well as items 7 through 10 on the high priority list. Those who would prefer to see graduate education run from colleges and departments are skeptical about the need of the Graduate Division to expand its administrative staff.

Going forward, the role of the Graduate Division will vary for the different colleges and schools. CHASS will require more from the Division than, for example, CNAS, Engineering, or Education which can raise and administer funds more readily than many departments in CHASS. Thus, whatever the final administrative structure of the new Graduate Division, it should remain flexible and accommodating to the diverse needs of each college and school.
P&B Advice Concerning Office of Research Affairs

P&B requests that the higher Administration and ORA distribute annually to all faculty on the campus a report detailing how all the grant overhead dollars received by the Chancellor are distributed. At the present time, there is not a uniform picture available to the faculty concerning the distribution of overhead dollars by the various academic Deans.

P&B requests that a uniform policy on overhead distribution be developed that includes a finite return to the originating unit and at least a token amount of $1000 to be guaranteed to the originating Principal Investigator. Recognition must be given by Deans and higher Administration that there is, in general, a paucity of secretarial assistance for grant preparation.

ORA can play a role in bringing UCR investigators together in writing research proposals. ORA should make available an office where Principal Investigators can obtain access to secretarial assistance in the preparation of grants. This is particularly essential for the preparation of large or multi-investigator grants (e.g. NIH Program Projects). Ideally there would be more than one secretarial office so that they could be located in campus precincts close to the faculty group (e.g. College of Engineering, the Boyce/Webber/Spieth buildings, etc).

UCR would gain a great deal if ORA expanded the activities of the Technology Development Center to assist faculty in commercializing their research products.

P&B Advice Concerning Office of Student Affairs

The Office of Student Affairs has a very large budget that provides an enormous array of services to UCR’s students. P&B provides the following recommendations.

?? Carry out a thorough review of its needs across all its offices in order to keep up with enrollment growth

?? Focus on student retention after it has caught up with enrollment growth

?? Significantly expand its endowment base

?? Develop a formal plan for classroom scheduling, in consultation with the Academic Senate.
P&B Advice Concerning Subject A/Math 3

In the course of P&B’s deliberations with the Deans of CHASS, CNAS, Engineering it became clear that UCR has a serious problem in the magnitude of the numbers of students who are admitted to this campus who have not passed Subject A or Math 3. Since these are admission requirements for the University of California, we find this disappointing. In times of budgetary shortfall, it is difficult to rationalize allocation of state derived funds to presenting remedial instruction directed towards Subject A and Math 3. Particularly the Subject A responsibility has been onerous for CHASS.

P&B requests that a joint Administration Academic Senate committee be appointed immediately so that alternative solutions can be explored.
*** CATEGORY C TOPICS ***

Of equivalent Priority

P&B Advice Concerning Computing & Communications

Given the significant cut in the State support for the University in the area of C&C, the Planning & Budget Committee can only support the allocation of funds for Maintenance Agreements and those projects which will directly impact teaching functions. Particularly P&B would promote Priority #6 & #8 (Classroom support up to $500,000) and Priority #4 (Blackboard) to be, respectively #1 and #2 priority. Maintenance Contracts should be Priority #3. Given the importance to UCR of having state-of-the-art Computing & Communications facilities, consideration should be given to allocating $100-$200 from the permanent state funding for each individual student to C&C.

P&B Advice Concerning Extension

UNEX has done a remarkable job over the years in becoming a self-sustaining unit that provides many valuable services to the Inland Empire. It should be encouraged to expand its outreach. It must be allowed to use its surplus to cover the current downturn in enrollments and to begin developing new programs that can ensure its growth in the near future.

Just whether or not UNEX should be the contractor for a full summer quarter hinges on whether or not it can do a better job than the colleges and departments. Although P and B is sympathetic to UNEX's need to find revenue sources, the issue of how to implement a summer quarter must be reviewed by the Academic Sensate and administration before any decision is made as to how to implement the program. In all likelihood, the program will be administered as are the fall, winter, and spring quarters; and so, P and B would caution UNEX not to rely upon a contract with the university for implementing the summer quarter.
P&B Advice Concerning the Office of Development

The Office of Development must be nourished by providing funds for Fund Raisers. As the University of California becomes more privatized, it is critical that UCR initiate and maintain a highly successful Office of Development so that our endowment is maximized.
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PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences

P&B INTERVIEW(S)


ACADEMIC VISION

CHASS earned a sixth place ranking among the nation’s public research institutions in Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, a designation accorded them by two East Coast researchers, Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond, who published The Rise of American Research Universities. In the same rankings, UCR was the top public university in the nation based on faculty productivity and 11th overall, an accomplishment that can be directly tied to the success of the college that accounts for more than half of the undergraduates who make UCR their intellectual home.

Within the entire University of California system, only UCR combines the humanities, arts, and social sciences within one college. CHASS faculty and research initiatives are increasingly interdisciplinary and engaged with the policy and analytical challenges associated with Southern California’s social, cultural, and ecological diversity. The College has several research centers; among these, the Center for Ideas and Society (CIS) has attracted special attention as a focal point for intellectual exchange. CHASS departments offer 11 doctoral programs and 15 masters degrees. These programs range from the traditional to the distinctive; an example of the latter is the first-ever doctoral program in dance history.

CHASS presently has 220 full-time faculty, 57 majors with 7,000 students, 1,100 CHASS undergraduates with undeclared majors, and 15 graduate degree programs enrolling 526 students. It supports 4 formally established research centers and 6 developing centers. CHASS provides nearly 60% of UCR’s total student workload hours and enrolls 63% of undergraduate students in its majors. By 2010, CHASS is projected to have 11,000 undergraduate majors, 1,100 graduate students, and 450 faculty.
ACADEMIC PRIORITIES:

The 2002-2005 CHASS Academic Plan lists five “important priorities for action and investment”:

?? Faculty hiring. This will include both faculty renewal and programmatic expansion, and a set of criteria reflecting current strengths as well as developing interdisciplinary areas will drive the placement of FTE.

?? Graduate education. Graduate enrollments in CHASS have been relatively flat for the last 6 years and now threaten to drop. Increasing graduate enrollments is a priority, and existing programs need to be strengthened, new programs developed, and financial support expanded.

?? Undergraduate education. While the undergraduate student population is rapidly expanding, it has been accompanied by declines in graduation rates and retention. Remedial education programs (e.g., Subject A) and adequate teaching assistant support require special attention.

?? Research. A stable and growing external support base with increased indirect cost recovery is a pressing need.

?? Infrastructure. Staff, facilities, information and instructional technology, and library resources all require an immediate infusion of resources.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;R</td>
<td>36,887,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Fees</td>
<td>3,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>26,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>507,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,425,162</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003

The CHASS budget request for 2002-05 includes:

1. 69 new faculty positions
2. Additional Teaching Assistant FTE
3. Additional funding for a total of 22.25 staff positions.
4. Support for research (including seed money for collaborative research, core budgets for new centers, and budget augmentation for existing centers)

5. Infrastructure needs.

The budget request amounts can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2,215,266</td>
<td>603,200</td>
<td>2,818,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1,383,785</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>1,671,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>621,310</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>888,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,220,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,158,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,378,561</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[See Figure 7.1, CHASS Resource Allocation Request Summary, Fiscal Years 2002-03 through 2004-05, for more detail.]

For each fiscal year over the next three years, 11 areas are listed in order of priority, and this order will change for each year. For 2002-03, the fiscal priorities (in ranked order) are:

1. Faculty lines (highest priority)
2. Central Fellowship Support increases (graduate education)
3. Additional Teaching Assistantships
4. Staff positions (for faculty and student support)
5. Theater Facilities deferred maintenance
6. Faculty lines (lower priority)
7. Core funds for new research centers
8. Staff positions (for second priority support needs)
9. Programmatic support for existing research centers
10. Facilities funding
11. UCR/CMP facility

For 2003-04 and 2004-05, the #1 priority remains faculty FTE while the remaining areas shift in rank priority.

Other requests include:
?? $423,000 (over 3 years) for space alterations, upgrades, and moves (interim measures until CHASS 1 and 2 are completed)

?? $270,000 for the University Theatre (equipment replacement)

?? $57,000 annually for staff computers

?? $200,000/year for a five-year replacement cycle for instructional technology and equipment

?? $115,000 for an initial complement fund in the library (to assist in faculty recruitment)

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

?? Faculty growth and recruitment are a key priority for CHASS, and the projected average cost of $450,000 for certain high-priority recruitment packages (distinguished senior hires and in fields involving digital media) should be supported.

?? CHASS should be allocated significant Central Fellowship Support increases for graduate education. The size and quality of CHASS graduate programs has a fundamental impact on UCR's national profile as well as on the quality of education for all UCR undergraduates. We note that CHASS is distinctively different from CNAS and COE because it cannot rely on extramural funds for graduate support.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

P&B supports the following objectives for CHASS.

?? The need to hire top-flight faculty which in turn will facilitate recruitment of strong graduate students.

?? The need to increase extramural grant activity and indirect cost recovery

?? The need to raise the overall number and quality of graduate students (in fact, to reverse negative trends in graduate enrollment)

?? The responsibility to offer general breadth courses and remedial courses (required by 40% of all entering freshmen in Fall 2000) for the entire campus.
The budget deficit. As the CHASS Budget Presentation states, “the single biggest factor contributing to the College deficit is that resources lag behind the enrollment growth and instructional need, leaving the College in a position of playing ‘catch-up.’” CHASS attributes the deficit to the rising costs of TA resources, initial complements, and benefits. While strategies for adequately funding TA support and initial complements are alluded to (but not specified) in the Budget Presentation, benefits costs remains a serious obstacle to resolving the College deficit. The bottom line is that CHASS will not be able to reduce this annual shortfall if it must also absorb rapidly growing enrollments.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

Of all the major administrative units, CHASS is one of the keys to the fiscal and intellectual health of UCR. The factors affecting CHASS necessarily affect the entire campus due to the way its curriculum is needed by all UCR undergraduates. In that sense, CHASS is a litmus test—or perhaps one could say fills the role of a canary in a mineshaft—for the campus as a whole.

We urge the administration to bring CHASS out from behind the starting line by first absorbing the budget deficit and second, by allowing CHASS to stay abreast of undergraduate enrollments by supporting its request for faculty and teaching assistant FTE. The enrollment boom will ultimately be steep but short-lived; if CHASS can grow along with it, the entire campus will enter the 2010 decade in a position of real strength.

Too many of UCR’s major administrative units are so far under the bar (e.g., the Library, the Anderson Graduate School of Management) that only extraordinary measures will ensure excellence and fiscal solidarity by 2010. CHASS is in a very different position, and we urge swift and assured budget decisions to ensure its pivotal place in UCR’s continued development.

Finally, we do not believe that CHASS should be saddled with responsibility for providing remedial classes, particularly Subject A. This is a problem for all academic units which have undergraduates, and there should be a collective solution not one focused on CHASS. P&B separately comments in its Extension report, on some alternative approaches to this problem.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

Dean S. Angle; December 6, 2001 & March 29, 2002

ACADEMIC VISION

(As stated in a written document prepared by Dean Angle).

CNAS seeks to be a premier college of science and agriculture. This will be achieved in a number of ways: (a) By maintaining and enhancing a strong foundation in the fundamental sciences and mathematics; (b) By partnerships with other colleges and programs at UCR involving interdisciplinary initiatives; (c) By recruiting and retaining a world-class faculty to lead high quality research and graduate programs and top-notch undergraduate education; (d) By exploiting the “Riverside Advantage”—our unique combination of agriculture biological and physical sciences, and mathematics; (e) By aggressively addressing our challenges; and (f) By investing in selected areas in which CNAS has a competitive advantage.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

Dean Angle emphasized in his March 29, 2002 meeting with P&B that the top priorities for the academic plan for CNAS were as follows:

(a) **Ongoing Initiatives:**

Continuation of the funding and development of the Genomics Institute.

Continuation of the funding and development of the Plant Sciences Center.

Continuation of the funding and development of Material/Structure of Material/Material Sciences and Nanotechnology in collaboration with the College of
Engineering. The CNAS contribution will include 5 FTE in Physics with an unstated number of FTE in Chemistry.

Augmentation of Pest and Disease Sciences by construction of a new building (Pest Management, phase II), and providing new and replacement faculty FTE.

Augmentation of the Environmental Sciences Program and department by providing new and replacement faculty FTE.

(b) Basic Sciences:

CNAS must invest in the basic sciences that form the foundation for our teaching programs and future major initiatives; this includes the departments of Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics. The support will consist of new and replacement FTE.

(c) New Initiatives:

Mammalian-Based Biology (in collaboration with the Division of Biomedical Sciences).

Creation of a structural biology program to compliment the initiatives in genomics and mammalian biology.

Creation of a modeling and simulation program.

CURRENT BUDGET 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;R</td>
<td>$ 28,768,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>$ 25,338,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>$ 280,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>$ 5,529 (I&amp;R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>$ 26,086 (OR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>$ 20,117 (I&amp;R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>$ 604,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 254,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: $ 55,298,611

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2002/2003

I&R = $6,433,546 planned/requested
OR = $2,427,000 planned/requested

Priority #1: Faculty recruitment; CNAS proposes 8.52 FTE in FY2002/2003

In addition Initial Compliment/renovation funding of $1.645,000 for projected expenditures in FY 2002/03 and another $2,196,000 to cover CNAS unfunded budget deficit related to FY 2000/01 for initial compliment.

Priority #2: Dean’s Office/Undergraduate Student Affairs officer

Priority #3: Physics Undergraduate Student Affairs assistant.

Priority #4: Dean's Office/Graduate Student Affairs analyst

Priority #5: Dean’s Office/Graduate Student Affairs-Associate Dean

Priority #6: Biological Sciences Graduate Student Affairs Center

Priority #7: Statistics Department- Programmer analyst

Priority #8: CNAS/Graduate Division –Graduate Student Fellowship funding

Priority #9: Graduate Student Recruitment

Priority #10: Physics building Plasma Lab renovation
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

It is disappointing that there is no clear enunciation either by the Dean or his written document of what level of academic excellence is to be sought by selected CNAS departments and graduate programs (top 10, top 20, top 30, etc.).

The creation of the Genomics Institute and Plant Science Center and its further development is to be applauded. Further support for the Genomics Institute can continue to provide much needed modernization and catch-up for UCR biological research activities. However given the frequent encouragement to faculty in CNAS by the Administration and Dean to “increase the number of NIH grants”, it is disappointing to see the low priority for development of biomedical or mammalian-based biology; this is relegated by the Dean to the category of “new initiatives”. It is unlikely to achieve a necessary priority in the event of a serious budget cut or a slowed growth of the California economy. There is little formal evidence of collaboration of CNAS with the Division of Biomedical Sciences.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

P&B’s top priorities are:

(a) To hire new faculty with competitive initial compliments (Dean’s priority #1);

(b) To resolve the dialog with the Central Administration over initial compliments (who pays what proportion; see comment following).

(c) To increase graduate student recruitment and fellowship funds (Dean’s priorities #8 and #9).

The need for UCR to provide a competitive initial compliment for recruitment/renovation (either the Central Administration or CNAS) is crucial to success in hiring the highest quality new faculty. The Central Administration’s insistence that CNAS must fund a significant proportion of the initial compliment is puzzling. CNAS does not have other sources of income other than the Central Administration. Development efforts in CNAS cannot be expected to help support initiatives for a number of years. If UCR wishes to be in the top echelon of research universities, then the Central Administration is going to have to fund initial compliments at a level comparable to top echelon research universities. At the very
least, the higher Administration should enunciate a readily understandable policy on funding of initial compliment and laboratory renovation.

**P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC**

P&B's top priority is our request that the Higher Administration increase its contribution to the funding of initial compliments for faculty hires in CNAS.

A close 2nd priority is for the higher Administration to facilitate the collaboration between the Division of Biomedical Sciences and CNAS with respect to hiring 7 biomedical research oriented faculty FTE to develop multiple tracks of an undergraduate Human Biology or Premedical Sciences major.

The higher Administration in collaboration with CNAS should initiate a project to evaluate the success of high “cost” hires since July 2000. Have they been successful with regard to their increasing extramural funding of CNAS since they joined the UCR faculty. Are they playing leadership roles: Would we hire them again?
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

Dean S. Tripathi on October 23, 2001.

ACADEMIC VISION

The vision of the College is to become a nationally recognized leader in engineering research and education.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

The broad goals of the College are:

1. Create selective “fields of strengths” in each department that support the interdisciplinary research initiatives within the College and across the campus.
2. To be ranked in the top 50 PhD granting Engineering Schools by *U.S. News and World Report*.
3. Develop new centers in Communication Networks and Bio-Engineering and have at least one center become a NSF Engineering Research Center.

Some of the steps that will be taken over the next five years to achieve these goals are:

1. Create graduate programs in Digital Arts, Materials Science and Engineering, and Bioengineering.
2. Increase enrollment from 1600 to 2300 undergraduates and 200 to 430 graduate students.
3. Increase faculty FTE from 54 to 120 with 15% vacancies.
4. Raise $38M in gifts.
5. Graduate 25 Ph.D. students per year.
6. Have at least one faculty member become a National Academy of Engineering member.
7. Increase research funding to $350 K/year per faculty member.
CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

General core funds: $11,098,085  
Sales & Service $97,453

TOTAL: $11,195,538

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003

The incremental budget requests associated with the growth of the College are provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Complement</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
<td>$2,239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Support</td>
<td>$657,841</td>
<td>$726,051</td>
<td>$1,325,289</td>
<td>$2,155,465</td>
<td>$2,538,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment</td>
<td>$687,790</td>
<td>$652,325</td>
<td>$373,805</td>
<td>$890,490</td>
<td>$1,222,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Center Support</td>
<td>$77,245</td>
<td>$154,490</td>
<td>$154,490</td>
<td>$74,945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Temporary</td>
<td>$3,584,630.00</td>
<td>$3,694,620.00</td>
<td>$4,092,583.00</td>
<td>$5,439,444.00</td>
<td>$6,074,647.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-Permanent funds</td>
<td>$564,168</td>
<td>$437,225</td>
<td>$157,198</td>
<td>$273,990</td>
<td>$48,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College plans to hire about 12 faculty members per year, which means that the request for initial complement works out to be about $187,000 per faculty from central funds.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

The plan has not identified the “fields of strengths” in each department that the College wants to focus on. It is unlikely that the College will be ranked in the top 50, if the research is not focused in selected niche areas. There is simply too much competition from much older, established schools.
There is some indication that the College plans to focus on Nanotechnology, but there is a need to be more explicit to set academic priorities.

It is not clear what specific steps will be taken to convert CE-CERT to an NSF research center.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

The research center support requests are directed towards setting up the Communication Center and the Bio-Engineering Center. The budget requests, which appear to be very modest, are likely to be modified by the center directors, who will be hired during the next four years. If one of the major goals is to create “fields of strengths”, it is not clear how the budget will be used to fulfill this goal.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC (Engineering)

The vision of the College is to become a nationally recognized leader in engineering research and education. The College interprets a “leader” as an institution with the “profile” of the top 25 schools in the U.S. The profile consists of measurable parameters, such as faculty funding and graduate student GRE scores, used by *U.S. News and World Report* to rank schools. The profile differs from actual ranking because of the weight placed on the subjective evaluation of the school by prominent engineers in the relevant field. This aspect of evaluation is likely to favor much older, established colleges.

The College will strive to achieve the following goals over the next five years:

- Create selective “fields of strengths” in each department that support the interdisciplinary research initiatives within the College and across the campus.

- To be ranked in the top 50 PhD granting Engineering Schools by *U.S. News and World Report*.

- Develop new centers in Communication Networks and Bio-Engineering and have at least one center become a NSF Engineering Research Center.

The plan has not identified the “fields of strengths” in each department that the College wants to focus on. It is unlikely that the College will be ranked in the top 50, if the research is not focused in
selected niche areas. There is simply too much competition from much older, established schools. There is some indication that the College plans to focus on Nanotechnology, but there is a need to be more explicit to set academic priorities. It is not clear what specific steps will be taken to convert CE-CERT to an NSF research center. The research center support requests are directed towards setting up the Communication Center and the Bio-Engineering Center. But, the budget requests of an average of less than $100 K a year do not appear to represent major investments in these centers.

The budget requests for graduate student support and initial complements appear to be reasonable and uncontroversial. However, the budget needs to clearly identify where investments will be made to establish College leadership in selected fields. The relationship between the budget and the achievement of the major goals is weak.
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PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

Division of Biomedical Sciences

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

Dean Michael Stemerman; October 30, 2001

ACADEMIC VISION

The Division of Biomedical Sciences’ (DBS) goal is to become a nationally recognized leader in biomedical education and research, building towards an outstanding future using past strengths as a firm foundation. The vision encompasses the UCR/UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences (a seven-year BS and Doctor of Medicine degree program), undergraduate education, the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program, and the research activities of the faculty and staff of the Division of biomedical Sciences.

DBS is exploring programmatic changes that will make its BS/MD program more flexible, particularly with regard to offering a 4 or 5 year premedical sciences tracks which may increase access by under prepared high school graduates. DBS is considering proposing a BS and BS/MS undergraduate education track in human biology, so that students are prepared, not only for the limited number of medical positions in the Biomedical Sciences Program (24 seats), but also for more effective competition at other high quality medical schools and venues in the health sciences (dentistry, physical therapy, nursing, physician assistants, pharmacy, hospital administration and biomedical research, for example).

DBS is exploring new relationships, particularly with the City of Hope medical center. These could include a graduate program affiliation and development of a longitudinal genetic/behavioral database for studying chronic illness.

DBS strives to be a leader in both basic and applied human and mammalian research. This includes efforts to recruit new faculty in the areas of cardiovascular, cancer, mammalian molecular biology and neurosciences research.
**ACADEMIC PRIORITIES**

Dean Stemerman chose not to present his specific academic priorities directly to P&B. These were abstracted from his presentation in the Budget Hearings’ Process.

(a) Faculty retention of one key faculty member.

(b) Development of a pre-eminent research and academic unit.

(c) Development of a more flexible UCR/UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences.

(d) Continued and additional support for a Community-Based medical curriculum.

(e) A scientific approach to pre-medical education.

**CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002**

- Health Science: $2,708,321
- Student Fees: $176,000
- Endowments: $30,462

**TOTAL:** $2,914,783

**BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003:**

Priority #1: Four faculty FTE (See Priorities #1A, 1B, and 1C, below)

Priority#1A: $$ equivalent to 1.5 FTE for Academic and educational operational and programmatic needs. These $$ will allow the DBS to address the research and instructional needs of the unit, such as guest lecturer honoraria, to integrate clinical correlation with basic science medical courses, pay for the cost of lecturers for the DBS didactic graduate seminar series, and to provide some funds for common research equipment costs.

Priority #1B: $$ equivalent to 1.5 FTE for a Gross Anatomist. Gross Anatomy is a required first year medical school course. However it is not reasonable
to fill this position with either a community physician or a ladder-rank faculty position (all FTE are currently filled), as most gross anatomists do not have the academic qualifications for a ladder-rank appointment. It is proposed that this critical position be recruited on a permanent basis to provide stability and quality to the instruction of human anatomy to the UCR/UCLA medical school program.

Priority #1C: 1.0 FTE ladder-rank faculty for a Medical Education Specialist. This individual would have a wide array of academic responsibilities, including (a) faculty development for clinical and new basic science faculty; (g) evaluation and development of curriculum, especially in tying in clinical correlations between basic sciences and clinical medicine; (c) Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) which is a requirement of a medical school program; (d) liaison with the UCLA School of Medicine; (e) developing clinical research, etc.

Priority #2: $63,000 for one specific faculty retention. Funds will be used while the Boyce West vivarium undergoes upgrading and renovation. It includes rental costs for vivarium space, travel, lodging, etc.

Priority #4: $171,141 to support graduate education in the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

Priority #4: $500,000 for Boyce West Vivarium upgrades.

Priority #5: Long-Range Plans for Vivaria.

Priority #6: 7.0 FTE (I&R) to permit development of an alternative, more flexible pre-medical sciences tracks.

Priority #7: $43,520 for development of a FastStart Residential Program. This is a five week summer program for 24 disadvantaged students who matriculate as freshman in year 01 of the seven year BS/MD UCR/UCLA educational program.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

P&B views the academic plan of the Division of Biomedical Sciences as both broad and aggressive. This may reflect the somewhat
fragile nature of the current status of the DBS, which likely has been exacerbated by the return several years ago of the second year of medical instruction to UCR from the Harbor/UCLA hospital. This circumstance has resulted in a heavy responsibility for presentation of a true clinical medical curriculum (typical of the 2nd year of medical school). To the credit of the Dean and faculty they have spoken frankly in articulating the five (a) through (e) goals. While they are all laudable, it seems unlikely that they can all be achieved in the near term, particularly in times of diminished State financial support for the university.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

P&B supports as its top priority the $63,000 for retention of one key DBS faculty member.

P&B supports with enthusiasm the DBS 2nd priority, the allocation of 7 I&R FTE to facilitate development of a traditional pre-medical education major with an end BS degree in Biomedical Sciences. The development of this program must be very carefully coordinated with CNAS and several of its departments that already have significant numbers of pre-med majors. The hiring of seven new I&R FTE who all engage in biomedical or mammalian related research, would represent a very significant augmentation of the number of biomedical researchers at UCR and should be strongly supported by the Administration.

P&B supports as its 3rd priority the request of salary funds for a non academic staff anatomist to provide the medical school gross anatomy instruction.

DBS Priority #4 concerning Long-Range Plans for Vivaria are a part of the general campus initiative to make UCR more competitive in biomedical research. This request, while of top campus priority, should not detract from other DBS needs.

It is not clear in DBS Priority #1C, whether the requested FTE is to be from I&R or Health Sciences FTE. Probably it should be the later, since the individual will be engaged in medical school curriculum instruction.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

The top priority is to take whatever steps are necessary to provide support for the DBS so as to ensure that the Division of Biomedical Sciences functions as a “place-holder” for UCR with respect to possible acquisition of a medical school at some time in the future. This is
consistent, of course, with the Administration desire to increase the amount of biomedical research on campus which will in turn lead to a significant increase in overhead return.

An equivalent top priority is to fund the 7 faculty biomedical researcher FTE to allow DBS to reorganize its undergraduate phase so as to allow multiple tracks of premedical majors; this project must be implemented in collaboration with CNAS.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

P&B INTERVIEW

Dean Robert Calfee on November 7, 2001.

ACADEMIC VISION

(As stated in a written document prepared by Dean Calfee)

The Graduate School of Education’s (GSE) mission encompasses research, instruction, and service. As a professional school, the GSE bears a special responsibility for linking this triplet in the support of schooling across broad domains of education. Research within the GSE includes investigations of both fundamental and applied problems in education. These cover a broad range—teaching and learning, student assessment and school organization, subject matters, student differences, school leadership, and educational policy. Instruction in the GSE centers on engagement with knowledge, practice, and policy, and relationships among these. The enterprise combines the preparation of academicians and practitioners—researchers, teachers, and administrators—who will serve as university and school leaders by virtue of their ability to produce and mobilize useful knowledge. Service programs in the GSE involves partnering with K-12 school districts to ensure quality educational outcomes for all students, including students from backgrounds not typically associated with academic success. The GSE vision is, by the end of the decade, to have achieved stature as a premier institution within the University of California.
ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

Dean Robert Calfee emphasized in his November 7, 2001 meeting with P&B that the top priorities for the academic plan for GSE were as follows:

(a) Current Programs
The maintenance and expansion of GSE’s current programs through additional student enrollment is its primary goal. The GSE continues to work on improving faculty workload. The current Ph.D. and M.A. programs have established a pattern of student enrollment growth in the last three years that the GSE predicts will continue through the planning period. These programs are not scheduled to receive additional faculty FTE in the planning period, and the unit will not request any new positions. GSE does plan on replacing faculty positions that open through departures or retirements.

(b) The Teacher Education Program
The Teacher Education Program (TEP) enrollments will grow because of recently (2001) approved and implemented Masters Degree in Education (M. Ed.) Program. Current Teacher Education Supervisor FTE allocations support about 120 students, yet the TEP enrollments are 170 students in 2001-2002. By 2005, the program will add at least 40 additional students. At this time, GSE is requesting no additional permanently funded campus resources for TEP. However, if the UCOP funding source is not sustained, or if enrollments grow at a faster pace than predicted, the GSE plans to request additional campus resources.

(c) The Joint Doctorate Program
The Joint Doctorate Program to be conducted by UCR in collaboration with four CSU institutions was approved by GSE faculty on January 16, 2002 and is now moving through campus and state approval processes. The GSE will rely on two sources of funding. The first is the UCOP-mandated and campus-provided permanent sum of $300,000 per year to develop and support the program. The second funding source will be funds provided by a UC/CSU Joint Doctorate Board now being constituted.

(d) Community College Initiative
Senior GSE faculty members Douglas Mitchell and Rodney Ogawa (now departed to the UC-Santa Cruz campus) recently developed a prospectus for the establishment of a GSE graduate program in community college leadership. GSE requests permanent funding for two faculty FTE to begin in 2003-2004 academic year. GSE ranks this new initiative as its seventh priority.

(e) Administrative Support Services

The rationalization of the GSE support staff has resulted in a leaner, more efficient staff. GSE requests 0.5 additional FTE—a purchasing assistant—to support the School, along with several other positions to support the two new programs referred to above.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

General Core Funds: $4,215,998

TOTAL: $4,215,998

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2002-2003

The following are viewed as budget priorities:

1. Maintenance and expansion of current programs, including expansion of Teaching Assistantships from 1.5 to 2.5 FTE in 2002-2003; expansion to 3.0 FTE for 2003-2004; expansion of 3.5 FTE for 2004-2005.

   Additional cost for Teaching Assistants for 2002-2003 is $39,158
   Additional cost for Teaching Assistants for 2003-2004 is $60,073
   Additional cost for Teaching Assistants for 2004-2005 is $81,903


   Additional cost for 2002-2003 is $92,520 (salary and benefits)
   Additional cost for 2003-2004 is $92,520 (salary and benefits)
Additional cost for 2004-2005 is $92,520 (salary and benefits)


Additional cost for 2.0 faculty FTE for 2003-2004 is $149,235 (salary, summer salary, and benefits)
Additional cost for .5 FTE TA, including fee remission, for 2002-2003 is $19,579
Additional cost for .5 FTE TA, including fee remission, for 2003-2004 is $20,022
Additional cost for .5 FTE TA, including fee remission, for 2004-2005 is $20,476


Additional cost for 2002-2003 (salary and benefits) is $22,594
Additional cost for 2003-2004 (salary and benefits) is $22,848
Additional cost for 2004-2005 (salary and benefits) is $23,105

5. Support positions for joint doctorate/Ed.D. program including 1.0 FTE Assistant II and 1.0 FTE Student Affairs Officer I beginning in 2002-2003.

Additional cost for 2002-2003 (salary and benefits) is $88,030
Additional cost for 2003-2004 (salary and benefits) is $89,020
Additional cost for 2004-2005 (salary and benefits) is $90,022

6. An Administrative Assistant III (1.0 FTE) to support the community college initiative for 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. Beginning in 2004-2005, GSE requests only .5 FTE for this position.

Additional cost for 2002-2003 (salary and benefits) is $45,613
Additional cost for 2003-2004 (salary and benefits) is $46,126
Additional cost for 2004-2005 (salary and benefits) is $29,088

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

The plan and vision of GSE seems reasonable with its ultimate goal by the end of the decade to have achieved stature as a premier institution within the University of California. However, P&B would hope that the School would set its sights on the broader goal of being in the top tier of graduate schools of education nationwide. GSE has been successful in obtaining extramural funding, but with only a small number of its faculty receiving funding from grant sources. P&B would like to see increased activity by more faculty in obtaining extramural funding for research and training of students in its various programs.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

The budget priorities are reasonable, particularly for maintaining and expanding current programs in the School. The development of the Joint Doctorate/Ed.D. program with four CSUs is justified given the directives from UCOP and agreements between UCOP and the CSU system to offer the doctorate. The Community College initiative, while important, is lower in priority than the Joint Doctorate/Ed.D.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

P&B recommends that Priorities 1, 2, and 5 be given the highest preference in the budgeting process. It is important to the GSE to maintain and expand current programs, particularly in light of projected increased enrollments and the initiation of the Joint Doctorate/Ed.D. program with the California State University system. The community college initiative is also important, but should be given lesser priority in light of the aforementioned rankings.
PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

Anderson Graduate School of Management

P&B INTERVIEW

Dean Donald H. Dye; October 10, 2001.

ACADEMIC VISION

AGSM’s vision is to be recognized as a premier center of management research and education seeking to develop effective and socially responsible leaders. AGSM’s goals are designed to help the School realize its mission. They are as follows:

1. To maintain academically and professionally qualified faculty.
2. To foster a collegial environment of scholars immersed in knowledge creation and dissemination.
3. To deliver quality educational programs based on knowledge derived from high-quality research.
4. To provide instructional resources and assign instructional responsibilities consistent with the demands of the changing business environment.
5. To select a diverse student body and to provide students with a high-quality management education in a supportive environment.
6. To meet the demand for continuing education in the external community through self-supporting, quality programs.
7. To improve the perception, visibility, and support of AGSM in the community.

AGSM specific goals over the next five years include:

Accredited and ranked Business programs
1. Enrollment – 1600 Student FTE – 900 Undergraduates and 700 Graduate students
2. Faculty members – 78
3. Collaborations with and impact on the local economy
4. New programs
5. Master of Science Degree Programs in Information Systems, Entrepreneurship, Accounting, and Financial Management
6. Executive MBA
7. Creation of International Joint Ventures
8. Heckmann International Center for Entrepreneurial Management
9. Center for Socially Responsible Organizations
10. Center for Emerging Technologies
11. Electronic Economy management Center

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

AGSM budget requests are based on the following priorities:

1. Insufficient faculty members to accommodate rapid growth in University enrollment
2. Develop the academic and professional qualifications of the faculty
3. Inadequate building space to house the growing faculty complement and programs
4. Improve the curricula in both the graduate and undergraduate programs
5. Improve instructional resource development and the monitoring of student quality and work
6. Improve the quality of the School’s catalogue

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

1. General/Core Funds $6,141,182
2. Student Fees $1,193,305
3. Sales & Services $ 233,747

TOTAL $7,568,234

Since 1997/98 AGSM has been running a cumulative deficit:

1997/98: $ 263,466
1998/99: $ 145,591
1999/00: $ 861,241
2000/01: $2,093,801
2001(to 12-31): $ 130,492
BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2002-2003

The AGSM budget requests include position requests in order of priority for 2003-05.

1.  11 Faculty FTE (permanent) $1,004,900
2.  4 Teaching Assistants $ 130,104
3.  Faculty (temporary) $1,990,108
4.  Administrative & Finance
    Analyst, Principal $  78,880
5.  Director, MBA Admissions $  72,520
6.  Director, MBA Recruitment $  51,764
7.  Analyst, Programmer $  69,300
8.  Student Affairs Officers I $  29,275
9.  2 Assistant, Administrative II $  47,246
10. 3 Assistant, Administrative II $  70,869
11. Student Affairs Officer I $  23,623
12. Assistant Administrative II $  23,623
13. Assistant, Administrative II $  23,623
14. Assistant, Administrative II $  23,623

Total New Funds Requested $2,287,944

Total School Funds $1,529,407

AGSM permanent operating budget summary (Core Funds) for 2002-05.

2002-03 Grand Total $6,817,864
    Projected Funds Available $6,931,861
    Surplus (Shortfall) $ 366,988

2003-04 Grand Total $7,221,604
    Projected Funds Available $7,174,847
    Surplus (Shortfall) $ 375,169

2004-05 Grand Total $7,167,683
    Projected Funds Available $7,597,792
    Surplus (Shortfall) $ 430,109

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

AGSM’s mission and goals provide no indication that the School will cease to be a drain on the resources of the campus. P&B is
collectively depressed that one academic unit could be allowed to operate in such fiscal disarray for so many years.

With the very recent resignation of Dean D. Dye, it is not apparent that any of the Plan/Vision enunciated above will be pursued in the near future.

**P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES/VISION**

AGSM’s budget priorities indicate that in coming years the School will need to draw resources from other campus units in order to sustain its operations. The issue of the cumulative deficit is not addressed.

P&B can not support the request for $2.287 million in new funds, to augment the present budget of only $7.568; this would represent an increase of ? 30% which we deem inappropriate for a unit that has run a deficit for several years.

**P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC (AGSM)**

P&B has serious concerns about the academic viability of AGSM. Although the School has been in existence since 1970, we note that after a total of 32 years this academic unit still has not yet received validation in the form of academic accreditation. How can the goal of accreditation be pursued in the absence of a Dean? It appears that this goal will be ‘on hold’ for at least the next year.

In times of financial stringency, P&B does not support other segments of the campus taking larger budgetary cuts so that AGSM can be expanded or possibly even maintained. P&B separately will comment (in another report) on the Heckmann Center and its present status. It is also the view of P&B that AGSM should not, particularly in the absence of a permanent Dean, be involved with any aspect of the Heckmann Center. P&B has not yet had the opportunity to review any budget or plan for the Center for Entrepreneurial Management, we were unanimous in our disapproval of the AGSM proposed Program of Graduate Study in Financial Management for the Master’s of Science Degree.

Based on this grim assessment, P&B recommends that AGSM either be significantly downsized and/or placed in receivership for a significant interval of time. If receivership is implemented, then a strong UCR faculty person from another department should be appointed as the Interim Dean. The objective of P&B is to support an academic plan and budget that have real creditability so that UCR’s professional School of
Management is operated in a manner to provide our students with an academically sound educational experience. In addition, P&B insists that the UCR School of Management be operated with academic standards, scholarship, a level of extramural funding and research accomplishments of the faculty as well as fiscal creditability, which will enable this UCR academic unit to earn the respect of our fellow UC campuses and, in addition, one worthy of academic accreditation. If these steps are not taken immediately, then P&B regretfully concludes that AGSM, in its present form, should be a candidate for closure.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

GRADUATE DIVISION

P & B INERVIEW

Neil Schiller met with the committee on January 25, 2002.

ACADEMIC VISION

The Graduate Division is charged with coordinating graduate programs for the Schools, Colleges, and Departments. Its key values include: promoting healthy graduate programs; fostering vibrant research environment; increasing extramural resources for supporting graduate students; and maintaining an administrative infrastructure for managing graduate programs for the campus. To realize these key values, the Graduate Division lists a number of important goals and strategies for 2002-2003 and beyond: increasing funding for graduate students, cooperating with other UC’s in developing graduate programs, coordinating programs among diverse units on campus, and providing reports to the Graduate Council and other units on campus.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

The Graduate Division’s main academic priority is to become re-established as the primary unit for overseeing, coordinating, and facilitating graduate programs in all units at UCR. This priority involves overcoming the recent ambiguity over the functions of a central Graduate Division at a time of increased workload (due to increases in the number of graduate programs and degrees on campus as well as increases in graduate student applications and enrollments). To realize these priorities, internal reorganization of the Graduate Division is proposed.
CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FOR FY2001/2002

General Core Funding: $1,642,052
Endowments: $212,919

TOTAL: $1,854,971

Graduate Division Financial Aid
General Core Funds: $216,000
Specific State Approps: $650,434
Student Fees: $2,627,356

TOTAL: $3,493,790

Total budget for the Graduate Division is $1,309,402, with an additional $154,754 for running the office of instructional development.

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003

The Division lists three top priority and seven high priority requests. The three top priority requests are:

1. Conversion of the six-month temporary staff position in the Admissions Office into a career budgeted Student Affairs Officer ($47,048). This request is justified by the increase in applications over the last years by 77%, admissions offers by 53%, and fellowship offers by 142%.

2. Addition of a career budgeted Administrative Analyst ($62,872) to help manage the workload that has come from the increased number of students and programs.

3. Conversion of two associate dean's FTE from .25 to .50 ($60,600).

The list ranking of the seven high priority requests is:

4. Assign 1 FTE for Administrative Assistant for Deans.

5. Convert casual employees in Instructional Development into one Career Budgeted FTE.

6. $5000 for new Graduate Research Award program.
7. $30,000 for pool of funds to be used for Dissertation Research Grants.

8. $5000 to purchase Scantron software and a computer dedicated to processing teaching evaluations.

9. $7500 for undergraduate research grant competition and major instructional improvement grants.

10. $12,000 for Chancellor's Undergraduate Research Fellowships.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

Members of P and B disagree on how essential a central Graduate Division is to the campus. For those Colleges and Schools that support graduate students through research grants of the faculty, a strong division is seen as somewhat redundant to what departments and schools already do: take in applications, select students, and offer support packages. For those in the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, however, the Graduate Division is viewed as essential in generating resources for graduate student recruiting and support as well as for administration of graduate programs.

The disagreement among members of P and B hinges on the role of the departments, schools, and colleges (and the faculty therein) in securing funding for graduate students. Most members of P and B would support a Graduate Division that assisted colleges and departments in securing extramural funding for graduate students. The underlying problem is that CHASS does not secure sufficient extramural funding to support a significant portion of graduate students; and some members of the committee feel that it is incumbent upon the Deans and faculty of this college to work more diligently, perhaps in concert with the Graduate Division, a generating more extramural funding. Yet, many fields within CHASS cannot secure extramural funds at the rate typical of CHASS faculty, with the result that many departments must always rely upon sources of support within the university, such as the Graduate Division. In the end, P and B is cannot reach consensus on the role of the Graduate Division.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

Those in favor of a strong, central Graduate Division support the priorities of the Division, whereas those who do not see Graduate Division
as essential are less sympathetic to its budget priorities. Among those who support a central Graduate Division, the arguments of the Dean are persuasive. Staffing for the Division has remained stagnant over the last decade, while student enrollments have increased 25% and ten new programs offering sixteen new degrees have been implemented. Since 80% of the budget of the Division is for salaries and benefits, the three top priorities of the Dean are deemed appropriate if the Division is to keep up with the expanded workload. High priority items 4 and 5 are less essential, while priorities 7 through 10 enrich the campus with comparatively little cost.

P&B ADVICE TO THE CHANCELLOR/EVC (Graduate Division)

It now appears that, despite the last two years of ambiguity over whether or not to lodge the functions of the Graduate Division within the colleges, it is clear that a Graduate Division will continue to exist. Even though members of P and B disagree over the role of the Graduate Division, there is agreement on the need for the Graduate Division, colleges, and departments to work together at generating more funding for graduate students. Those who favor a strong Graduate Division would also support the top three priorities of the Division's budgetary proposal, as well as items 7 through 10 on the high priority list. Those who would prefer to see graduate education run from colleges and departments are skeptical about the need of the Graduate Division to expand its administrative staff.

Going forward, the role of the Graduate Division will vary for the different colleges and schools. CHASS will require more from the Division than, for example, CNAS, Engineering, or Education which can raise and administer funds more readily than many departments in CHASS. Thus, whatever the final administrative structure of the new Graduate Division, it should remain flexible and accommodating to the diverse needs of each college and school.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

V. Jorgensen, Interim Head Librarian; February 20, 2002

ACADEMIC VISION

The mission of the University Library is to provide collections and services in support of the University’s approved programs of instruction and research. The Library develops and maintains a preeminent collection that fully supports the research and teaching goals of the University, preserves the scholarly record, and serves as an asset in the campus-recruiting program.

A goal of the interim head librarian and her staff is to improve the Library’s ARL ranking, but to satisfy the qualifications entails substantial funding. P&B believe that the Library requires generous funding in the coming years in order for it to achieve a status comparable to other UC campuses of equivalent size.

The Library proposes to pursue fund raising opportunities for the purpose of attracting major gifts to support the Library.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

The budget requests for the next four years are based on the following:

1. Transition of the MELVYL legacy system and its associated databases to a new platform
2. Rising costs for full participation in the California Digital Library (CDL) and the rising costs of inflation in both print and electronic materials
3. Continuing costs for updating software and hardware to maintain state-of-the-art information technology
4. Relative small size of the staff compared to other UC campuses
5. Relative deficit in local funding for the Library over several years compared to other UC campuses
CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

Total permanent and temporary funding for the University Library for 2001/2002:

1. General/Core Funds $11,799,794
2. Sales & Services $ 82,300

TOTAL $11,945,700

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2002-2003

The Library requests for 2002-05 new permanent funding totaling $2,031,702 for the following priority-ranked needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Funding Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Collections-Inflation@6.2%</td>
<td>$257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Collections-CDL Co-Investment</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Collections-New Core Journals</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Academic Staff--Electronic Resources Coordinator</td>
<td>$ 48,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Academic Staff-Library Instruction Coordinator</td>
<td>$ 42,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Equipment-Microcomputer Replacement Program</td>
<td>$106,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Collections-Local Database Access</td>
<td>$ 36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collections-Engineering</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Academic Staff-Archivist/ Collections-Biomedical Sciences SpecialCollections Librarian</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Staff-1.5 FTE Library Assistant II (Electronic Reserves)</td>
<td>$ 37,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Equipment-Laptop Computer Loan Service</td>
<td>$ 42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Staff-Programmer/Analyst (Systems Department)</td>
<td>$ 36,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Academic Staff-INFOMINE Librarian</td>
<td>$ 42,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Staff-Library Assistant II (Science Access Services)</td>
<td>$ 25,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,469,464
### 2003-04

1. Collections-Inflation @ 6.2% $273,134  
2. Collections-CDL Co-investment $175,000  
3. Collections-New Core Journal $ 25,000  
   Academic Staff-Digital Reference Coordinator (Rivera) $ 48,984  
4. Professional Staff-Development Officer $ 78,000  
5. Staff-Library Assistant II (Education Services) $ 25,320  
6. Academic Staff-Government Information Librarian $ 42,780  
7. Staff-Library Assistant II (Science Access Services) $ 25,320  

**TOTAL** $693,538

### 2004-05

1. Collections-Inflation @ 6.2% $290,068  
2. Collections-CDL Co-investment  
3. Collections-New Core Journals $ 25,000  
4. Academic Staff-Reference Librarian (Rivera) $ 42,780  
5. Academic Staff-Reference Librarian (Science) $ 42,780  
6. Staff-0.5 FTE Library Assistant II (Science) $ 12,600  

**TOTAL** $613,228

A goal of the interim head librarian and her staff is to improve the Library’s ARL ranking, but to satisfy the qualifications entails substantial funding. However, this does not appear to be forthcoming. The committee believes that the Library requires generous funding in the coming years in order for it to achieve a status comparable to other UC campuses of equivalent size.

**P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION**

P&B support the Library’s mission and vision. It recognizes that the Library should be in a position to meet the particular needs of the University’s different programs. The different academic units - the
sciences, the social sciences, engineering, creative writing, and so on - have different needs and hence require from the Library different kinds of service. Thus, the digital library is useful to engineering, but less so to the humanities. The Library must be able to meet the different needs of the university.

Crucial to the mission of the Library is its status-rank in the ARL. Out of a total ARL membership of 111, the Library currently ranks 104. Previously, it was ranked in the 70s. ARL ranking is based on the following qualifications:

1. the size of the collection and the size of its annual growth
2. the size of the Library staff
3. the size of annual funding support to maintain the collection

A goal of the Library is to improve its ARL ranking, but to satisfy the qualifications entails substantial funding. Generous funding to support the Library’s vision and mission will greatly improve its ARL status.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

Of all the campus units the Library is the worst funded. It has lost ground as an institution supportive of faculty research. P&B offer the strongest support to the Library’s budget requests and its stated priority needs. Current funding simply maintains the status quo and fails to improve the Library’s ARL ranking and the quality of its service and does not promote growth. Journal subscriptions to the value of $200,000 have been cancelled this academic year. If there is no increase in funding next year $400,000 worth of journal subscriptions will have to be cancelled. At this rate, the Library will eventually lose its ARL ranking altogether.

Given the desperate and critical financial state of the Library, the requested permanent funding is far from adequate. Compared to other UC libraries, the net increases to UCR Library materials budgets since 1997/1998 are the lowest ($600,000). This figure is derisory. It practical terms it means that the Library is unable to maintain let alone expand its collections. In addition the Library has been declining in staff for several years. Again, compared to other UC libraries, the decline in total library staff at UCR Library, as reported in ARL statistics, is the highest. The urgent need of the Library is to hire the necessary staff as quickly and expeditiously as possible. The committee supports the Library’s efforts to carry this out.

P&B are aware that the Library is drastically under funded and requires immediate and sustained support so that it can function as a
quality research library. Of all the campus units, the Library is the worst funded and, in consequence, has lost ground with respect to other UC libraries and its ranking among ARL. Compared to other UC campuses of similar size, the Library’s funding for the past four years (1997/98-2001/02) has shown a 17% net increase ($600,000). This is the lowest net increase among the UC campuses roughly equivalent in size to UCR. Thus, UC SB has shown a 73% net increase ($2,566,494), UCSC has shown a 57% increase ($1,356,649), and UCD has shown a 21% increase ($1,176,970). In a period of student enrollment growth, the Library has not been able to expand its collection or retain and recruit the necessary staff. The Library requires generous funding in the coming years in order for it to achieve a status comparable to other UC campuses of equivalent size.

The funding category is divided into an undergraduate support component and a graduate support component. The budget priorities are geared to meet the demands of each. The Library needs substantial funding to provide adequate resources for the increasing number of undergraduate students who will be entering UCR in the coming years. The Library collections should have research depth in order to meet the expected expansion of graduate studies, particularly in CHASS. Current funding patterns are incapable of achieving this.

The Library proposes to pursue fund raising opportunities for the purpose of attracting major gifts to support the Library. This project is still in its formative stages. P&B support the proposal and call upon the administration to offer full assistance to this initiative.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

A well-regarded research university cannot exist without a decent library. P&B insists that the campus act in fiscal year 2002/2003 in order to organize a plan to upgrade the quality of the Library’s collections and services. This is our top priority, meaning that the Library urgently requires immediate and massive funding for its capital projects and programmatic needs. P&B proposes a minimum allocation to the Library for FY 2002/2003 of $1,000,000. The plan should create a budgetary arrangement that would allow for the sustained growth and development of the Library in the coming years.

P&B’s position is that the Library’s sustained growth and development necessitates linking growth to index allocations of one sort or another. The Library could, for example, receive a percentage allocation/flat fee (say $800) per each new undergraduate student or a percentage allocation/flat fee per each new faculty hire or some combination of both. The administration is urged to consider such options.
(or others) that will strengthen and enhance the quality of the Library’s collections and services. The Library requires generous funding in the coming years in order for it to achieve a status comparable to other UC campuses of equivalent size.
PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

Office of Research Affairs

P&B INTERVIEW(S)


ACADEMIC VISION

The overall mission of the Office of Research Affairs is Acquisition, Augmentation and Diversification of Resources for Research at UCR.

The Office of Research Affairs (ORA) provides the following services:

1. Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA)
2. Intellectual Property Services
3. Research Compliance
4. Campus Veterinary Services
5. Technology Development

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

The request for increased budgets during the next four years is based on:

1. Projected growth in contracts and grants (C&G) activity (15-20%/year);
2. Growth in intellectual property services;
3. Need for a new computerized Contract &Grant information management system (like the MIT, COEUS system);
4. Need for better systems to disseminate information on research activities

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

General Core Funds: $1,795,262
Sales & Services: $11,000

TOTAL: $1,806,262

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003

The ORA staff consists of 30 individuals. Sponsored Projects Administration (SPA), the core of ORA, is involved in Contracts and Grants Administration, Information Management, and Research Development. The ORA also has a budget of $63,243 for directed research programs.

The budget requests associated with each need are provided in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Budget ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>C&amp;G</td>
<td>AA II</td>
<td>37,686</td>
<td>37,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Information transfer COEUS</td>
<td>Asst. Project Facilitator Asst. Analyst</td>
<td>39,980</td>
<td>37,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>COEUS Intellectual Property C&amp;G Senior Analyst Licensing Prof. Senior C&amp;G officer Administrative Analyst</td>
<td>62,180</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>181,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>C&amp;G Intellectual Property C&amp;G Senior C&amp;G officer Licensing Prof. Administrative Analyst</td>
<td>56,900</td>
<td>62,180</td>
<td>196,746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

There is nothing unique about the mission of the ORA. They should consider adding “marketing” of research at UCR as one of the elements of their mission. They are in the best position to urge news organizations, such as the LA Times, to write articles on research conducted at UCR. Such publicity can play a role in attracting students as well as research funding.
ORA should play some role in bringing UCR investigators together in writing large multidisciplinary proposals.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

These budget requests appear to be reasonable but might be insufficient to support the expected growth in research activity at UCR. But ORA needs to consider embarking on activities that will add value to the conduct of research at UCR. For example, they should consider adding “marketing” of research at UCR as one of the elements of their mission. They are in the best position to urge news organizations, such as LA Times, to write articles on research conducted at UCR. Such publicity can play a role in attracting students as well as research funding.

We suggest a more ambitious program with the associated increase in staffing and budget requests. P&B suggests the following:

1. Developing the infrastructure required to fund exploratory research that can be used to leverage large projects.
2. Expanding the activities of the Technology Development Center to assist faculty in commercializing their research products.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC (Office of Research Affairs)

P&B requests that the higher Administration and ORA distribute annually to all faculty on the campus a report detailing how all the grant overhead dollars received by the Chancellor are distributed. At the present time, there is not a uniform picture available to the faculty concerning the distribution of overhead dollars by the various academic Deans.

P&B requests that a uniform policy on overhead distribution be developed that includes a finite return to the originating unit and at least a token amount of $1000 to be guaranteed to the originating Principal Investigator. Recognition must be given by Deans and higher Administration that there is, in general, a paucity of secretarial assistance for grant preparation.

ORA can play a role in bringing UCR investigators together in writing research proposals. ORA should make available an office where Principal Investigators can obtain access to secretarial assistance in the preparation of grants. This is particularly essential for the preparation of large or multi-investigator grants (e.g. NIH Program Projects). Ideally there
would be more than one secretarial office so that they could be located in
campus precincts close to the faculty group (e.g. College of Engineering,
the Boyce/Webber/Spieth buildings, etc).

UCR would gain a great deal if ORA expanded the activities of the
Technology Development Center to assist faculty in commercializing their
research products.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

Office of Student Affairs

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs James Sandoval, January 28, 2002.

ACADEMIC VISION

The VCSA guides campus-wide activities that are fundamental to the University’s vision for achieving excellence within a multicultural environment. The Division leads the campus-wide effort to assemble the undergraduate student body and create an atmosphere in which both undergraduate and graduate students can thrive. These goals are pursued through the progressive execution of academic outreach, recruitment, academic support, developmental planning, and cultural activities.

The VCSA oversees the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, the Registrar’s Office, the Office of Financial Aid, International Services, the Learning Center, the Campus Health Center, Career Services, the Counseling Center, Cultural Events, African Student Programs, Asian Pacific Student Programs, Chicano Student Programs, Native American Student Programs, etc.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

Student recruitment (especially through publications) and retention.
CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

General core funds: $9,287,551  
Registration Fees $6,105,933  
Other Student Fees $1,151,564  
Endowments $37,998  
Sales & Service $1,499,129  
Other $11,000  

TOTAL: $18,172,175

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY2002/2003

The annual operating budget of the Office of Student Affairs is currently $18 million, with over 300 FTE. The budget augmentation request for 2002-03 is $2.4 million. About 75% of this is for additional staff.

The budget request amounts can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1,167,647</td>
<td>1,272,418</td>
<td>2,440,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>412,390</td>
<td>806,000</td>
<td>1,218,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>108,465</td>
<td>831,000</td>
<td>939,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,688,502</td>
<td>$2,909,418</td>
<td>$4,597,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[See Table 1, VCSA 2001-02 Planning and Budget Process for Fiscal Years 2002-03 through 2004-05, for more detail.]

A significant portion of the VCSA operating budget comes from student registration fees and General Funds. In 2001-02, student fees generated $5,999,439 and in 2002-03 are projected to generate $8M.

The three priority areas for budget augmentation are: (a) the Office of Financial Aid, (b) the Registrar’s Office, and (c) the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Additional staff FTE are requested for each of these offices. Two other large budget requests (both for recruitment) include $224,818 (one time only) to cover an existing annual deficit in publications and $685,000 to expand the Chancellor’s merit scholarship.

UCR handles about $75 million in financial aid per year (half federal and half state sources). This is not included in the Student Affairs operating budget.
VCSA initiatives. The new Student Union is a major initiative, planned to open in early 2005 (a bit later than originally projected). It is designed for a student population of 20-21,000 students (i.e., for projected 2010 enrollment figures) and will be funded by student fees as passed by student referendum ($90/student/quarter). The buildings now holding the Commons Cafeteria will be demolished and a two-story structure will be built in its place; the Terrace Rooms and Costo Hall will be renovated. There is a future need for a Student Services Building, but this is not yet included in any proposals or requests.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

?? The administrative reorganization resulting in the new position of VCSA is so recent that the CPB cannot yet know what the fiscal results might be.

?? Several key operations (undergraduate admissions, financial aid, the registrar, etc.) are located in this arm of the administration. It is essential that they meet the predicted surge in enrollment growth between now and 2010.

?? The annual shortfall in the VCSA recruitment publications budget resulting in a deficit is a possible warning sign that UCR has not prioritized outreach and recruitment in the necessary ways. The VCSA’s Executive Summary notes that $364,000/year (permanent) will be needed to produce basic materials for student recruitment.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

From P&B’s perspective, the top priority must be to improve scheduling of classrooms in relation to the very significant growth of the campus that is anticipated over the next 8-10 years. UCR needs significant augmentation of its classroom inventory, particularly for small class rooms, and those that accommodate 200-250 students. Student Affairs must work with the major colleges and the Academic Senate in the next academic year (2002/2003) to develop a master plan.

The three priority areas for budget augmentation—the Office of Financial Aid, the Registrar’s Office, and the Office of Undergraduate Admissions—are appropriate and necessary. Staffing and technological support are key areas for expansion. Long-term plans to periodically update technological support will need to be part of the permanent budget. The burgeoning base of student fees (which will expand along with enrollment growth) should go a long way toward helping to keep up.
P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC (OSA)

We recommend that the OSA:

1. Carry out a thorough review of its needs across all its offices in order to keep up with enrollment growth

2. Focus on student retention after it has caught up with enrollment growth

3. Significantly expand its endowment base

4. Develop a formal plan for classroom scheduling, in consultation with the Academic Senate.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS

P&B INTERVIEW

Associate Vice Chancellor Charles Rowley, February 1, 2002

ACADEMIC VISION

The mission of the Computing & Communication (C&C) unit is to facilitate UCR’s teaching, research, and public service efforts by providing reliable, secure, innovative, and technically sophisticated infrastructure and services. As Communications provides these services, the unit will operate within budget and per the campus approved rate schedule.

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

1. A new IP enabled phone switch will be deployed allowing Communications to solve very pressing campus needs for increased voice reliability and capacity. During subsequent years, the new switch will allow the campus to replace Mitel and Merlin instruments in the most technically appropriate manner (via Voiceover IP phones or digital phones) as well as introduce new voice features to the campus (e.g. unified messaging).

2. Faculty, staff, and student access to the campus intranet and Internet 2 will be continually optimized. Therefore, the campus will follow a predictable and stable renewal and replacement plan relating to network electronics, campus access to Internet 2 will be upgraded (from a single 155 Mbs OC3 connection to four OC3s during the next 3 years), and the campus will aggressively participate in the UCOP facilitated Optical Network Initiative (ONI) which will provide a major Internet upgrade.

3. The campus will collaborate, primarily with other UC campuses on the design and implementation of network security and monitoring systems that adequately protect
UCR's assets while maintaining high usability and assuring academic freedom.

4. Support for campus growth will be provided by participation in all new building / major renovation planning efforts (especially relating to voice and data infrastructure visioning, planning, and budgeting).

5. UCR (to the greatest degree possible and to support the teaching, research, and public service missions of the university) will work to extend the campus core network into the surrounding community.

CURRENT BUDGET OF C&C FY 2001-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General/Core Funds</th>
<th>$6,896,744</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>$1,066,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,963,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

The academic priorities for C&C are embodied in 29 individual projects that are tabulated in Appendix I. This Appendix also includes the proposed budget allocation for each project.

C&C requests a total of $1,433,219 in Permanent Funding and $3,164,909 in Temporary Funding.

P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

The budgetary request for C&C is a significant augmentation of both the temporary and permanent funds to the 2002-2003 budget. These requests also have significant budgetary implications for the following two budget cycles. The impact of these requests for the teaching program and mission are many fold. However while state of the art computer and communications are also important in supporting excellent research programs, it is less clear how these requests will increase the research stature and mission of UC Riverside, especially in regards to increasing extramural funding.

There are numerous smaller projects and budget requests and it would seem apparent that Computing and Communications will have to revisit the priority list after budgetary decisions are made. It is
disappointing that C&C could not have been more focused on identifying top priorities.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

Given the significant cut in the State support for the University in the area of C&C, the Planning & Budget Committee can only support the allocation of funds for Maintenance Agreements and those projects which will directly impact teaching functions. Particularly P&B would promote Priority #6 & #8 (Classroom support up to $500,000) and Priority #4 (Blackboard) to be, respectively the #1 and #2 priorities. Maintenance Contracts should be Priority #3.

Given the importance to UCR of having state-of-the-art Computing & Communications facilities as the student population grows significantly, consideration should be given to allocating $100-$200 from the permanent state funding for each individual student to C&C.
### APPENDIX I

#### Computing & Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking No.</th>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Perm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content Creation</td>
<td>Visionary and Planning</td>
<td>$56,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Other Academic Computing Support</td>
<td>Maintenance Agreements</td>
<td>$3,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Administrative Computing Support</td>
<td>Maintenance Agreements Renewal and Replacement</td>
<td>$49,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Technical Literacy</td>
<td>Teaching/General Access Computer</td>
<td>$79,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Blackboard Support (4 Ras)</td>
<td>$91,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Administrative Computing Support</td>
<td>Continuing Support for UCOP PPS and IBM Upgrade</td>
<td>$111,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Classroom Technology Support</td>
<td>Support for UNLH 1000</td>
<td>$52,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Technical Literacy</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Classroom Technology Support</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>$90,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Ranking No.</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Optimizing</td>
<td>FTE for Distributed Computing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Computing Efforts</td>
<td>Central Computing Efforts</td>
<td>$152,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating</td>
<td>Learning Emporiums</td>
<td>$358,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Other Academic Computing Support</td>
<td>Collaboratory</td>
<td>$32,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Administrative Computing Support</td>
<td>SIS Information System</td>
<td>$181,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extramural Funds Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Computing Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Academic Administrative Systems</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>$56,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for Affirmative Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Academic Administrative Systems</td>
<td>Database and Academic Personnel</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Funding for Distance Learning</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Blackboard Level III Support</td>
<td>$64,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimizing Distribute Computing and Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Computing Efforts</td>
<td>Content Management Systems</td>
<td>$132,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Ranking No.</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content Creation</td>
<td>Mobile computerized Classroom on a Cart</td>
<td>$92,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimizing Distribute Computing and Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Administrative Computing Support</td>
<td>Human Resources System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Resources Circulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Classroom Technology Support</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement Program</td>
<td>$27,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td>Network Based Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Mobile Systems</td>
<td>$30,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td>Additional Technical Support, CHASS and CNAS</td>
<td>$95,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>East and West Campus Digital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Creation Self Service Centers (Faculty)</td>
<td>$2,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Computing and Support for Student</td>
<td>Cyber Cafes and Mobile Printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Technical Literacy</td>
<td>Stations</td>
<td>$12,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Technology and Digital Content</td>
<td>Activity Response System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Multimedia Classroom on a Cart</td>
<td>$539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Ranking No.</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Perm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Computing Efforts</td>
<td>Credit Card Processing System</td>
<td>$113,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>E-UCR Initiative</td>
<td>E-UCTRL TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Annual Increment Request  
Perm: $1,433,219  
Temp: $3,164,909
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

UCR Extension and Summer Session

P&B INTERVIEW

The Committee met with Jack Azzaretto on January 9, 2002.

ACADEMIC VISION

University Extension's (UNEX) mission is to develop diverse programs for lifelong learning for individuals of all ages within the region and around the world. This mission involves developing extension programs within the Inland region as well as partnerships in other countries. Extension operates under several guiding values: how much can students learn and take back to the workplace; how can extension provide the best instructors for educational excellence; how can people of all ages, at any time and at their own convenience, take advantage of diverse educational programs; and how can extension be a critical partner in the social, cultural and economic development of the Inland Empire?

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

Because UNEX is a self-supporting operation, academic priorities are constrained by past, present, and future fiscal considerations. Thus, the list of priorities below reflects a mix of both academic and financial goals:

To overcome the dampening effects of 9-11 on the growth of both domestic and international programs. These effects include a significant loss of revenue that can be regained with growth in academic programs.

To regain program growth in the face of an increasingly competitive environment for education services.

To become the contractor for UCR summer school when summer sessions are converted to a regular state-supported quarter. For UNEX to balance its budget, it must have the revenues from summer session.
To continue offering courses in Temecula, with the university covering the deficits that this program incurs (approximately $60,000 per year)

To suspend or significantly reduce current campus assessments on the budget of UNEX for (a) STIP assessment of $50,000 per year and (b) financial system costs of $52,000 per year in perpetuity.

- upgrade Executive Assistant to Vice-Chancellor’s position ($9,876 in permanent funding).

To supplement by $3,000 discretionary funding to support international development activities and the hosting of international dignitaries.

To continue the flex-funding arrangement to support campus faculty and student overseas travel (not to exceed $30,000 per year)

CURRENT TOAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Fees:</td>
<td>$11,131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service:</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxilliary Enterprises:</td>
<td>$ 671,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $12,784,397

Total Deficit: $225,000 (As described by Dean Azzaretto)

Note: The anticipated deficit is anticipated to come down to $50,000 for 02-03. The deficits are currently being taken from accumulated surpluses from previous years of $2.8 million.

Note: A new information system is need, at a cost of $400,000 that will also be taken from reserves. Also, in 02-03, another $100,000 will be needed for building renovations.

P & B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

Note: The anticipated deficit is anticipated to come down to $50,000 for 02-03. The deficits are currently being taken from accumulated surpluses from previous years of $2.8 million.

Note: A new information system is need, at a cost of $400,000 that will also be taken from reserves. Also, in 02-03, another $100,000 will be needed for building renovations.
P AND B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

STIP interests does not go to UNEX, the unit that generated the funds. This money should be returned to UNEX.

The assessment for the financial system was perhaps appropriate during the purchase and implementation stages, but this assessment should not continue indefinitely, as is currently proposed. The assessment should reflect the cost of the actual services provided by the central administration to UNEX.

P &B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

UNEX has done a remarkable job over the years in becoming a self-sustaining unit that provides many valuable services to the Inland Empire. It should be encouraged to expand its outreach. It must be allowed to use its surplus to cover the current downturn in enrollments and to begin developing new programs that can ensure its growth in the near future.

Just whether or not UNEX should be the contractor for a full summer quarter hinges on whether or not it can do a better job than the colleges and departments. Although P and B is sympathetic to UNEX’s need to find revenue sources, the issue of how to implement a summer quarter must be reviewed by the Academic Sensate and administration before any decision is made as to how to implement the program. In all likelihood, the program will be administered as are the fall, winter, and spring quarters; and so, P and B would caution UNEX not to rely upon a contract with the university for implementing the summer quarter.
June 8, 2002

PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

UNIT:

Development Office

P&B INTERVIEW(S)

Associate Vice Chancellor for Development Pamela Hillman, March 11, 2002.

ACADEMIC VISION

The Associate VC for Development reports to Interim VC for University Advancement & Development Robert Nava. According to the Office of Development (OD) website (www.development.ucr.edu):

UCR’s Office of Development is the fundraising arm of the University. The central- and unit-based development officers encourage and facilitate short- and long-term private support for the University from alumni, friends, corporations, foundations, and organizations. Their success comes from matching external constituencies’ interests and philanthropic goals with the creative exploration undertaken by professors, researchers and students in UCR’s laboratories, classrooms and in the field.

UCR has had the smallest Office of Development in the UC system (including UCSC). AVC Hillman has a staff of about 30, and only 3 are non-professional (compared to UCLA, which has @300 staff members in the Office of Development).

The offices within the OD include:\(^2\)

**Annual Giving.** The Chancellor's Associates is UCR’s premier annual giving program. UCR’s generous donors are able to direct gifts of $1,500, $2,500, $5,000 and $10,000+ to any college, department, or program at the University. For doing so, these individuals and organizations are recognized as Chancellor’s Associates by virtue of their generosity.

\(^2\) This information is taken directly from the OD website.
Comprehensive Campaign. UCR is currently in the midst of a $200 million campaign. This campaign, UCR’s first, will greatly benefit research initiatives, students and faculty throughout the university, assuring UCR’s strong and promising future.

Corporate and Foundation Relations. Oversees the solicitation of philanthropic support from corporations and foundations on behalf of UCR and facilitates the development of public/private partnerships in support of units of the University. Developing and maintaining beneficial long-term relationships with corporations and foundations is a high priority of the University.

Gift Planning. Encourages philanthropy to the University through charitable and estate planning.

Major Gifts. Encourages friends and alumni to establish closer ties to UCR through engagement in programs and activities on and about the campus. Ultimately, UCR hopes that this deeper understanding of what the University is doing and what it can accomplish will inspire more significant gifts for critical campus initiatives.

Research & Writing. Identifies and then matches the interests of individuals, corporations, organizations, and foundations with the initiatives of UCR’s colleges, schools and units. R&W is responsible for the Prospect Management and Tracking System which enables development officers to coordinate efforts for university advancement. R&W also coordinates a stewardship system to keep donors informed, on a regular basis, of the impact their contributions have had on the campus.

The Board of Trustees for the UC Riverside Foundation is now administratively located in the Office of Development. The President of the Foundation was formerly in the VC’s office and had the charge of outreach and fundraising. One-third of VC Hillman’s time is spent working with the Board, which has almost 100 voting members; 53% give at the $1,500 level or more. Beginning next year, all Board members will need to give at least $1,500 annually.

Comprehensive Campaign: “Seeds of Promise, Seeds of Strength.” This has been VC Hillman’s priority since 2001, working closely with the Foundation. The Comprehensive Campaign will run through calendar year 2006. About $40 million has been raised, and the goal is $150-152 million. VC Hillman is working with the deans to come up with specific ‘featured’ campaign objectives that will allow for focus as well as flexibility. Goals from each academic unit will thus shape the definition of fundraising. Each College will have a campaign committee by the end of the 2001-02 AY. VC Hillman decided to mark the beginning of the campaign with the gift of the Heckmann Center.
ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

UCR now has a full-time Director of Development (DD) in every major academic unit; this is a recent change, in the last 5 years. DDs have a wide range of activities (fundraising is only part of what they do); each DD “works with the dean or director to identify and then find the resources to bring critical initiatives to fruition,” according to the OD website. OD’s focus on gifts of $25,000 and above. Physical Education, the Library, and UNEX only have part-time development staff.

CURRENT TOTAL BUDGET FY 2001-2002

The Office of Development’s budget is a part of the larger unit administered by Vice Chancellor R. Nava; University Advancement and Development.

BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 2002/2003

VC Hillman has requested two new staff positions: a Campaign Operations Coordinator/ Administrative Analyst (for 2002-03) and a Gift Planning Operations Coordinator/ Administrative Analyst (for 2003-04).

The budget request amounts can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY</th>
<th>PERMANENT</th>
<th>TEMPORARY</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT OF REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$99,040</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$253,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$69,514</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$419,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>$146,500</td>
<td>$146,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$168,554</td>
<td>$650,500</td>
<td>$819,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VC Hillman provided the following information on the OD budget for FY 2001-02:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; benefits</td>
<td>$206,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$299,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Staff Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Permanent Budget</td>
<td>$1,848,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
P&B COMMENTS ON PLAN/VISION

The OD is central to any major research university, and this administrative unit—like so many others at UCR—is sub par. It is woefully understaffed and its Associate VC is still playing catch-up in too many ways. The fact that the P&B had trouble getting basic budgetary information on this unit is an indication that it needs attention.

The Office of Development, Alumni Relations, Governmental and Community Relations, University Relations, and Events Management are all linked: all report to the VC for University Advancement & Development. In a mature institution, all these activities are closely interlinked. These units will evidently have an integrated budget beginning in 2002-03. The CPB views this as an important step.

AVC Hillman noted that her office expects a budget cut for next year. 40% of the OD budget goes to recharge, which is a source of serious concern. VC Hillman’s office does not apparently participate directly in the budget hearing process, though the Interim VC for University Advancement presumably does; this report should therefore be considered along with that on the Office for University Advancement.

P&B COMMENTS ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

The OD’s focus on the Comprehensive Campaign and on the full-time Directors of Development (DD) in every major academic unit is timely and appropriate but must be viewed in the context of bringing UCR up from behind when compared not only with the other UC campuses but with major research universities nation-wide. AVC Hillman’s request for two staff FTE over the next two years is certainly modest; on the other hand, it was disturbing to hear that the OD still needs better donor software although it has already kicked off its Comprehensive Campaign. In short, there are certain indications that the OD does not entirely have its house in order, though there are undoubtedly many reasons for this.

P&B ADVICE TO CHANCELLOR/EVC

The Office of Development must be nourished by providing stipends for Fund Raisers. As the University of California becomes more privatized, it is critical that UCR initiate and maintain a highly successful Office of Development so that our endowment is maximized.
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