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The Committee on Planning and Budget committee met 23 times during FY 2004/05. We met with the following people:

- Dean Steven Angle, CNAS
- Interim Dean Joel Martin, CHASS
- Interim Dean Mark Matsumoto, COE
- Dean Steven Bossert, GSOE
- Dean Dallas Rabenstein, Graduate Division
- Dean Jack Azzaretto, Extension Services
- Vice Chancellor William Boldt, University Advancement
- Associate Vice Chancellor Chuck Rowley, Computing and Communications
- Vice Chancellor Charles Louis, Research
- Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar, Academic Planning and Budget
- Vice Chancellor James Sandoval, Student Affairs
- Vice Chancellor C. Michael Webster, Administration
- Associate Dean Raymond Williams, AGSM
- Assistant Vice Chancellor LaRae Lundgren, Enrollment Management

We also met with Chancellor France A. Córdova and the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Ellen A. Wartella. From our meetings with Deans, Unit Heads and other members of the administration, the committee developed a list of priorities for consideration during the budget process.

The Committee on Planning and Budget carefully examined the key goals of the Chancellor’s vision. The Committee felt that judicious investment in the teaching and research infrastructure of the campus could help achieve the Chancellor’s goals of AAU status and expanded professional education. UCR is both a teaching and a research university, whose distinction depends as much on the success of its students as it does on the research output of its faculty.

**Teaching Priorities**

The committee felt that the ability to read critically and write cogently is of paramount importance to the success of all of our students, whether they major in art history or biochemistry. As such, teaching our students who need further work to pass the systemwide Subject A requirement must be funded by the university. So too must the English composition requirement which all of our students must take be funded. We recognized that there is some debate in the Senate as to whether a change in the English composition sequence is advisable.
We did not endorse any particular outcome, but we did affirm the principle that funding these courses (whatever they might become) need occur. Furthermore, as Subject A and English composition are universitywide requirements, we felt that the fiscal responsibility for teaching these courses should not reside in any one College. For the sake of budget clarity, we recommended that these courses be funded centrally and administered perhaps by a newly established writing program. We recognized that teaching these courses is costly, and that there are alternative funding needs on campus. There are always trade-offs and alternative uses of funds. In the case of Subject A and English composition, however, the relevant Senate committees, including the Advisory Committee, have endorsed funding these courses as a high priority.

Regarding graduate education, the committee was supportive of increased funding to attract graduate students. We understood that 30% more funding was allocated to the Graduate Division this year for fellowship support. However, graduate enrollments are roughly the same as the previous year. We considered this failure to increase enrollments a serious problem and requested the administration to look in to this and report their findings to the Senate.

Staff and Infrastructure

The Committee felt that the overall success of our teaching and research missions depends critically on our staff infrastructure. The Committee strongly believes that the campus needs to invest in staff support alongside faculty FTE, if growth is to be managed smoothly. We should hire new staff where needed as well as invest in upgrades and reclassifications where appropriate. Staff support should be allocated throughout the Colleges in departments and programs and should not be heavily concentrated in the Deans’ offices.

Specifically, Planning and Budget found the following initiatives to be of high priority:

1. Investing in web infrastructure across the Schools and Colleges, perhaps even centralizing efforts through James Lin in CHASS or through C&C;
2. Support the need for increased development efforts across the campus, and especially in the Schools and Colleges;
3. Support the need for additional space management personnel for CNAS and CHASS;
4. Reassess the requests for staff for Deans’ offices – discuss the requirement for sensitivity to departmental needs

Research

We recognized that the recently announced drop-offs in enrollments severely hinders our ability to recruit new faculty and even replace faculty who have left the university for one reason or another. All in all, we found the requests by the various Deans to be reasonable and urged the administration to invest in faculty growth as much as feasible. However, we did urge that the administration proceed with caution in making faculty appointments given these uncertain budgetary times. In particular, we did not think it wise to invest more resources in departments
or schools that are undergoing internal struggles until the existing faculty has presented a cogent and realistic plan for faculty recruitment.

The investment that the administration is making in the Health Sciences Research Initiative (HSRI) is something we see value in. However, given the size of this investment, we feel that the Senate needs to be more involved in planning for the HSRI due to its significant budgetary and FTE implications.
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