

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING & BUDGET
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 4, 2018

To be received and placed on file:

From September 1, 2017 to August 31, 2018, the Committee on Planning & Budget (P&B) met a total of 24 times, with a typical meeting length of 1.5 - 2 hours. The Committee discussed and considered several business items from the campus and from Office of the President.

Campus level review subjects:

- P&B reviewed and supported FTE transfers for 6 faculty.
- Revised proposal to establish a graduate program in Biophysics – P&B supported the proposal and felt that all the issues raised in the previous version had been addressed. P&B did point out the current difficulties of budgetary support for interdisciplinary programs and suggested that for the first cycle of review by the Graduate Council the problems with interdisciplinary funding receive special attention.
- Draft WASC Institutional Report – The Committee discussed the draft report and noted that including comparison data in the report would be beneficial as well as using better metrics and analysis to compare how UCR fares against comparable universities.
- Request to Establish the S. Sue Johnson Presidential Endowed Chair in the School of Medicine - The Committee discussed and supported the proposal and the MOU.
- Report Review Sustainability Ad Hoc – The Committee reviewed the report and strongly supported a standing Academic Senate committee on Sustainability. The Committee did not see the need for a Vice Provost of Sustainability. Instead the new Senate committee on Sustainability could create strong ties to administrators relevant to sustainability in Facilities and in Planning and Budget.
- Open Access 2020 – The Committee was supportive of the principle of open access. However, the document did not make it clear what open access principles are being proposed or what the goals of the proposal are. Transition costs are also not addressed. The document lacks details on the cost considerations, how they will be funded, or a discussion of what the relevant questions are. Discipline specific differences are also ignored but are important in framing solutions. Future impacts on publishing and current sectors are not discussed in the document.
- Proposed Regulation Change to GR1.6 from Graduate Council – P&B discussed the proposal and was in support of the revisions although they felt the changes did not seem to modify the requirement but may involve additional faculty time and commitment that should include teaching credit.
- Revisions to UCR Appendix 7 – P&B discussed the revisions being proposed and was generally supportive of the clarifications being made. However, the committee felt that a couple areas needed more information.
- Cluster Hiring Initiative: Status & Future Plans - P&B discussed the document and did not advocate for any of the three options. P&B welcomed more dialog supported by more information on the present situation and future plans. The committee pointed out that the analysis presented omitted several important aspects of the cluster hiring process – 1) the way the number of cluster hires was presented masked the effect of the

cluster hiring process; 2) announcement to grow faculty by 300 was made in 2014; however, this document uses a baseline of 2013. The campus should not be tied to previous rhetoric when circumstances have changed; 3) no part of the document addresses faculty concerns over the method of selection of the clusters; 4) discussion of the necessary infrastructure resources to support faculty growth on campus is conspicuously missing from the document; 5) the document has no information on the remaining resources to support further growth; 6) the document states that the cluster hiring process is very similar to the process for departmental hiring; however, there are in fact critical differences; 7) the document gives no sense of how individual clusters have proceeded. It is not clear whether there has been any accounting or monitoring on a “per cluster” basis. P&B did not feel that the document or three options offered were responsive to the faculty cluster hiring surveys.

- New master’s Degree in Supply Chain and Logistics Management (MSCLM) – revised proposal – P&B reviewed the revised proposal and felt that it was much improved from the previous version. The committee had two remaining concerns – 1) the proposed degree would be more expensive than other surveyed degrees (USC is \$18k cheaper with fewer courses over the same period and MIT’s degree while priced similarly to UCR’s takes six fewer months to complete). It is also not clear if the market will support the degree at UCR when compared with a less expensive and less intensive degree from elsewhere. The committee noticed that a marketing budget had been removed from the proposal; yet this might be necessary given other universities’ offerings. 2) some of the text could be reworked to be more recent or accurate. Some of the information is out of date and some of the plans to use staff support from existing programs is not allowed without compensation. This needs to be removed or clarified.
- Campus Implementation Procedures for the Negotiated Salary Trial Program – P&B reviewed the procedures and had concerns over the further erosion of the UC salary scales which have not been competitive for decades. This program further exacerbates the problem, by providing another mechanism, outside the merit review process, for salary increases. This has two effects – first, it promotes unseen salary inequities. Second, it gives the appearance of solving the total remuneration gap between UC and comparison institutions by focusing on a few individuals with research programs amenable to this program. This program has long-term budgetary implications as it will impact UC’s ability to push for the necessary increases in state support to maintain competitive salaries. The committee was concerned that by focusing on our ability to retain a few faculty in select areas, we (UCR and UC as a whole) may have lost ground in our ability to attract and retain high-quality faculty in all areas.
- Proposed Degree Program: Joint Entomology BS/Entomology MS Five-Year Combined-Degree Program – P&B reviewed the proposal and found no budgetary concerns.
- Academic Planning: UCR 5-Year Planning Perspectives 2018-2023 – P&B reviewed the document and felt it concurs with current planning on campus. The committee pointed out a few errors in the report.
- Course Scheduling Policy Workgroup Report – P&B was supportive of the report and felt that they do not have budgetary impact and will increase UCR’s capacity to accommodate student and faculty preferences.
- Proposed Degree Program: Master of Science in Business Analytics (MSiBA) – P&B reviewed the proposal and found that it did not follow the proper format or guidelines for self-supporting program proposals, particularly in regard to accounting for indirect costs back to the department, college, and campus. The committee also recommended a

market analysis to help justify the tuition and enrollment numbers. The committee questioned admission into the program, particularly for students whose background is outside of undergraduate business or statistics. It is unusual to have separate degree requirements by undergraduate major and this curriculum leaves out students who fall outside of one of the enumerated categories which may unnecessarily restrict enrollment. The committee also recommended that the program have a single primary director that alternates, not co-directors. The proposal also needs a faculty vote from each department and College Executive Committee.

- Medical and Health Humanities Minor – P&B reviewed the proposal and found no budgetary concerns. The committee was supportive of the new minor.
- Everett and Imogene Ross Term Chair in Computer Science and the Ross Family Term Chair in Computer Science – P&B reviewed the proposal and was supportive of the chairs. The committee asked to be sure that any deviation on the use of funds provided for the endowed chairs follow the designated goals of the donation and previous stipulations/protocols to ensure consultation with appropriate stakeholders.
- Proposed Changes to Implementation Procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan – P&B found that the proposed changes strip wording that allocates “Z” payments proportionally from funds that exceed expenses and instead replaces it with the requirement that individual units submit Implementation Plans (yearly) on how they will make “Z” payments to their physicians. Later the document indicates that the “Z” compensation must be based on contributions to the school and performance measures. The committee assumed the yearly Implementation Procedures are the documents which specify the contributions and performance measures, although this is not made clear. This appears to remove problematic wording, with respect to the Halifax ruling. However, the unit-level Implementation Procedures must be properly vetted to make sure that the system does not run afoul of the Halifax ruling, or any other similar legal restriction. The proposed changes also remove an exact amount necessary for the reserve, replacing “20%” with “an appropriate amount”. As the School of Medicine’s budget is in a state of change, the committee could not comment on the budgetary effects of this change.

Systemwide level review subjects:

- Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program – P&B reviewed the procedures and felt that the program is relatively new, and its full effects may not yet be realized. However, they had five requests should the program continue: 1) proper data should be collected regularly from both participants and non-participants in order that the program can be comprehensively reviewed again in the near future; 2) the committee questioned if there are any mechanisms for moral or ethical oversight in place to prevent conflicts of interest; 3) it would be beneficial to add review criteria about benefits for under-represented groups; 4) the source of supplemental salaries should be tracked for future reviews; 5) data should be collected to monitor whether state support for positions in these fields, participants and non-participants, declines.
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations – P&B reviewed the proposed policy and did not have any concerns.
- Second Systemwide Review: Proposed Revised APM Sections: 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135 and 235 – P&B reviewed the proposed changes and felt they were generally favorable because they improve clarity in making the titles and steps in line with other

Senate appointments. P&B found the criteria for merit and promotion still vague in areas. The committee was pleased that sabbatical credits will be extended to LSOE and LPSOE titles. The committee acknowledged concerns that increased numbers of LSOEs might change the culture and direction of the campus. However, this proposal does not change this possibility. P&B advocates for established membership of at least one LSOE on CAP to help inform CAP on SOE series members. The committee found two points in which more clarity is needed: 1) regarding sabbaticals in residence, the required teaching for SOE series titles is ill-specified. 2) for “changes of series”, the language is relatively clear for tenured appointments. For Assistant Professors and LPSOEs, it is less clear.

- Proposed New APM - 675, Veterinary Medicine Salary Administration – P&B reviewed the proposed new APM and found no noticeable impact to the UC Riverside campus.

In addition, the Committee held regular monthly meetings with the Vice Chancellor of Planning & Budget or the Associate Vice Chancellor.

P&B also met with all Academic Deans and select non-academic unit heads to discuss the yearly budget process. Deans and unit heads were invited to share their feedback on the new budget process, its impact and future projections for the units. The committee produced a final report to the Academic Senate Chair and members of the administration of their findings after meeting with the Deans and unit heads.

All members of the Committee also participated in the campus’s Budget Committee, which reviews academic and self-supporting units, and the campus’s Governance Committee, which reviews non-academic unit budget requests.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lynda Bell, History
Rogerio Budasz, Music
David Eastmond, Molecular, Cell & Systems Biology
Cathleen Geraghty-Jenkinson, GSOE
Yawen Jiao, Business
Katherine Kinney, English
Mikeal Roose, Botany & Plant Sciences
James Tobias, English
Harry Tom, Physics & Astronomy
Akula Venkatram, Mechanical Engineering
Francisco Zaera, Chemistry
Martin Garcia-Castro, Biomedical Sciences, Vice Chair
Christian Shelton, Computer Science and Engineering, Chair