

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)
MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 2025

PRESENT:

David Oglesby, Earth & Planetary Sciences, CPB Chair
Vyjayanthi Chari, Mathematics, CPB Vice Chair
Bahman Anvari, Bioengineering
Richard Debus, Biochemistry
Anthony Grubestic, School of Public Policy
Steven Helfand, Economics
Liz Przybylski, Music
Jade Sasser, Gender & Sexuality Studies

ABSENT:

Meng Chen, Botany & Plant Sciences
Hyun Hong, Area of Accounting
Cong Liu, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Scott Pegan, Biomedical Sciences

Chair David Oglesby called the meeting to order at 11:05am.

CPB members voted unanimously to approve the September 16 meeting minutes.

CHAIR'S UPDATES & COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Chair Oglesby attended a Campus Leadership Retreat on September 29. There were 3 threads that were discussed throughout the entire day: 1) student success; 2) research; and 3) community engagement. In particular, with student success: undergraduate student success was focused on. With research: use of campus seed money was discussed; and how faculty members start up large-scale, collaborative, interdisciplinary research programs, where maybe they feel like they haven't had as much support before. And then with community engagement, there were discussions on how best to work with the local community, state, and country to try to disseminate what UCR does to actually help the general public. It was discussed that if UCR does a better job of engaging with the community, hopefully UCR will do better in convincing legislators in better funding UC. Nothing was decided at this retreat. It was a chance for the Chancellor to get his priorities across to UCR Senate representatives and administration. The Chancellor committed to having a graduate-oriented retreat at some point in the future.

Regarding undergraduate success: at the retreat, the Chancellor discussed the issue of how increasing UCR's enrollment to increase funding presents a quandary, in which more resources will be needed (e.g., advising). Then without hiring new people to do this kind of advising and to support these students, current personnel may very well be stretched more thin. Chair Oglesby identified this as a bit of a Catch-22 and asked the Chancellor: how is UCR going to thread this needle? The Chancellor indicated that devoting resources towards student support is going to be a high priority, and whether that means taking resources away from other aspects of the campus, that waits to be seen.

Chair Oglesby attended the October 7 UCPB meeting. The UCPB Chair, Professor Robert Brosnan (UC Davis), conveyed that one area of focus for UCPB is to monitor threats to federal funding—to quantify impacts on UC programs and provide recommendations on replacement funding and to prioritize. If somehow the UC has to choose and make tough choices: what are UC's priorities? And how does the UC deal with targeted federal demands and sanctions against the UC? UCPB Chair Brosnan brought up that orphan endowments may be a consideration to support activities that are no longer priorities or no longer happening at all.

Other areas of focus for UCPB include: graduate student funding model recommendations; healthcare costs and the UC Care PPO sustainability; how the UC should be restructured to reduce operating costs; whether AI can be leveraged to increase operational costs, both instructional and in non-instructional ways; and how to improve the UC brand and the communication of UC impacts to all Californians.

At the UCPB meeting, it was mentioned that there are 3 bond bills coming up next year that could potentially bring some much-needed funds to UC. Overall, the final budget for the UC this year was essentially flat from last year—although it was a combination of cuts this year, restored funds from previous years, and deferrals to following years, etc. A big potential cloud on the horizon is cuts to federal housing funding, Medicaid, and federal medical funding. Keeping the medical funding going is a huge priority of the state of California. And so, if the state has to backfill billions of dollars into medical care to make up for cuts at the federal level, that is going to be felt in every other state agency, including the UC.

Some CPB members attended the October 12 Campus Finance Committee (CFC) meeting. CPB members felt that it might be beneficial for the entire committee to be invited to future CFC meetings that might be of strategic importance. CPB members reiterated that CPB should have one of its members serve on the search committee for the new VCPBA.

[CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSAL: *TRANSFER OF CNAS MICROBIOLOGY UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM TO THE CNAS DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY AND PLANT PATHOLOGY*

CPB did not see any budgetary implications to note for this proposal and is generally supportive of the transfer.

[CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSED DEGREE PROGRAM: *FLEX MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY (FLEX MPP-SSGPDP)*

CPB members noted that the School of Public Policy's main motivation for this is to give professional students that have full-time jobs the flexibility to complete an MPP degree. SPP is not pitching this as a big money-maker.

At this juncture, CPB members did not see any budget-related red flags and had no objections to the proposed degree program. After the meeting, CPB members will look more closely at the documents and evaluate whether they have any comments.

[SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSAL: *PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PRESIDENTIAL POLICY ON SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES*

CPB discussed the proposed revised policy that focuses on the following key issues:

- *Green Building – New provisions added requiring Regents’ approval for investments in natural gas infrastructure that exceed \$20M and requiring that new buildings and major renovation projects complete one year of monitoring-based commissioning to ensure that they perform as designed.*
- *Clean Energy and Climate Action - Updates remove references to centrally procured biogas (per the UC Energy Services Governing Board’s direction to focus on direct emissions reductions over the use of biogas as a transition fuel source) and add a provision allowing locations to update their interim greenhouse gas reduction targets at regular intervals. Additional minor revisions remove outdated provisions, clarify intent, and improve organization.*
- *Sustainable Transportation – Soon to be outdated single-occupancy vehicle reduction targets were replaced with general requirements to continue promoting commute trip reduction programs and support locations’ greenhouse gas reduction efforts. Additional updates streamline the policy, clarify which State electric vehicle regulations apply to UC, and add a requirement that each location administer an annual commuter survey.*
- *Sustainability at UC Health – This section was removed and its policy elements embedded within related topical policy sections. Additionally, the terms for campuses and health locations were standardized throughout the policy to clarify which provisions apply to campuses, health locations, and/or all UC entities.*

Although these revisions touch all sections of the current policy, they do not alter existing requirements. CPB members would like to know:

- *With respect to the provisions related to green buildings, what spurred this on? Is there a history of buildings not complying with functional requirements related to the actual performance of the building?*
- *Could environmental standards that are already set be met; and yet, performance goals not be met? Is it worth the additional money?*
- *The UC has its own inspectors that are supposed to ensure that contractors are doing things as specified; so why would this be necessary? It seems like an unnecessary expense.*

DISCUSS “UCPB REPORT ON DIVISIONAL-CPB BEST PRACTICES”

CPB discussed the “UCPB Report on Divisional-CPB Best Practices,” dated November 13, 2023. The document is nearly two years old; and this is the first time current CPB members heard/learned about it.

UCPB’s report offered best practice guidance to Senate divisions for increasing the involvement of their committees on planning and budget (CPBs) or equivalent in budget-related decisions and strategic planning. The recommendations in the report were designed to empower divisional planning and budget committees to play a more impactful role in shaping budget principles and guiding financial decisions for their respective campuses.

By implementing these suggestions, Senate divisions could bolster the effectiveness of their CPBs, ensuring that they contribute significantly to the financial sustainability and academic excellence of the campus. Doing so would also ensure that campus financial resources are allocated prudently in alignment with academic and research priorities. Moreover, embracing greater transparency and shared governance in budget decision-making would foster trust and help maintain a positive and collaborative campus environment.

The report states explicitly:

While each campus has contributed important practices to these recommendations, UC Davis is currently the role model for the overall most involved and effective divisional CPB and thus has contributed heavily to these points.

With this in mind, CPB reiterated its desire to schedule a meeting with the UC Davis CPB Chair or representative in the near-term.

CPB members also felt that it would be more efficient and save a considerable amount of time and effort to opt out of reviewing campus/systemwide review items that focus on issues not relevant to the remit/purview of CPB.

As it relates to Goal #2 in the report (“Oversight of Operating Budgets and Resource Allocation for Individual Units”), CPB this year would like to request that each School and College provide top-level budget information related to unit revenues, expenses, and strategic goals.

As it relates to Goal #3 (“Participation in Long-Term Strategic Planning for the Campus”) and Goal #4 (“Regular Consultation between CPB and the Campus Leadership”): in the near-term, CPB would like to meet with the Interim VCPBA, Provost and Chancellor to discuss UCR’s long-term strategic planning, to include discussions of graduate student funding/support and undergraduate enrollment growth. CPB’s meeting with the Interim VCPBA is already set for October 28.

BEGIN PREPARING QUESTIONS FOR OCTOBER 28 MEETING WITH INTERIM VCPBA

Thus far, CPB intends to ask the following questions:

- *After the Faculty Feedback Forum last year, the VCPBA’s Office committed to additional transparency. This included the idea from VCPBA’s team to have a regular communication or newsletter about budget topics. The AY24-25 CPB provided ideas for initial topics, based on faculty feedback. Where is this communication piece in the process?*
- *How is the VCPBA’s Office approaching the cost of graduate education? What are the feedback mechanisms currently in place to invite faculty feedback into any proposed changes?*
- *How is the VCPBA’s Office approaching the cost of undergraduate education, particularly as it relates to providing adequate and trained TAs in an instructional capacity to support undergraduate learning?*

- *Does the VCPBA believe that using AI to replace and/or change the duties of TAs, instructors, and/or advisors is a likely and/or appropriate outcome for undergraduate education for financial reasons?*
- *What impact(s) does the VCPBA anticipate from ongoing pressure from the federal government, and from the state government? What is the VCPBA's take on the document shared by Ahmet Palazoglu on behalf of the Academic Council regarding academic freedom (["STATEMENT FROM THE UC ACADEMIC COUNCIL REGARDING ANY POTENTIAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT"](#)), as potentially tied to federal pressures?*
- *Regarding the "UCPB Best Practices for Divisional CPBs" document: what does the VCPBA envision the connection to be moving forward between UCR's CPB and VCPBA's Office? How does this relate to optimal information dissemination/sharing and transparency?*

CPB will continue drafting questions in advance of the committee's meeting with the VCPBA on October 28.

The meeting was called to a close at 12:45pm.