COMMITTEE ON PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

PRESENT:
David Oglesby, Earth & Planetary Sciences, CPB Chair
Bahman Anvari, Bioengineering
Meng Chen, Botany & Plant Sciences
Richard Debus, Biochemistry
Steven Helfand, Economics
Matthew King, Religious Studies
Scott Pegan, Biomedical Sciences
Liz Przybylski, Music
Jade Sasser, Gender & Sexuality Studies

ABSENT:
Vyjayanthi Chari, Mathematics, CPB Vice Chair
Anthony Grubesic, School of Public Policy
Hyun Hong, Area of Accounting
Cong Liu, Electrical & Computer Engineering

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

Chair Oglesby welcomed everyone, and CPB members introduced themselves.

PLANNING & BUDGET ORIENTATION / PRESENTATION BY CPB CHAIR
Chair Oglesby provided CPB members with an orientation/presentation on: CPB's charge and formal role in campus matters of planning, budget, and resource allocations; the review and approval process for campus review items and systemwide review items; the [University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB)](#); and the UCR [Campus Finance Committee (CFC)](#).

Chair Oglesby indicated the following are possible issues that CPB might want to examine this school year:

- *Research and discuss possible greater role in budget process—more transparency and consultation*

- *Financial pressures hitting the university*
  - *State support*
  - *Grad student expenses*
  - *Pressures from federal government, including linking funding to other concerns*
  - *Lots of concern among faculty about these issues*

MEETING MODALITY FOR SCHOOL YEAR

CPB members decided that the committee will meet primarily via Zoom for AY25/26. CPB may at times hold in-person meetings when the committee deems it appropriate; and/or when administrators/other invited guests request such.

INVITED GUESTS FOR SCHOOL YEAR
CPB discussed inviting the following guests to meetings this school year:

- *Chancellor—to ascertain the vision for the campus.*

- *Provost—to discuss CPB's role in relation to new administrative hires on campus and how these hires interpret CPB's role; to articulate that CPB desires input in hiring the VCPBA (i.e., a CPB member serves on the search committee; or there is a stop at a CPB meeting on the interview tour for potential VCPBA candidates).*

- *Interim VCPBA—to follow up on action items discussed at the May 19 "Faculty Feedback Forum on Budget Challenges" hosted by CPB (action items, e.g., creating a comprehensive budget information link on the PBA website; and PBA developing more regular and proactive budget communications to faculty).*

- *Academic Senate Chair—to assess the Senate's consensus on planning and budget-related issues.*

- *Graduate Council Chair—to be more proactive in discussing graduate funding issues and potentially coordinating stances/actions between CPB and the Graduate Council.*

- *UC Davis CPB Chair or CPB Representative—to learn more about how the UC Davis budget consultation process works.*

- *AVC Facilities & Services—to discuss shortages of lab/classroom spaces.*

CPB members will look into who develops the UCR Strategic Plan and inquire how CPB can be involved in the process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST (COI) STATEMENT
CPB members voted unanimously to adopt the following COI Statement for AY25/26:

> *Potential conflicts of interest may occur as members of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) formulate recommendations of concern to the campus. Accordingly, CPB members will be available to offer the committee information and to participate in discussions but will inform the committee as soon as possible and excuse themselves from the vote on matters specifically pertaining to departments and programs of which they are members, from which they might materially benefit or for which they might have any other conflict of interest.*

[SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM] INTERIM REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE TASK FORCE ON UC ADAPTATION TO DISRUPTIONS

The Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) was established by the Academic Council in April 2025 in response to growing concerns about the University's ability to sustain its teaching, research, and public service mission areas amid political volatility and external disruptions.

The Interim Report of the Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions presents UCAD's initial recommendations in four key areas:

> *1. Research Funding Assistance*
> *2. Academic Personnel Evaluations During Disruptions*
> *3. Program Resizing and Restructuring*
> *4. Need for Flexibility in Course Offerings and Modalities*

CPB reviewed/discussed the interim report and had the following comments/questions:

- *CPB is fully aware of the gravity of the financial situation that the UC system faces as a result of declining public support, disruption of federal research funding, a significant increase in the cost of graduate student employees, and impending demographic changes. Significant changes will likely be necessary, and these should be developed deliberatively and in consultation with faculty.*

- *The interim report articulates "Budgetary constraints should not drive the academic mission." This should be affirmed, but this does not resonate throughout the document.*

- *The interim report does not document the exceptionalism of the UC System in its mission and outcomes.*

- *How is the Academic Senate being consulted regularly to participate transparently before an economic strategy reshapes the priorities?*

- *This interim report does suggest that cutting undergraduate major programs, shutting down graduate cohorts and/or moving some to only some UC campuses, and decreasing research-focused faculty are strategies that should be used. These are possibilities but should not yet be presumed as best practice.*

- *A demographic cliff is a reasonable expectation; at what point does the strategy to count major enrollees and/or rely on enrollment for budgetary means fail as reasonable strategies?*

- *What would be the metrics be to determine a "disrupted research program"?*

- *Pursuing donor funds is always an excellent idea. It may be easier to find funding for "ramp up" activities than "ramp down" activities.*

- *Extending review periods for affected faculty sounds promising, but it assumes that either the impediments are temporary, or that the faculty will be able to transition to a new, better-supported research area.*

- *It is not clear how recruiting more teaching professors and joint faculty will improve the situation for the research mission of the UC. It seems more like a recipe for downgrading the research enterprise.*

- *Would the discontinuation of programs be based only on quality, or potentially on financial or other measures of viability? In other words, will reviewers recommend discontinuation of hiqh quality, excellent outcome programs that are underfunded and too small to be viable without additional support?*

[SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM] PROPOSED REVISIONS TO APM-015/016
In accordance with the directive from the Regents to ensure more timely adjudication of allegations of misconduct by faculty members and academic appointees, the following key revisions are proposed to APM policies following 90-day review and review and approval by the Board of Regents,

Proposed revisions to APM - 015 and APM - 016 incorporate the following timelines, unless extended for good cause:

- *The initial assessment of allegations of misconduct will be completed within 30 business days following the receipt of a report—similar to Sexual Violence/Sexual Harassment (SVSH) cases.*

- *The investigation and investigation report will be completed within 120 business days following the initial assessment (similar to Abusive Conduct cases).*

- *The Chancellor will file disciplinary charges within 40 business days following the conclusion of the investigation (similar to SVSH cases).*

- *Campus P&T committees should appoint a hearing panel no more than 14 calendar days after the Chancellor files charges.*

CPB reviewed the proposed revisions and had the following comments and questions:

- *"Campus P&T committees should appoint a hearing panel no more than 14 calendar days after the Chancellor files charges."*

  - *Please provide the current average and median number of days that it takes to put together the hearing panel.*

  - *Please also articulate what additional staff and/or faculty resources will be made available to speed up this process.*

  - *This information should be reviewed before the calendar day number is set, to make sure it is a feasible timeframe for UCR, and it should be adjusted as appropriate before this is finalized.*

- *"In order to facilitate the efficient and timely handling of disciplinary matters, it is*

recommended that procedures be developed that allow the Systemwide Network Committee on Privilege and Tenure and each Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure to sit in hearing panels smaller than the full committee."

- *What is the number of members required for a subcommittee in such a case?*

- *How is this number determined?*

- *Precisions should be made before this language is adopted, if it is.*

- *"The Chancellor will file disciplinary charges within 40 business days following the conclusion of the investigation (similar to SVSH cases)." This statement should have some sort of qualifier such as "any appropriate charges" to indicate that not all investigations may result in charges.*

[SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM] INTERIM POLICY: PRESIDENTIAL INTERIM POLICY FOR UC'S USE OF ONLINE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COMPANIES
CPB reviewed the interim policy that establishes guidelines for the University of California's partnerships with Online Program Management (OPM) companies to uphold academic integrity, transparency, and compliance with federal and accreditation standards. Of special note is the adoption of supplemental guidance of OPM policy on bundled services drafted by UC Legal.

CPB had the following comments and questions:

- *Why do course evaluations for OPM-supported courses not use the same (recently revised) course evaluations that all other UCR courses use?*

- *When for-profit OPMs hire faculty, the interim policy requires that they are accompanied by "information stating that they have been reviewed and approved by the division/school offering the program."*

  - *What is the mechanism by which outside contract faculty are reviewed to be able to become approved or not approved?*

  - *Students need to be reassured that when they are getting a UCR degree, that UCR has a significant investment in that program.*

- *Are we looking at a potential future in which outside profit-making management is in competition with UC staff (unionized and local) and faculty? It is not clear what the financial and personnel implications of such a move would be.*

The meeting was called to a close at 12:55pm.