COMMITTEE ON PLANNING & BUDGET
MINUTES
OCTOBER 25TH, 2022

PRESENT:
Peter Atkinson, Entomology, Chair
Dana Simmons, History, Vice Chair
Reza Abbaschian, Mechanical Engineering
Bala Balachander, Business
David Lo, School of Medicine
Hiroki Nishimura, Economics
Ayala Rao, Microbiology & Plant Pathology
Frances Sladek, MCSB

ABSENT:
Roger Lake, Electrical & Computer Engineering
Bronwyn Leebaw, Political Science
Yadong Yin, Chemistry

Chair Peter Atkinson called the meeting to order at 11:00 am.

The Committee unanimously approved the October 18th, 2022 minutes as written.

CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS
Chair Atkinson provided an update from the Enrollment Governance meeting – other UC's are concerned with enrollment issues as well, however UCR students are taking less credit hours than students at other UCs. As a result, in academic year 2024 there will be approximately $6 million less coming to UCR. Chair Atkinson gave the committee an update from the last Executive Council meeting – Senate Chair Lee informed the Council of her priorities which are 1) helping to solve the undergraduate FTE deficiency; 2) faculty building – find strategies to make it feel like pre-Covid times again so faculty feel like a sense of belonging to the greater active faculty body; 3) staying ahead of potentially harmful Impact23 issues. Chair Atkinson shared other Senate committee responses to the Strategic Plan and will post them to the committee's Google Drive once they have officially been forwarded to the Provost.

SITE ANALYSIS – UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING & LEARNING FACILITY (UTLF)
P&B reviewed the proposal for an undergraduate teaching and learning facility and agreed with the new building location. The committee also felt that the campus needs more parking so suggested that this building also include an underground parking garage. Committee members also wondered what the plans are for the climate initiative funds and the $85 million being given to UCR for infrastructure expansion. Members of the committee were unsure if they agreed with the proposed generic name of the building and suggested that UCR explore naming options for it.

SENATE FACULTY RETENTION PROCESS

Committee members discussed the proposed Senate faculty retention process and were unclear who the liaison mentioned in the proposal is – is this person from the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel's office, or a colleague of the faculty member who is the focus of the possible preventative retention? The committee agreed the process was good if the retention was just about money; however, our collective experience is that this is not always the case. Faculty often have a desire to leave for other reasons including respect, a sense of community and value, facilities, campus culture, etc. The committee would like to see qualitative consideration made in this proposed process. The committee also agreed that the process *needs to be expedited* (and immediately as the case may be) to develop preemptive retention without going through the entire process. Timing elements are missing from the process – and these should be defined. The committee also wondered if there were any steps that could be removed; for example, does CAP need to be involved if not necessary? Members felt the invitation to apply should be more preliminary and that the process should include a small token (e.g., a closer parking spot) earlier in the process. *A major tool should be any form of quick action that helps to retain the faculty member.*

2ND ROUND – ONLINE MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (OMBA)

P&B discussed the revised proposal for an online MBA program and members were concerned that the contract with Everspring gives their employees UCR email addresses, which is misleading. *UCR email addresses should be reserved for UCR employees only.* Members were appreciative of the additions regarding the Everspring contract and budget and agreed that if all revenue the school is providing Everspring stays transparent, then that is the school's choice. It was unclear to members how much funding is going to scholarship/return-to-aid – in one section of the proposal it says up to 30% and in another section, it says up to 35%. *A set amount should be determined and defined as well as a minimum amount which was not indicated in the proposal.* For this proposal to pass through the relevant systemwide committee (Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and UCP&B) review, a defined amount for return to aid combined with the proposed indirect cost rate (with justification) will be required or the proposal will be returned. The committee recommended that scholarship funds be taken off the top before Everspring can receive revenue. The committee wondered why the service fee to Everspring increases to $150 per unit from $12.50 per credit hour (for online students) if students will be on campus and a justification for this needs to be made. Members were happy to see an assessment paid to campus. The proposal states that the range paid to campus is 10-15% and members asked for a more definite number, with justification of the calculation provided. The committee expected that, if students are on campus using campus resources, then the percentage should be higher and perhaps this is related to the increase in the service fee to Everspring noted above. Members were satisfied with the Dean's quick response in sending faculty an email requesting that they identify any potential conflicts of interest but suggested he follow up again in case any faculty missed his initial and single email. Finally, the committee asked if Everspring will be awarded a proportion of the revenue from students that UCR recruits into the program.

The meeting was called to a close at 12:30 pm.