To the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly:
The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) respectfully submits its report of activities for the academic year 2007-08:

A. Council Operations
The Council met 12 times this year. Attending regular CPB meetings were ten appointed members, the Divisional Senate Chair Elect-Secretary (ex officio), the Librarians Association of the University of California, Irvine (LAUC-I) representative, the Budget Office Consultant, the Undergraduate student representative, and the Graduate student representative.

The Council appointed several members to serve on various committees during the year:

- **University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB):** Abel Klein
- **Campus Physical and Environmental Committee (CPEC):** Abel Klein
- **Design Review Team:** Peter Krapp
- **Senate Committee on Graduate Student Housing:** Dana Aswad (alternates: Jutta Heckhausen, Michael Fuller)
- **Senate Committee on Diversity:** Alfred Kobsa
- **Small Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee:** Kerry Vandell
- **Space Planning Team:** Peter Krapp

B. Academic Planning Group (APG)
The APG is a joint Administrative/Senate committee chaired by Vice Provost for Academic Planning Michael Clark. Its membership includes all voting members of the CPB, the CPB Library Representative, and the following administrative members: the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, Graduate Dean, Division of Undergraduate Education Dean, Vice Chancellor for Research, Director of the ADVANCE Program, Director of Academic Budget, Director of Institutional Research, and Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget.

The APG did not meet this academic year. The committee’s work is derived primarily from FTE allocations which takes place every two years.

C. Proposals for Departments
1. **Proposal to Establish a Department of Population Health and Disease Prevention**, Endorsed 4/16/08
   The Council voted unanimously to support the proposal after the future Chair of the department, Professor Oladele Ogunseitan, attended a meeting and provided members with a satisfactory response to each of the concerns raised at a previous meeting.

D. Proposals for Degree Programs
1. **M.S. in Nursing Science.** Endorsed 10/3/07
   The Council unanimously endorsed the proposal but had two concerns regarding the proposed space plan for build out, specifically the need for graduate student office space. Furthermore, some members wondered if the pool of highly qualified and "movable" potential applicants for additional faculty positions is adequate to support the growth plans, and if the high cost of housing in Orange County relative to UC salaries will impede recruitment.

2. **B.F.A. in Music Theatre.** Endorsed 1/23/08

**E. Proposals for Programs, Schools, or ORUs**

1. **Proposal to Establish an ORU in Molecular and Mitochondrial Medicine in Genetics (MAMMAG).** Endorsed 2/6/08
   The Council endorsed the proposal; however, concerns were raised that the University has not satisfied agreements made in the original recruitment letter offered to Dr. Wallace. The Council requested that EVC and Provost Gottfredson clarify the points raised in the proposal.

2. **Proposal to Establish an ORU: Air UCI.** Endorsed 6/30/08

**F. Endowed Chairs**

1. **Peltason Endowed Chair.** Endorsed by Senate Chair Bradley and CPB Chair Klein.

2. **Granville and Sidney Kirkup Endowed Chair in Psychiatry and Human Behavior for the Treatment of Stuttering.** Endorsed by Senate Chair Bradley and CPB Chair Klein.

3. **Hasso Brothers Endowed Chair.** Endorsed 6/2/08

**G. Divisional Issues/Policies**

1. **Campuswide Policy on Maternity/Paternity (Parental) Leave for Graduate Students.**
   CPB enthusiastically supports the two proposals from Graduate Council. However, CPB suggests clarification on two items:
   
   1) CPB noted that the amount of time for paid leave differs for Academic Student Employees and Research Doctoral Students (4 weeks versus 6 weeks).
   2) CPB was unclear if the 6 weeks of paid leave for Research Doctoral Students was intended to apply to both parents simultaneously, to only one parent at a time as decided between the two parents, or to birth mothers only.

2. **Disestablishment of Department of Community and Environmental Medicine and the Transfer of the Graduate Program in Environmental Toxicology to the Department of Medicine.**
   The Council unanimously endorsed the proposal to disestablish, but recommended that the Senate leadership review the regulations to ensure that a vote from the entire School Faculty is not required. The proposal indicates that votes were only taken from the Departments of Medicine and Community and Environmental Medicine. The Council recommends that this matter be clarified to ensure that the procedures were adhered to, so that the legality of disestablishing the Department of Community and Environmental Medicine can not later be questioned.
3. **Campus Five-Year Perspectives.**
   The Council concluded that there were no issues of planning and budget raised by the Five-Year Perspectives that, at this time, need to be addressed.

H. **Systemwide Issues/Policies**

1. **BOARS Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy:**
   CPB agrees that the policy is in need of modification. The only aspect of the proposal to receive strong support was point #3, to loosen the a-g course requirements. Several members felt that the holistic approach to review (#4) would entail considerable resources without providing a significant increase on the number of applicants who would ultimately succeed in the UC system.

   CPB feels that any changes to the admissions criteria should meet the following criteria:
   
   a) Highest priority should be given to reducing the number of required a-g courses.
   b) While SAT II may be made optional, other standardized tests should not be given up to allow for a more objective comparison across high schools.
   c) Before carrying out major changes at a system-wide level, they should first be tested on 2-3 campuses over a period of about 5 years, and the resulting changes in the composition of the admissions pool and its academic progress as well as the cost implications thoroughly studied.

   The following alternative approach to solving the applicant problem was outlined by one member as follows:
   
   1. Improve outreach efforts to help high schools effectively relay the UC eligibility requirements to all students and to track their progress. Make the requirements easily accessed to all (students and parents) via the web.
   2. Keep the cost of attending UC as low as possible. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the cost of attending the UC system is a major reason (perhaps THE major reason) why many highly qualified applicants choose alternatives such as the Cal State or community colleges.
   3. Continue to use a numerical academic index (based on a combination of GPA and standardized tests) to qualify 70-80% or so of the applicants. Submit the remaining 20-30% to a comprehensive review.

2. **Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 636:**
   The Council unanimously endorsed the first section of the proposal to eliminate the names of specific tests from the regulation to remove redundancy and to clarify the language. The Council endorsed the second amendment to enforce a 20-student per section cap for Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) classes as a goal, but did not endorse it as a mandate.

3. **Report of the UC Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education:**
   After reviewing the documents relevant to the Report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee and discussing the current state of international education at UCI with CIE Faculty Director Glenn Levine and Administrative Director Marcella Khelif, the Council concluded that it could make a preliminary evaluation of parts of the report.
However, CPB will need to return to the important and complicated issue of international education at UCI to develop a more detailed assessment at a future date.

4. Proposed Regulations Governing Conduct of Non-Affiliates:
In general, the Council is supportive of the proposed regulations, but had the following comments:

1. Members noted the lack of background information in the proposal, specifically what issue prompted the creation of the new regulations.
2. Some members questioned the need for the regulations, especially if pre-existing policies are in place. Furthermore, it is unclear who would enforce the new regulations.
3. The proposal does not include language regarding non-affiliated students who volunteer in labs.
4. Given that CPB does not have the legal expertise to evaluate the proposal, the Council recommends that the Cabinet consult with a representative from the Counsel’s office.

5. CCGA/UCEP/ITTP ‘Dialectic’ Paper on Remote/Online Instruction:
In general CPB felt that this form of instruction was a valuable addition to the existing forms of instruction and that its use on campus should be facilitated. Past experience worldwide shows however that in most cases it will only play an auxiliary role, except when better forms of instruction are not easily available. CPB felt that the current discussion on UC quality, fair access and residency requirements in the context of remote and online delivery of instruction were still too conceptual to have tangible budgetary implications. Representatives from NACS and the UCI Libraries pointed out however that lower residency due to remote instruction may not necessarily imply lower usage of campus resources. In the case of online resources (specifically online course materials and online library materials) usage is even likely to be higher than when students are in residency.

The Council supports the general concept of Policy Option 2, which establishes a separate Transitional Leave Policy from Sabbatical Leave policy, but differs from the current policy (APM 740 and 758).

7. Systemwide Review of the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) Report, “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure”:
CPB welcomes UC-wide efforts that "facilitate collaborative action across the UC campuses and increase the ability to offer high-quality services that advance our teaching, research and public service missions," including specifically technical efforts. CPB, however, considered the specific line of action that is being recommended by this report as anachronistic, unduly centralistic, and nontransparent.

CPB suggests that the unspecified funds that are planned to be devoted to this cyberinfrastructure effort might rather go into a competitive program that funds the development of IT services that can be shown to successfully advance teaching and research across UC campuses. Proposals would need to include faculty and IT units from at least two campuses, and an impartial monitoring process for user adoption would need to be established. Once the feasibility, usefulness and long-term adoption
of a service has been demonstrated in pilot applications with a small number of initial participants, the current infrastructure can be augmented if a wider adoption requires this. Follow-up funds for the enhancement of services that show extensive user adoption would need to be provided. The "cyberinfrastructure" would then be improved based on the demand that this adoption creates, and not be the first and foremost goal.

The Council on Planning and Budget supports the central goal of the Workgroup on Undergraduate Affordability: to keep study at UC within reach of all students eligible to attend.

Two key aspects of the situation are beyond our collective control:
- Income for the middle class and lower middle class has not been keeping pace with the growth of the economy.
- The California voters are unlikely to increase taxes in order to keep fees from going up.

The metric for affordability—the mid-point of the manageable range—seems appropriate and helps to give projections to set out the problem a useful specificity. Among the four categories of actions proposed to maintain accessibility, however, the implications of some seem less than fully worked out and need further elaboration.

9. Revised Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy:
CPB recognizes how this new version was modified to include a much more extensive admission provision both in the local context and statewide.

CPB endorses the proposal, and views it as well-intentioned in broadening the applicant pool in the hope that this leads to a more diverse admit pool. CPB understands how the current construct may not allow some students to succeed who under the proposed new policy would succeed in gaining admission, while the old policy also apparently saw admissions of students whose performance is actually surpassed by that of students whom the current policy excludes.

CPB discussed and endorsed dropping the SAT subject test scores as an admissions requirement, making them optional. CPB discussed and endorsed the Entitled to Review construct based on the simulations, but raised a question in this regard: simulations of Entitled to Review include a column for ETR with guarantee, but does not break it down into previously eligible or ineligible (while breaking ETR without guarantee into two columns: previously eligible, and previously ineligible). CPB requests that this picture be completed.

In its previous discussion of the proposal, CPB had been concerned that a much wider catchment for comprehensive review could create a bigger admissions bureaucracy, with additional cost and potentially reduced transparency. This worry has been addressed by the new version. But CPB requests that the UC track very closely what difference implementing the proposal actually makes in the student body and in the admissions process, and that this be reported to the Senate transparently.
I. Other Issues
   1. CCGA Request for UCOP Report on Differential Fee Programs and Data on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs: The proposal was provided to the council for informational purposes.
   2. Proposal to Change the Name of the Department of Anesthesiology to the Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Care: Endorsed 6/16/08

J. Carry-Forward Items for 2007-08
   1. CPB Vice Chair 2008-09: A Vice Chair for the next academic year was not selected. The Council will follow-up with this issue at its first meeting in the fall.
   2. Proposal to Move Administration of ACE into ICS: Senate Chair Bradley requested additional information. The Council will begin its review of the proposal once all the documents have been received.

K. Guests
CPB invited thirteen guests to discuss various topics at CPB meetings:
   Hoda Anton-Culver, Professor & Chief of Epidemiology
   Wendell Brase, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Business Services
   Michael Clark, Vice Provost for Academic Planning
   James Earthman, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
   Stephen Franklin, Network and Academic Computing Services (NACS)
   James Given, Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Representative
   Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth, Director of Admissions and Relations with Schools
   Herbert Killackey, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
   Marcella Khelif, Administrative Director for the Center for International Education
   Glenn Levine, Faculty Director for the Center for International Education
   Craig Martens, Council on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) Chair
   Stacey Murren, Director for Parking and Transportation
   Dana Roode, Network and Academic Computing Services (NACS)

L. Council on Planning and Budget Membership
   Abel Klein, Chair and UCPB Representative
   Dana Aswad
   Vincent Caiozzo
   Martha Feldman
   Michael Fuller
   Donald Hoffman (term began 11/16/07)
   Alfred Kobsa
   Peter Krapp
   Kenneth Mease
   Kerry Vandell
   Jutta Heckhausen, Divisional Senate Chair Elect-Secretary (ex officio)
   Julia Gelfand, LAUC-I
   Richard Lynch, Budget Office Consultant
   Bryan Sloane, Undergraduate Student Representative
   Frank MacCrory, Graduate Student Representative
   Twyla Forcadela, Council Analyst