

**SENATE PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT
1995-1996 ACADEMIC YEAR**

I. Committee Members

Kevin Andrews, Angela Dodson, Robert Eberwein, Ravi Parameswaran, Michelle Piskulich, Joel Russell (Chair), Laura Schartman, Maura Selahowski, David Shantz

II. Principal Accomplishments and Concerns

A. New Programs Reviewed

1. Ph.D. in Applied Mathematical Sciences - recommended for approval
2. M.A. in Biology - No action needed by SPRC since M.A. is being used merely as a means to distinguish a non-thesis option for current master's program.
3. M.T.D. (Master's in Training and Development) - Concerns with respect to impact on HRD undergraduate program, SHES staffing, implementation as an incentive program, and collaboration with other units discussed with faculty proponents.

B. SPRC Procedures for Requesting Programmatic Support

Discussions with SBRC to establish a single set of guidelines for units to use in submitting proposals for new programs and increased programmatic support resulted in the creation of two guidelines. SPRC will use the revised SBRC "Guidelines and Procedures for Instituting a New Degree Program" when reviewing proposals to establish new degree programs. However, SPRC members felt that to fulfill their charges the two Senate review committees should also monitor all requests for new or significantly enhanced levels of programmatic support. The guidelines to be used for such reviews, "Procedures for Requesting Programmatic Support", are attached. Note that the SBRC still needs to develop a simplified budget form for use in requests for programmatic support that don't involve new degree programs.

C. Recommendations for Academic and Administrative Policies and Actions

1. Strategic Plan Implementation

SPRC members believe the proper role for the committee in fulfilling its charge to monitor the implementation of the Strategic Plan is to review and comment on plans proposed by the administration and assessment reports on implementation actions. The committee needs much more specific information on how deans and other administrators proposed to implement tactics of the plan than the list of assignments provided by the VPAA. The committee recommends that each dean (and others assigned responsibilities for implementation of the Strategic Plan) provide an annual audit and assessment of actions undertaken during the previous academic year and a description of proposed actions for the following academic year. Proposed actions requiring new resources should be accompanied by a document conforming to the "Procedures for Requesting Programmatic Support". An overview report by the VPAA on both the prior year audit and the future year proposals showing how

individual actions are prioritized to fit available resources would provide a basis for the committee to provide more informed advise to the VPAA and Senate.

2. Discretionary Funds

The committee has concerns about the sources and allocations of these funds. The method used in 1994-95 to generate these funds (equal taxation of prior year equipment, supplies and services, and travel funds) ignores differential instructional costs. The other principle source of discretionary funds, incentive program profits, is of less concern since this source does represent "new" money and not removal of "old" funds which have in most cases been inadequate for many years. The 1994-95 allocation formula was based only on credits delivered and numbers of majors which again ignores differential instructional costs. Over time these source and allocation methods would result in only large-enrollment low-cost programs having adequate resources.

3. Strategic Lobbying

The committee strongly endorses this activity and applauds the efforts to coordinate student lobbying with the university's strategic lobbying plan. The current emphasis on percent faculty with Ph.D.'s, student-centered institution, and uses of information technology does little to show Oakland's strengths relative to other state universities. These data should be augmented with data concerning faculty productivity with respect to scholarship and external funding as well as scholarly and service activities that support state goals.

III. Suggestions for Activities for 1996-1997

A. Relationship with SBRC, Graduate Council, UCUI

Since there are no longer representatives from the Graduate Council and UCUI on SPRC, it would be desirable to hold one joint meeting per semester with these other committees as is currently done with SBRC. Joint SPRC-SBRC meetings with the VPAA would be more productive if agendas and handouts could be distributed to committee members in time for review prior to the meetings.

B. Review of Minority Equity Office and Relocation of Honors College

To fulfill its charge to report to the Senate regarding the outcome of organizational changes these two reviews should be completed in 1996-97. It was felt that a review during 1995-96 would have been premature to fairly assess the impact of these organizational changes.

C. Review and Approval of SBRC Budget Form for Procedures for Requesting Programmatic Support

Respectfully submitted,

Joel W. Russell, Chair

APPENDIX A - Procedures for Requesting Programmatic Support