

RECEIVED

APR 29 1976

Office
of the Provost

April 29, 1976

TO: Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Jacqueline R. Scherer, Chairperson *Jacqueline Scherer*
Academic Budget and Planning Committee

RE: 1975-1976 Report of the Academic Budget and
Planning Committee

Before reviewing the activity of the Academic Budget and Planning Committee for 1975-1976, I would like to discuss the future of this group. Throughout the year we have tried conscientiously to both clarify our charge and adopt viable procedures for budgetary evaluations. Every member of the committee has been interested in exploring, as fully as possible, the role of the committee in Senate governance within the university. However, we have had some difficulties both with planning and budgets. The Senate resolution on the configuration of the university (which we proposed) has, at least for the near future, assumed all long-range planning responsibilities. We supported the adoption of this special planning committee strongly because we believe the process of planning requires the maximum number of influential representatives in the institution working together and devoting considerable time and energy to this effort. We recognized that our committee could not meet these criteria. In terms of budgetary considerations, we simply were unable to develop the necessary expertise required to make sound judgements in this area. Committee members involved in budgetary matters must be continually working with the numbers to develop this expertise, if their contribution in decision making is to be responsible and significant.

In sum, although we believe most strongly that this committee has a useful function to perform in university governance through the Senate, we have found the present arrangements difficult. Therefore, we recommend that the Steering Committee do the following for a two-year period:

1. Appoint the Academic Budget and Planning Committee as a sub-committee of the Academic Policy Committee. As a sub-committee the group will be specifically charged with the responsibility to investigate financial implications of any new policies and programs.
2. Select four members of the Academic Budget and Planning Committee (or temporary sub-committee) to serve as an advisory group to the Provost on budgetary matters. The Provost has suggested that such a group might be of value to him. The arrangement would also permit some members of the sub-committee to gain sufficient expertise on budgets to make sound recommendations about the future role of the Senate Academic Budget and Planning Committee, in terms of budgets, particularly determining what is feasible and what is not.

3. At the end of the two years, to re-evaluate the committee's organization in light of recommendations from the Advisory Budget Committee, the Provost, and the University Planning Committee. At that time the Steering Committee could return the Academic Budget and Planning Committee to its past status, continue the group as a sub-committee of A.P.C., or the Steering Committee could make new arrangements.

Briefly, the other activities which the committee worked on during the year are as follows: We tried to clarify our charge by reviewing past practices and talking with the Steering Committee; we worked closely with A.P.C., we participated actively in the Position-Shift Layoff Report for the Senate; we developed guidelines for budgetary considerations of new programs; we attempted to make suggestions for alternatives to other budget cuts as requested by the Provost, but were not successful in this task; we reviewed past planning practices by discussions with several key parties on campus: the Provost, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Liebow as past chairman of the committee, and several others; and we developed an on-going system of record-keeping so that the next committee will have some way of reviewing in detail our deliberations. We postponed consideration of the Physical Therapy Program proposal until September.

JRS:mh