

Senate Budget Review Committee

Annual Report

2000-2001

This memorandum constitutes the annual report of the Senate Budget Review Committee for the academic year 2000-2001.

The membership of the committee this year included the following people: Gadis (Buck) Dillon, Marc Lipman, Austin Murphy, Pat Nicosia, Mohinder Parkash, Richard Pettengill, Gloria Sosa, Michael Smith (Chair). This report will also serve as the requested one page summary that can be distributed to the full senate in the fall as a means of keeping them apprised of committee activities and concerns.

The committee was very active this year. Our general charge was to review and comment on the budgetary implications of university initiatives, task forces, and new program proposals. We considered the following proposals, task force reports, or new program proposals, and submitted written reports to the provost's office, which then had them posted on the Senate's website. These written reports represent the real work of the committee during the past academic year. Since they have already been published by being posted on the Senate website, I will not append copies of them to this report.

- 1) Enrollment Planning Committee and President Russi's response (October 2000)
- 2) Task Force on International Students and Scholars (Oakland International Imperative) (February 2001) < 3) Task Force on Research and Graduate Study (February 2001)
- 3) Task Force on Research and Graduate Study (February 2001)
- 4) Master of Arts in Liberal Studies Proposal (February 2001)
- 5) Nursing/Health Sciences Task Force (March 2001)
- 6) Proposals for Master of Science in Embedded Systems and Information Systems Engineering from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering (March 2001)
- 7) Proposals for Doctoral Programs in Physical Therapy and a Master of Science in Information Technology Management (MSITM) (March 2001)
- 8) Campus Master Plan (March 2001)

On May 3, 2001, the Senate Budget Review Committee met jointly with the Planning Review Committee to discuss shared concerns. The following themes emerged as especially worth mentioning.

- 1) During the past year there did not seem to be an orderly process or timetable for submitting material for review to the Budget Review Committee and the Planning Review Committee. Both committees were swamped during Winter 2001 with too many proposals to adequately review in the short times requested. We strongly recommend that the administration develop and adhere to a reasonable timetable for departments and other university groups to follow in submitting program proposals, etc, through campus governance, so a similar situation does not occur again.
- 2) Committee members were concerned that our reports may not have been read and/or considered by all members of the Senate. On those occasions when members of either the Budget Review Committee or the Planning Review Committee attended Senate meetings when issues that had come before the senate committees were being discussed, the members who attended did not feel that the committee reports were addressed in Senate deliberations. It would be appropriate that the members of next year's committees have some assurance that their work is of value to the Senate's business.
- 3) Some committee members feel that web-posting of committee reports makes it less likely that the reports will be read by senators. We would like to suggest that the Senate consider once again distributing paper copies of committee reports to all senators on a regular basis.

Submitted by,
Michael B. Smith

July 2, 2001