

MEMORANDUM

April 29, 1985

TO: Keith R. Kleckner, Senior Vice President for University
Affairs and Provost
Chair, Senate Steering Committee

FROM: J. Curtis Chipman, ~~Chair~~
Academic Policy and Planning Committee

SUBJECT: Academic Policy and Planning Committee
1984-85 Academic Year Report

During the current academic year the majority of the Committee's efforts were directed toward the development of procedures for carrying out its responsibilities as newly defined in the revised charge approved by the Senate in the Spring of 1984.

In addition, two new programs were reviewed - Perfusion Technology, an undergraduate program in the Center for the Health Sciences, and Education Specialist in Administration, a graduate program in the School for Human and Educational Services. There were no policies discussed which apply to both undergraduate and graduate students, but the issue of final examination period scheduling was accepted as an agenda item for next year.

For the remainder of this report, I would like to concentrate on the two charge items that commanded most of our attention. For them we have developed operating strategies that we will try to implement next year in order to assess their effectiveness in practice.

The two charge items referred to are:

6. To receive from the Provost reports on the allocation of resources to the various academic programs and to advise the Provost on the priorities for such allocations; and
7. To advise the Senate and its committees (UCUI, Graduate Council, and the General Education Committee) on the University-wide academic and budgetary implications of proposed new academic programs or the discontinuance or major reorganization of existing academic programs as may be proposed.

Keith R. Kleckner
April 29, 1985
Page 2

For both of these items, the related financial questions are the most difficult. Most of the Committee's work was borne by a subcommittee chaired by Ray Harris with members David Beardslee, David Doane and Robert McClory. The current status of these issues is summarized as follows:

Academic and Budgetary Impact of New, Substantially Revised, or Discontinued Programs:

The Academic Policy and Planning Committee assumes its primary focus in these matters to be at the University level. By the time such a proposal reaches the Committee the sponsoring School or unit will have assessed its effects internally and probably found them either beneficial or necessary. The appropriate Senate committee, will be considering the academic validity of the proposal itself. It is then the Academic Policy and Planning Committee's responsibility to make a candid assessment of the proposal's likely effect upon the University as a whole. In doing so, the Committee is concerned with issues such as consistency with the University's Role and Mission Statement, academic impact upon faculty and students of other programs, and the resource demands that will be generated both directly by the sponsoring unit, and by other academic and support units as well.

The discussion of these issues has resulted in the revision of the budgetary forms which the Committee has requested proposers to submit in the past. The academic deans and directors will be asked to review them this Summer since their offices would be most involved in their preparation. With suitable revisions, the Committee will begin using them for a trial period in the Fall.

Provost Reports and Priorities:

Here a major question has been what kind of budgetary information should be provided to the Committee. As a general operating principle, it has been determined that the Committee should be cognizant of all of the public information concerning the University's budget.

While most of this responsibility would be assumed by a subcommittee, all Committee members would review summary sheets detailing current and historical divisional budget distributions at Oakland and other institutions in the state, current distribution of monies amongst units in Academic Affairs with the current year's incremental changes indicated, next year's budget as submitted to the State, and an inventory of all current program revision requests and requests for capital outlay.

Keith R. Kleckner
April 29, 1985
Page 3

This information is available in the Fall when the final distributions have been completed in Academic Affairs and an approved budget for next year has been submitted to the State. The Committee would gather these materials with assistance from the Budget Office and the Provost's Office. At least two Fall meetings would be spent reviewing these, initiated by a presentation on the salient issues by the budget subcommittee.

As the year progresses the transition from the budget requested from the State proceeds towards the budget granted by the State. Two meetings in February and March of the Committee would be devoted to the Provost's presentation of all the changes present in the current year's budget and major issues under consideration for the next year's budget currently under construction. This presentation would include descriptions of how and why new monies were allocated as well as how and why existing monies had been reallocated. Whenever possible, actions that had been considered, but not implemented, would be discussed. Progress on long range budgetary goals would be described and single year actions detailed. Most of this could be covered in an initial meeting, with the second meeting devoted to follow up and feedback.

The first priority for the Committee's relationship with the Provost would be to provide an occasion for the Provost to discuss resource allocations with a broadly based University group whose direct responsibilities do not involve the actual administration of these budgetary decisions. It is not considered feasible, at this time, for the Committee to attempt to develop such priorities on its own initiative. However, the Committee would be prepared to develop advisory recommendations on these or any related issues at the Provost's request.

This completes my summary of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee's current position. I believe that the net contribution of this Committee to the University governance system will largely rest upon how constructive the final procedures are viewed to be in the overall planning and budget process. Consequently, I would appreciate any comments that you or any other member of the University Senate might have on how the Committee has decided to deal with these issues so far and on what concerns should be recognized as we attempt to put these initial plans into effect.

Thank you.

/kk