

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of February 2, 2006**

**Present:** Chair Paul Koch, Onuttom Narayan, Ray Gibbs, Quentin Williams, Ravi Rajan, Don Rothman, David Evan Jones, Emily Honig, Faye Crosby, Marina Sarran, Saurabh Mishra, Mary-Beth Harhen

**Absent:** (with notice) Wentai Liu

**Guests:** CPEVC Dave Kliger, Assistant Provost Charlotte Moreno, VPDUE Bill Ladusaw, VC Meredith Michaels, and CEP member John Tamkun

**Member's Items**

A petition from faculty is coming to senate committees requesting information about Senate consultation on the issue of FTE targets for the divisions in the ongoing academic planning process.

**VPAA Job Description**

Many questions were raised during the initial review of the VPAA job description. The description lists many duties that are one-time tasks undifferentiated from on-going duties. There is a lack of clarity about authority and involvement in the academic personnel process. It appears that the position will be the primary liaison to the Senate on issues of academic planning, but it is not given authority over resultant resource allocations. This may be a delegation of the EVC's longstanding interaction with the Senate, and especially CPB, to the VPAA. No organization chart showing how the position fits into the administrative structure was provided. A letter with specific recommendations and concerns will be sent to Senate Chair Faye Crosby who will respond to the administration on behalf of the Senate committees.

**EIR/LRDP Response**

CPB agreed to draft a resolution on the committee's concerns about housing and traffic in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A draft of the resolution will be discussed at the next CPB meeting.

**Consultation with CPEVC Kliger**

CPB listed six questions that might assist the CPEVC in replying to the expected faculty petition about the academic planning process and the projected sizes of divisions.

1. What are proposed targets, how do they differ from those offered in 2002 by CPEVC Simpson?
2. What criteria are being used to generate the proposed distribution of faculty?
3. If ability to raise external funds was a consideration in establishing the FTE spread, give the ratio of input to output by division, including infrastructural costs.
4. How were trends in undergraduate and graduate enrollments assessed as well as the impact on faculty workload.

5. What alternative scenarios were considered and rejected?
6. How will the plans account for efforts other than through divisional structure? What is the mechanism to bring divisions together?

CPEVC Kliger stated that we must look at the academic plans, evaluate what we want to do as a campus and then decide how to spend our resources. He did not receive uniform responses from the divisions to his call for revised plans. Many are not explicit in their relation to campus goals. This makes reviewing them somewhat difficult. The plans need critique and revision and must be better integrated. CPEVC Kliger and Interim VPAA Alison Galloway are having conversations with the Deans about how the divisions can work together in meeting campus goals.

VC Meredith Michaels provided data regarding contracts and grants in the Physical and Biological Sciences and the School of Engineering. A question was raised about the costs of research, in terms of capital costs and costs for infrastructure and support. It was noted that capital costs are typically supported by state funds, but that funds sources to pay for infrastructure and research support come in part from general funds and are difficult to parse among research, academic support, student affairs, etc. While overhead on research grants is partially allocated to the general fund, it is hard to determine how “profitable” grant generating entities really are. CPEVC Kliger also reiterated that he intends to use opportunity funds generated by research grants in PB Sci. and Engineering to support research in the Arts and Humanities. This is only possible, however, if the campus accepts that slightly more faculty are needed in the divisions that generate substantial research support.

CPB discussed the VPAA job description briefly with the EVC. He stated that this position is not different from the other VPs, in that they are there to help him move his academic agenda forward. The committee noted that this position, unlike the other VPs, has no budgetary purview. He stated that he does not intend to give budgetary authority for implementing plans to the VPAA but relies on that position for information. He indicated that he might consider formulas that offer this position some funding to stimulate campus academic planning.

#### **Consultation with VPDUE Bill Ladusaw**

CPB invited CEP member John Tamkun to participate in the consultation. VPDUE Bill Ladusaw stated that UCSC has lower undergraduate retention rates than comparable UC campuses, but does better in comparison to similar schools nationally. It is important to improve this rate because for every one student the campus retains, there are five students we don't have to recruit. It is in the interest of the campus to spend funds to retain students in the first two years, where the drain occurs. A study was done on the 1997 freshman cohort data, recognizing the campus has changed since 2001. Since 2001, all students have GPAs and the campus is now selective. A complete six- year graduate study cannot yet be done on the 2001 cohort.

VPDUE Ladusaw reviewed information on attrition and retention in years one and two. UCSC graduation rates are relatively equal in terms of fairness (i.e., with respect to

ethnicity, gender, student preparation, etc.). However, we disproportionately fail to retain students who have high SAT scores. In trying to get retention rates up we must be careful not to do so at the expense of the positive aspects of current retention practices. Students are retained due to a complex weighting of personal factors and interactions with the institution. UCSC has retention rates and student attitudes to the campus typical of a “safety” school. Students using UCSC as a safety school arrive with a low commitment to the institution but a high commitment to getting a degree.

The committee discussed the following issues. As we have grown larger, contact between students and ladder faculty (who provide research opportunities) in the first two years has decreased. We have not developed an honors program, which aides in recruiting high scoring students. The committee debated if this would improve retention, or if the spending priority should go to support for all first and second year students. In response to a CPB question, the VPDUE noted that on other campuses, funding for Honors programs comes from academic divisions and budgets, not Student Affairs.

The VPDUE stated that an appropriate goal would be to bring the UCSC graduation rate up from 65% to 72%, which is the mean for the UC system. This is similar to what UCSB accomplished when they addressed this issue several years ago. It means changing the outcome for just 150 students.