

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of April 13, 2006

- Present:** Chair Paul Koch, Faye Crosby, Onuttom Narayan, Quentin Williams, Ravi Rajan, Don Rothman, Marina Sarran, Mary-Beth Harhen
- Absent:** (with notice) David Evan Jones, Ray Gibbs, Emily Honig, Saurabh Mishra
- Guests:** CPEVC Dave Klinger, Assistant Provost Charlotte Moreno, and Interim VPAA Alison Galloway

Member's Items

There was a brief discussion about the fact that the Environmental Impact Report for Terrace Point was pulled before it was considered by the Coastal Commission.

Statistics and Stochastic Modeling Proposal

CPB identified several issues that they will send to the Graduate Council, who will incorporate CPB's recommendations in their response to the department.

Academic Plans

In preparation for discussion with CPEVC Dave Klinger and VPAA Alison Galloway, committee reviewed their draft response for the Arts, Physical and Biological Sciences and Humanities divisional plans. The remaining divisions will be discussed at the next meeting.

Consultation with CPEVC Dave Klinger, Interim Dean Gary Lease and History Chair Lynn Westerkamp

The Department of History has proposed a Target of Excellence (TOE) hire in their department in the area of African Diaspora studies. History Chair Lynn Westerkamp identified several benefits should this candidate come to UCSC. They include dramatically increasing the prestige of the History Department, attracting students and faculty, and building strengths by interconnections between faculty members in a wide variety of disciplines. This candidate would strengthen both the World History and African American history, which is a need in the History Department. The candidate is one of the top historians and is the top scholar in his subfield of African Diaspora. Chair Westerkamp explained that the proposed offer does not include a reduced teaching load, but rather a concentrated distribution within the academic year. Dean Lease stated that if the candidate is hired, it will require major choices in the division and may come at the expense of other departments and programs. EVC Klinger countered that this may not be the case and that the situation will be reviewed very carefully before any programmatic decisions are made. CPB's recommendations regarding the TOE will be sent to EVC Klinger.

Consultation with CPEVC Dave Klinger and Interim VPAA Alison Galloway

Interim VPAA Alison Galloway provided a handout on the elements of a campus strategic academic plan and reviewed it with the committee. CPB will discuss the draft at their next meeting.

Consultation with VC University Relations Donna Murphy and AVC for Development Jennifer Svihus

In response to CPB's question regarding UCSC's organizational structure, which combines the Development Office (OD), public, governmental and alumni relations under University Relations (UR), VCUR Murphy stated that both combined and separate models exist at universities of this size. She stated a preference for the connection between University Relations and the Office of Development because fundraising and public/government relations are both communication processes that must be coordinated. There is a necessity for a strategic communication and alignment of goals between UR and OD. AVC Svihus stated that from the development point of view it is critical to align with alumni and government relations. This aspect seems to work well at UCSC. There must also be a strong connection between the Office of Research and the Office of Development because research and development should work in concert.

Divisional development officers have a 51% appointment in development and a 49% appointment in the division. The issue of how to manage conflicting priorities between the center and the division remains. The currently very decentralized organization makes it difficult to respond to central priorities. AVC Svihus meets quarterly with deans and development officers to review activities and priorities. VCUR Murphy and AVC Svihus are developing new strategies for their units which will be launched in July 2006.

CPB questioned VCUR Murphy about the method for establishing fundraising priorities. She noted that campus wide priorities should be identified through academic planning and the budget process. Strategic plans for fundraising should arise from these priorities. It is important that the EVC work with the deans to identify campus priorities. UR needs to understand how individual projects tie in with the over all vision of campus in order to communicate this to donors. They are trying to tie donors into the university, not just to a division, college or specific project. UCSC currently lacks development officers that work on overall campus priorities and cross cutting, cross regional opportunities. All officers are tied to divisions or specific programs. VCUR Murphy will send a report from the USC campaign that articulates how they identified their compelling areas of interest. She will also be setting up other councils to help develop the messages and identify the areas for fundraising. We must reach beyond our alumni base and reach out to the corporate base. VCUR Murphy suggested that each division could select a handful of community and industry leaders to test their strategic vision of the school.

VCUR Murphy expressed a philosophy of inclusion and transparency for UR. Many relationships must be built. Although it is the deans and the faculty who often contact donors, it is the task of UR to facilitate these communications. There will be planning for a capital campaign, and it is likely that consultants will be used to determine goals and target populations.

In discussing the development yield at UCSC, AVC Svihus distributed handouts that showed the costs to raise a dollar. At UC campuses overall, the cost standard is 10-20%. The UC average is 13%. UCSC is slightly above this average but there are some large, established institutions like UCB and UCLA that require less investment to raise funds in this group. Younger institutions need to “ramp up” by investing more funds. Most investments in development efforts take three to five years to pay off. Turnover at the leadership levels of Deans, Chancellors and Development Officers means relationships have to be rebuilt. There is an impact of these changes, but also an opportunity to get new Deans indoctrinated to the expectations that they are also development officers.