

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of April 20, 2006**

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

**Absent:** (with notice) Marina Sarran,

**Guests:** CPEVC Dave Klinger, Assistant Provost Charlotte Moreno, Interim VPAA Alison Galloway and VC Meredith Michaels

**Member's Items**

Chair Koch reported on the recruitment and retention meeting he had with the deans. A consensus was reached that housing assistance was the top priority, and several options were considered, including a Supplemental Home Loan Equity Program (SHLEP), a shared equity program, and the possibility of buying down infrastructure costs on projects. The first two strategies recycle funds, which is a strong factor in their favor. Neither the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) nor the deans advocated for use of the funds towards childcare.

CPB member Onuttom Narayan reported on the Advisory Committee on Facilities (ACF) meeting that discussed Master Capital Improvement Program (MCIP) options. CPB needs to think about how planning and growth will proceed at UCSC as state funds to deal with construction costs become more and more inadequate.

**Dual Degree Disestablishment**

The committee would like to see the final copy of the request from the School of Engineering and must know the number of students affected by this program. This program was intended to complement the deliberate decision by UCSC not to have the full suite of engineering curriculum. CPB noted that there is no response from UC Berkeley and there is also no financial analysis provided or an analysis of the impact on students. CPB recommends maintaining the program and keeping it in the catalog until a full analysis is presented to the Senate.

**CEP Draft Report on Retention**

The report shows that we do disproportionately well at retaining and graduating students who are under prepared, and disproportionately poorly with students who seem well prepared. It is not clear that these two observations are related causally. The report does not make recommendations about how to meet goals for retention. There is a hypothesis that connection to the university will improve retention, and emphasizes connecting through the curriculum and the major. There is no strong evidence that connecting students to a major earlier and more tightly helps retention. Also, there was little recognition that extracurricular and college activities play a part in connecting to the

university. CEP chose to examine only those issues of curriculum, etc. that are under their purview.

The report lacks concrete information on majors or areas that fail to retain students, or if students are dropping out of college or merely transferring. Consequently, it does not give clear evidence about where the problem with retention is located. There are no recommendations on how to target specific groups. The report does note that we do not collect data that would allow us to determine if bottlenecks at the departmental level affects retention. CPB noted that the report done by VPDUE Ladusaw, which have much of the data upon which the CEP report is based, should be included as an appendix to this report. The committee did not support the proposed resolution, which was too amorphous, and noted that Student Affairs would need to be tasked to examine the student life side of the question more thoroughly.

### **TIM Program**

CPB noted that funds for the Technology and Information Management (TIM) program are being used by the School of Engineering (SOE) for general purposes. CPB will recommend that the SOE repay the funds. CPB discussed with EVC Kliger several options and concerns regarding TIM. A letter from CPB responding to the questions raised by the EVC during this consultation will be forthcoming.

### **Consultation with EVC Kliger and VPAA Galloway**

The Arts divisional plan was discussed and CPB noted that the request is reasonable, even small, but that support of the proposal would make a great difference for the division. If you look at the campus goals from five years ago, the division has accomplished the following: increased graduate programs, maintained/increased student retention, launched interdisciplinary programs, and increased diversity. The division needs to maintain undergraduate strength in order to support graduate students. As the division moves out of this period of strong growth in graduate programs, it will need visionary leadership to help break stalemates over directions within and between departments. CPB will write up recommendations to be sent to EVC Kliger. The Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) divisional plan was also discussed. There was a very long discussion about Material Sciences. CPB will write up recommendations to be sent to EVC Kliger.

### **Pre-consultation Chancellor Denton**

CPB identified several issues and will send questions to Chancellor Denton for her April 27, 2006 consultation with the committee.

### **ITS mid year Report**

Due to lack of time this agenda item was deferred to a future meeting.

### **CPE Report**

There was an initial discussion of the Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) proposal to increase curricular support for students under-prepared for university-level

writing. A draft response will be circulated via email and the response will be finalized at the next meeting.