

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of November 2, 2006

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Emily Honig, David Evan Jones, Tracy Larrabee, Karen Ottemann, Grant Pogson, Ravi Rajan, Faye Crosby, Quentin Williams, Alegra Eroy-Reveles, Gabriela Sandoval, Sarah Curtis, Bryant Mata, Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: (with notice) Ray Gibbs

Guests: EVC Dave Klinger, AVP Charlotte Moreno, Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels, UNEX Dean Cathy Sandeen and Director Jane Meyer

Member's Items

CPB discussed preparing an interim report on planning for the Winter Senate meeting. On general correspondence issues, the Committee agreed that all correspondence will be circulated to members for review and approval before sending out to recipients.

EHAP

The Committee discussed and finalized the letter on the Employee Housing Administrative Plan.

External Reviews/Universal Charges

Community Studies

CPB will request that the following questions be added to those in the universal charge:

1. The Department has a productive and intellectually diverse faculty, who, moreover, come from a striking range of disciplinary backgrounds. To what extent has the Department leveraged this intellectual strength and become more than a sum of its parts? To what extent is it collaborating with other units on the campus whose faculty have research interests that overlap with those of Community Studies?
2. What is the scope for the Community Studies Department to gain access to federal, state, and private funds? Why has the seeming potential to raise research grants for the Social Documentation Masters Program from agencies, such as the NSF or foundations and endowments, , not been realized? If such funding is available, what explains the Department's weak performance in fundraising: s it a case of inadequate attempts to apply, poor response from donor agencies, or lack of adequate support from UCSC's Development Office, or a combination thereof? What are the prospects and potential sources of external funds for the program?
3. Why is the stated priority in the Health Sciences not reflected in the FTE priorities?

Anthropology

CPB will request that the following questions be added to those in the universal charge:

1. Where does the Cultural Anthropology section of the Department see the frontier of the field today, and what, specifically, does the UCSC department define as its niche in that area?
2. How does the Anthropology Department currently conceive of the opportunity represented by our geographical proximity to Silicon Valley? Will the fact that anthropologists are increasingly represented in hires by Silicon Valley companies translate in to a commitment to train undergraduate and graduate students to meet this potential demand?

History of Art & Visual Culture

CPB will request that the following questions be added to those in the universal charge:

1. According to the department's self-study, the closure of Photography Services has increased the workload of HAVC faculty who must now provide their own images for teaching and research. In response to pressure from HAVC faculty, the campus is looking into the possible provision of such services by external vendors. How do faculty in Art History and Visual Culture departments at other universities create photographic images for teaching and research? How do services at UCSC compare? What recommendations do you have for the resolution of the concerns of HAVC faculty in this regard?
2. According to the department's self study, "[T]he research productivity of our faculty over the last six years may be measured in three ways: invitations to speak, external grants and fellowships, and service to the profession through membership on an association's board or an editorial board." There is no reference to publications in this list. Do these measures seem appropriate to the ERC?
3. Please assess the projected impact of the full implementation of the new graduate program on the undergraduate major. Are there steps that can be taken to ameliorate any negative effects the committee identifies?
4. According to the department's self-study, the department has resources to support graduate students for three years of study with no teaching required for the first year. How does the projected level of graduate student support compare to that offered at similar departments at other universities?

Consultation with EVC Dave Klinger and UNEX Dean Cathy Sandeen

According to data requested by CPB and provided by Dean Sandeen, the current financial profile of University Extension (UNEX) shows success in incremental cost cutting (achieved largely through decreasing personnel and courses carried) but not in increasing revenues. The financial analysis of the different UNEX subunits, based largely on instructional costs rather than including overhead expenditures, shows that two of the programs, Art & Design and Humanities, are far from generating the approximately 43% revenue margin necessary to break even, and the others, aimed primarily at "serving the Silicon Valley workforce" (according to the UNEX statement of philosophy, Task Force Report, September 21, 2005), hover around the 30% range. Thus, if one includes the overhead costs, it appears that not a single one of the UNEX subunits is financially viable. Beyond financial viability, the situation raises the following broad, programmatic issues for CPB.

The measures taken by UNEX management to address the fundamental problem of decreasing enrollments have ranged from ad hoc changes to the course offerings in the 2003-05 catalogues (to address the perception that they are too basic and unexciting), to the hiring of new directors on short-term contracts. As a comprehensive strategy or individually, none of these measures has succeeded in raising enrollments.

Dean Sandeen recommended that future development efforts no longer be oriented as fully as they have been around an engineering focus. This is a surprising recommendation, considering that she has resolutely defended this focus to CPB for the last few years, despite having had (apart from the financial imperative) broad autonomy to set the direction of UNEX. Even with this recommendation, the majority of the new courses offered are in the areas of business and technology that seem clearly to draw on an engineering approach and clientele. Given the failure to identify a clear market niche within the target audience (the workforce of Silicon Valley), CPB questioned the predictions made by UNEX for a better future. We noted that the assumption in the long term UNEX projections for an annual revenue increase of 5.0% is not based on any past performance.

CPB reiterated the recommendation made in 2005-06 to downsize and restructure UNEX. The committee urged the campus administration and faculty to take direct control of UNEX operations, programmatic and financial. A particular concern is the relationship of UNEX to the wider set of activities that UCSC is planning in Silicon Valley (ranging from the School of Management to plans for other professional schools): risk is unavoidable for all of these, and clear benchmarks and measures of accountability must be in place before we move forward with these plans.

CPB's recommendations about how to proceed with UNEX have not changed but have been reaffirmed in the course of this latest consultation. The Committee requested that CPEVC Kliger communicate his reasoning for continuing to offset the UNEX deficit and for expecting that the overall financial picture will improve more dramatically and rapidly than it has in the past six years. CPB would like follow-up on the seeming structural disconnect between the UNEX administration and the central administration.

External Reviews/Closure Letters

Art

CPB revised the draft letter on the Art External Review and the letter to VPAA Galloway is forthcoming.

Electrical Engineering

CPB revised the draft letter on the Electrical Engineering External Review and the letter to VPAA Galloway is forthcoming.

Recycling Multi-Campus Research Unit Funds

Due to lack of time this issue will be put on the next meeting agenda.