

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of November 30, 2006**

**Present:** Chair Susan Gillman, Ray Gibbs, Emily Honig, David Evan Jones, Tracy Larrabee, Karen Ottemann, Grant Pogson, Faye Crosby, Gabriela Sandoval, Sarah Curtis, Bryant Mata, Mary-Beth Harhen

**Absent:** (with notice) Ravi Rajan, Quentin Williams,

**Guests:** EVC Dave Kliger, VPAA Alison Galloway, and Analyst Ken Christopher

**Member's Items**

CPB Chair Gillman reported that the Advisory Steering Committee for TIM has been formed. CPB expressed concerns that the Committee was formed by Dean Kang, not the EVC, but the membership follows that which was recommended by CPB

Senate Chair Faye Crosby reported on the Academic Council meeting which discussed the UCPB Futures Report. The three Regental priorities are faculty salaries, graduate student support and the undergraduate faculty/student ratio systemwide. There is a discrepancy in UCPB regarding the estimated short fall to support these endeavors UCPB says the short fall is \$1billion and UCOP says it is \$5million. It is unlikely that the state will be able to solve this because it has a structural shortfall of \$5billion. This leads to questions about fundraising and development on campus. Information Technology calls for CPB to monitor the fundraising at UCSC to be sure that it links to campus priorities and goals. CPB recommended in a previous report that a Development Officer be assigned to targeted or nascent graduate programs. CPB recognizes that the Development Office may not take these programs as a priority due to the notion that the more narrow the charge the more difficult it is for them to follow broad opportunistic leads.

**Film and Digital Media Ph.D. Program Proposal**

The revised proposal and accompanying letter from the Dean address most of the issues raised by the previous CPB review, and CPB believes that the Ph.D. program is realizable with the resources that are planned. The proposal is widely supported by departments at UCSC as well as other UC campuses. It would still be desirable to append letters from UCLA and UCB that are listed as "forthcoming." CPB is willing to support the forwarding of the proposal without these letters, but given the closeness of the intellectual content of the UCLA and UCB programs, it would solidify the proposal to have those letters. CPB agreed that the proposal is sound and should go forward. A letter with additional recommendation to VPAA Galloway is forthcoming.

### **Consultation with CPEVC Dave Kliger**

#### Themes and size of divisions

In response to the inquiry about how to determine the sizes while divisional plans are being revised, CPEVC Kliger stated he doesn't think that the divisional plans will effect the discussion of the size of divisions. That determination will emerge from what we think constitutes a full service, balanced campus. The divisions have already been given numbers and they will not change significantly. There is a need to determine the numbers so the focus can shift to determining how to promote excellence within their departments, given the projected future growth. The projected sizes assume a degree of flexibility. The size of divisions is being used as planning horizons with the first horizon being an enrollment of 17, 215. CPB noted that it is a close horizon (3-4 years) and that a change of one percent could be as many as six FTE to the smaller divisions, which is significant. The distribution should be matched with specific benchmarks such as enrollment growth, graduate program approvals, etc. CPEVC Kliger cautioned against putting too much weight on enrollment numbers, given that some divisions, like Social Sciences, have a higher faculty/student ratio on all campuses.

CPEVC Kliger stated he is looking for advice on the nature the communication. His analysis included six criteria from divisional contributions. (To general education, supporting majors, extramural funds.) CPB recommended that the criteria be put forward again along with the CPB addendum, which was based on comparisons with size ranges at other UCs.

CPEVC Kliger agreed that he will compose the first draft of the rationale, and he requested that CPB consider issuing a joint communication with him about the criteria/etc for the divisional sizes. The FTE discussion obscures the differences between start ups for different divisions.

Pitting the size of a dept against excellence. Strategic Futures Committees used a rationale of looking at size of departments on campuses that are in the top quartile. But the lowering of the enrollment target for the LRDP, there was discussion about small departments that are excellent (and may not match the sizes of departments on other campuses.

#### Themes:

CPB recommends staying away from the terms "Studies" and instead using more forward thinking terms.

Came up with

Advancing Human and Environmental Health

Cross cultural initiatives

Innovation in Science Technology and Society

Transnational and Globalizations

Communication – Visuality Production and reception Communication

Verbal and visual communication

Arts chairs are meeting next week to try to come up with themes that represent what we do at UCSC.

Theory / Critical Studies

CPB recommended accomplishing something in relation to society

Questions for informal CPB/Dean consultations in January

What are the areas of excellence in your divisions?

How do you promote them?

What are three “building block” themes that are overarching in your division?

CPB requested that the EVC consult with the committee on a revised job description/portfolio for the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. CPEVC Kliger replied that he has requested the revised job description from Student Affairs. He recommended that once that is done, that CPB consult with Acting Vice Chancellor Jean Marie Scott.

CPB recommended that there be an explicit College Provostial review of the draft academic plan, on both phases of the plans (external document and the implementation document).

#### **Philosophy External Review (Universal Charge)**

There was an initial discussion on the Philosophy External Review Universal Charge. The relationship of the Department with other campus units was discussed. The draft response will be vetted via email.

#### **MCD Biology External Review**

The principal Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB)-related issues that emerge from MCD Biology’s External Review, Dean's response and Departmental response are:

- How to best deal with the increasing number of undergraduate students in MCD majors.
- Increase the staff support for core facilities, lab courses and undergraduate advising.
- Finalize the separation from Ecology & Evolutionary (EE) Biology.
- Institute a better plan for return of salary savings to departments.

A letter with additional recommendation to VPAA Galloway is forthcoming.

#### **Draft Campus Plan Response**

CPB continued their discussion of the draft campus strategic academic plan. They agreed to recommend that there needs to be two documents; one external public document and one for internal campus use. The public document should be a shorter version that is visionary and can be used for fundraising and public relations efforts. The internal document would address the implementation aspects of a campus plan such as the size of the divisions. CPB noted that some part of the plan must address the upcoming challenge of accommodating an increasingly diverse population. CPB formed a subcommittee for

addressing undergraduate education delivery issues in the plan. Top priority items identified were faculty/student ratios and coordination of campus advising. They have invited CEP Chair Jaye Padgett to attend the December 7th meeting to discuss undergraduate issues to the committee.