

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of November 1, 2007

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Michael Brown, Emily Honig, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Herbert Lee, Karen Ottemann, Grant Pogson, Quentin Williams, Lora Bartlett, and Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: Kelvin Cen

Guests: VC Meredith Michaels, VPAA Alison Galloway (via conference call), VPDUE Bill Ladusaw, Graduate Dean Lisa Sloan, President Robert Dynes, Director Gretchen Kalonji, Coordinator Kate Callen, Assistant Vice President James Stofan

Consultation with VC Michaels, VPDUE Ladusaw, VPAA Galloway and Graduate Studies Dean Sloan

CPB and the guests discussed the enrollment templates provided by the Office of the President (OP). CPB inquired as to how the divisional deans were instructed and what the process was. Dean Sloan and VC Michaels had met with the divisional deans and shared with them the OP letter details and the projections OP wanted. They asked the deans to discuss this with their department chairs. The deans based projections on divisional academic plans and their faculty FTE projections. Everyone realizes the uncertainty is fairly large because these are projections out to 2020. VC Michaels said the deans were asked to respond in eight days, making it difficult for them to consult with all department chairs. Some deans had the opportunity, prior to compiling the data, to consult with department chairs. Those who did not consult stated that they will go back and discuss the numbers with their chairs.

CPB expressed interest in being involved in the process and concern about the potential for concretization of numbers put on paper as placeholders. Dean Sloan commented that the deans and chairs that were consulted were given the build-out numbers, their own plans, their current FTE targets and other program comparative data. The deans also took space into consideration. CPB suggested providing the deans with a template that the chairs can sign to record that they were consulted. CPB recommended that the Chancellor and EVC do whatever they decide it takes to get the campus the most resources. CPB offered to put together a small committee to develop a recommended set of numbers for the campus and professional schools. CPB has done work on this issue and has some ideas in terms of management and policy that will address the issue of serving the state's needs.

CPB also commented that there is no place on the template to address future growth in Silicon Valley. CPB members Gillman, Brown, Williams and Kletzer will work with Dean Sloan, VPDUE Ladusaw and VPAA Galloway on this issue and will present draft language to the EVC by November 7.

External Review Charges

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Theatre Arts external review charge.

1. The VPAA and dean's letter are very detailed about the issue of spreading the faculty too thin. CPB's supplement should draw attention to perception of dispersal of faculty energies across units.
2. Graduate program development has been difficult. CPB will summarize the structural issues and note the graduate program issues.

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Literature external review charge.

1. This is a complicated review because Literature is so large and has a history of difficulties and fragmentation.
2. The dean's letter was more of a final evaluative letter and did not formulate issues that the review committee should address.
3. Given the diverging concepts of the department, as described in the self study, what reconfigurations of the department should be considered?
4. In the view of the external review committee, what factors contribute to the department's lack of success in recruiting?
5. Given the department's research interests, what fields and focii make sense for the future?
6. Graduate program: there are issues of workload distribution in running the program. Graduate program clusters and concentrations: how would the review committee consider the clusters? What should be the place of creative writing?
7. In light of governance issues described in the self study, what structures of leadership, selection of leadership, and transparency of processes should be proposed? Is there some tension in what gets communicated from the chair to the department?
8. What resources are needed to accept more graduate students, and are more graduate students desirable? Is there a system by which faculty who advise a substantial number of graduate students could get a course equivalence?

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Astronomy external review charge.

1. The department would like to grow to four positions but that isn't what is currently allocated, so how will that happen?
2. Astronomy is a fundamentally strong department. The department would like to raise money for prized post doctorate fellowships to recruit a higher caliber of graduate students but there is no mention of how they will do that.
3. CPB would like more information about shared big computers.

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Mathematics external review charge.

1. Does the department have the appropriate mechanisms to assure consistency across course offerings?

2. Does the department wish to pursue the sort of research that leads to the addition of post doctoral students?
3. Is the form of centrally funded teaching post docs a norm in other departments? Why not instead pursue visiting professors?
4. What are strategies for improving retention?

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Ocean Sciences external review.

1. The previous review pointed out that Ocean Sciences takes the entire block allocation for the first year and pays it immediately, with students then on their own in future years. CPB would like to see the review committee comment on this policy. It appears to have generated a problem in Ocean Sciences, in that their students are sponsored outside the department.
2. What are the best options for space?
- 3.

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Computer Engineering external review.

1. It appears that graduate students are not clearly directed to the department and so the graduate program is not getting the applicants it needs. Also, the program is not ranked so they are not getting the credit they deserve. The external review should ask about the potential for joint structures with other allied departments and programs.
2. Are the differences in teaching allocations well justified?
3. What is the space plan? What are departmental priorities if they don't get more space?

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Computer Sciences external review.

1. What has happened since the previous review? (This was not mentioned in the current review.)
2. There is no information or detail about the proposed five year combined BS/MS.
3. Where do the undergraduates end up, and what is their training?
4. CPB would like more information on the structure that requires each staff person to support three departments.
5. Is one new hire enough to support the computer game program? The self study stated that the department wants a faculty member rooted in the arts (digital media) but the arts doesn't have any hires planned that support this. Is this really a joint effort?
6. What are the chances for long term success in the computer game program?

The committee discussed the following issues and questions regarding the Information Systems Management (ISM) external review.

1. This is an undergraduate program, yet a large percentage of the documents focus on a graduate program that doesn't really exist.
2. What is the long term outlook for this program?

3. Are there enrollment goals? Are undergraduate and graduate enrollments consonant with teaching resources or are they unrealistic?
4. Are there under utilized opportunities for cross disciplinary programs? The external review needs to comment on the troubled administrative structure and ensure that a representative from the Economics Department is present at the review meeting.

CPB members will refine their questions for submission to the deans by November 15.

Consultation with UC President Dynes

Following introductions President Dynes explained that notes are being taken at all campus visits so that he can record and report his observations.

Chair Gillman began by providing an overview of CPB and explained that the committee has been making an effort to enhance lines of communications with the administration and other Senate committees. CPB's questions for the president address largely the framework of differential development among campuses and the need for differential investment. Within the idea of the power of ten, how are the differences accommodated? How are strengths developed and recognized?

President Dynes responded by discussing the power of ten concept and the goal of individual campuses developing their own strengths in a way that is complementary to the University of California (UC). State funding is there to support UC's teaching role. That is virtually all state funding covers. UC is currently receiving about \$11,000 dollars of support per student. President Dynes feels that support should not be differentiated, but rather that it should be transparent and that OP is working on a more transparent process. The base for teaching funding should be uniform, and UCSC should receive no less than other campuses. With respect to building UC, President Dynes would like to see more joint appointments between campuses.

CPB asked President Dynes how he views the conflict between the state priorities and the criteria of national rankings. UC has started making the case for increasing graduate enrollment on the basis of state priorities. These state priorities are not usually in academic areas but in professional schools. President Dynes responded that UC has led the thinking in the country for a half century. We have to do what we believe is right and not play to rankings. If we don't like the priorities, we should change the rules. We are one university that is strong enough to be heard by the legislature and by national ranking institutions.

CPB brought up education as being a need identified by the state. President Dynes said that UC does an excellent post secondary school through graduate and professional schools. UC doesn't do very well before or after that. We have not done a particularly good job at pre-k through 12th grade and beyond. K-12 is a disaster in the state of California. We as a system can choose to carry on with what we are doing in those areas or really work to address this crisis. It is President Dynes' opinion that if we don't raise the call to arms, no one is going to do it. This is what triggered his motivation to commit

to helping science and math students. He is appalled at the absence of qualified science and math teachers in urban schools. President Dynes committed, without a plan, along with CSU, to generate 2500 new science and math teachers a year.

Responding to CPB's question about UC structure, President Dynes said he hopes that thoughtful people from different campuses will figure out the structure and then coordinate in a way that would bring the strengths of the ten campuses together. CPB and President Dynes discussed joint appointments. CPB asked if OP has been thinking of a mechanism or structure to link graduate programs and shared funding. President Dynes responded that he is thinking more along the lines of graduate programs that bring research opportunities at the same time. Working jointly, campuses can undertake large research programs that bring in federal funds. UC needs to reinvent the funding model for graduate students because enrollment is flat. The first step is to definitively determine that graduate growth and professional schools are our priorities. We need to make the state understand that it is important to support graduate students at a more realistic rate than we currently receive.

CPB and President Dynes then discussed the Education (Ed.D.) program. President Dynes said that OP determined it did not want to put UC graduate resources in an Ed.D. degrees. UC does not want to deliver inflated degrees; we want to concentrate on research. President Dynes feels UC should be generating creative people at the baccalaureate level who want to move forward. UC has very different strengths than CSU.

Responding to a question about Silicon Valley, President Dynes said UCSC should have been there over a decade ago. UCSC should be Silicon Valley's research campus. UCSC needs to be looking at innovative management in Silicon Valley. President Dynes is not sure what that entails but believes it will take close collaboration with people in Silicon Valley. People in the valley move from career to career very quickly, and UCSC needs have a presence.

Director Kalonji added that many Silicon Valley companies are founded by international executives. The connections between India and Silicon Valley are multiple, and people travel back and forth between them all the time. Innovative programs in Silicon Valley would open UCSC up to the world.

In closing President Dynes asked CPB to allow Chancellor Blumenthal to be opportunistic and support and encourage him to be adventuresome and nimble. CPB responded that recent collaboration between the administration and the Senate has built trust. The campus culture has changed in substantial ways over the last ten years. Our academic planning process helped to create a certain level of agreement about broad directions.