

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of February 21, 2008

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Michael Brown, Emily Honig, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Herbert Lee, Karen Otteman, Olga Najera-Ramirez, Grant Pogson, Quentin Williams and Mary-Beth Harhen

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger and VC Meredith Michaels

Member Items

Senate Chair Williams reported that the latest revised state budget is on the web. The legislative analyst report was not favorable to UC. The final state budget will not be passed until July 1 or after.

Chair Gillman reported that she sent a project proposal to CPB's data subcommittee for an ITS initiative to enhance curriculum planning and management. Chair Gillman and CEP Chair Padgett met with a representative from ITS to determine if there is anything, such as specific data collection, the Senate would like included in the software program. The CPB data subcommittee will review the proposal and determine if they have anything to add.

Chair Gillman is drafting a professional schools report for the Senate call. She is connecting professional schools with CPB's work on enrollment management and conditions for growth. The data subcommittee will provide an oral report at the upcoming Senate meeting.

Professional School Pre Proposals Discussion

CPB began by discussing the school of management (SOM) pre proposal. CPB found the intellectual message to be potentially innovative but is concerned about the details of the pre proposal. CPB feels there needs to be more specific information with regards to funding and diversity, and questions whether and how UCSC will mount a management school with a research arm. There also needs to be more analysis of local need for SOM programs. CPB would like more information on current enrollments versus enrollment targets for other UC management schools in the last decade. It appears that other management schools in the state have not achieved their projected enrollments.

CPB agreed that the next steps in the pre proposal process is to determine where the proposed schools are on a timeline and to determine if these potential schools are part of the relevant dean's (or deans') plans.

Budget Reduction Discussion

CPB reviewed the draft reduction worksheet, which was previously provided by the EVC, and had a number of questions including: What is the principle for protecting the instructional mission? The principle is important to press but CPB is not sure there is a way to implement it. This principle seems to be contradicted in the ten percent cut in

instructional support. What is rolled up in the various budgetary categories? The support unit budgets need to be more transparent. CPB had a number of questions about what constitutes academic support versus instructional support. VC Michaels informed the committee that the numbers in the worksheets came from the budget cut proposals that the academic deans submitted to the EVC. CPB commented that it appears that safety, mandatory charges, infrastructure in ITS and income-producing enterprises (such as UR) are all being protected. However the research enterprise is cut, which is difficult to reconcile with the principle of protecting income producing enterprises. CPB also asked about the hollowed out FTE's and whether the campus is undermining its ability to build them back up. VC Michaels responded that there is an assumption that enrollment will grow each year, although not at the rate stated in the LRDP, and the campus will continue to receive income from the state. The EVC would hold on to 100 percent of those new FTE for the first year, then 50 percent the following year, and 75 percent the third year.

Consultation with EVC Kliger

The committee and EVC briefly discussed the Physical and Biological Sciences request for second hires in Molecular, Cell and Development Biology, Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry and Biochemistry. The committee and EVC agreed that these hires appear to be a good opportunity and are clearly priorities for the division.

The next item of discussion with the EVC was the budget cuts. CPB Chair Gillman explained that the committee believes there are inconsistencies in the EVC's scenarios in the application of the principle of protecting the instructional mission. It is unclear what counts as "instructional mission". It is also unclear why a full 100% of the budget in University Relations (UR) and Information Technology Services (ITS) needs to be protected, since there are areas in these units that are strictly administrative. The EVC agreed that not everything in ITS and UR needs to be protected. CPB is concerned that the way the deans apply the cuts may not be consistent with the EVC's goals, undermining the principle of protecting the academic mission. How will deans be held accountable? Also, CPB believes if income producing enterprises are being protected, there are areas of research that need to be protected with the same vigor.

CPB reminded the EVC that the re-shifting of work that resulted from the centralization of business functions has had an unintentional negative affect on faculty. The EVC responded that if faculty is provided with more support that will result in fewer faculty. It is a trade off. CPB did not readily agree with this assumption.

Chair Gillman asked how the totals for the development officers are computed. Are research grants calculated in to their numbers? The EVC said that generally the campus wants to appear to be successfully fundraising so that everything is aggregated into the development totals; however, the accountability measure for the divisional officers is based on contacts.

Chair Gillman reiterated that there doesn't seem to be a principle for protecting faculty time, and CPB regrets that missing component. The EVC agreed that it is too bad but asserted that certain cuts will come from the Regents, the state will then give more, and

that one could argue that if the campus is going to put more in direct faculty support, then cuts are going to have to come from some other area. The campus took cuts three years ago and thirteen years ago, and the cumulative effect has been damaging.

The EVC said that the principal officer meetings are scheduled for early March at that point the EVC will be provided with more information and be able to develop a more nuanced approach to the cuts.

Finally, CPB asked the EVC about the McHenry move and what process is used for units being moved in there. The EVC responded that there has been a half dozen proposals, and all have elicited some level of opposition from the deans. There have not been any final decisions.

History of Art and Visual Culture (HAVC) External Review Discussion

CPB discussed a number of issues raised in the external review final report. Issues include:

- What is the status of the Graduate Ph.D. proposal?
- How will the department maintain its functions with the current number of FTE?
- How is this program distinctive? It doesn't seem that different from other programs in art history.
- There is a concern that the funding slotted for the graduate program will not make it competitive with other institutions. The dean's letter is non committal. Under the circumstances is it viable to launch the program?
- The graduate program will only tax HAVC and its resources beyond capacity. A risk analysis of HAVC yields a negative result. The dean's response letter seems to overlook these more critical concerns. How are the external review committee (ERC) concerns about the graduate program going to be addressed?
- There are serious issues in terms of offices and inadequately equipped classrooms. What does the department think of this and is there a long term solution?
- The ERC recommends that the undergraduate assistant and staff advisor be combined but the dean's letter does not address the recommendation.
- There is no plan to reinstitute support services and there has been the closure of photography services. The ERC recommended the establishment of a central faculty and the dean's letter recommended a task force. None of CPB's original questions about what other models there are at other universities are addressed. CPB recommends against a task force.

University Relations Pre Consultation

In advance of next week's consultation with Chancellor Blumenthal, Vice Chancellor Murphy and Assistant Vice Chancellor Svihus, CPB requested information about the comprehensive campaign from University Relations. In order to develop questions for the consultation, CPB asked for the capital campaign targets and numbers and their descriptions, but did not receive a response from UR. CPB agreed it would like to inquire about the timing of the campaign, measures for success, and how the campaign announcement will be made in the current economic climate.