

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of February 28, 2008

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

Guests: Chancellor George Blumenthal, VCUR Donna Murphy, AVC UR Jennifer Svihus and VC Meredith Michaels

Member Items

CPB discussed the potential budget cuts and the rationale of principles of protecting University Relations (UR) and Information Technology Services (ITS) from all cuts. CPB would like to see analysis of protecting all units within UR and ITS. CPB further stressed the principle protecting faculty time.

A member of CPB was approached by a department chair whose department had recently gone through the external review process. The chair questioned CPB's response, stating that it was hostile, and indicated that the dean agreed with the chair. CPB agreed that its response was appropriate and that it is important to have a CPB representative at the closure meeting to answer any questions the chair or the dean might have.

University Relations Consultation with Chancellor Blumenthal, VCUR Murphy and AVC UR Svihus

The consultation began with CPB expressing disappointment that the committee was not provided preliminary priorities with targets attached to them in advance of the meeting. Chair Gillman explained it is better if the committee is prepared to have a consultation which is pointed and deliberative. Next CPB asked how totals for the comprehensive were derived. CPB also asked for a better sense of development operations. Chancellor Blumenthal expressed the necessity of significantly increasing successful fundraising in order to meet campus priorities which should be informed by the academic plan. He asked all the divisions and units on campus, including the Academic Senate, to submit their priorities and a list was compiled. Chancellor Blumenthal and VCUR Murphy will meet with the campus units to understand and refine those priorities and coordinate between units. CPB noted that the coordination between units in fundraising has been a weakness of our campus and that a campus wide effort would be advantageous. Chancellor Blumenthal noted that some units did not submit priorities.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal described an iterative process for vetting the comprehensive campaign across units. After the plan is complete consultants will be hired to do a feasibility study of the plan. The first step was collecting the campaign priorities which has taken longer than originally anticipated. The feasibility study will advise on the timing for launching the campaign. The chancellor further explained that the campus wants to move away from the large, broad "campaign priorities" to more specific projects. A 350 million dollar campaign will just cover the very top priorities but

because it is not possible to control areas of donor interest the actual money that comes in may not fall into the categories that the campus has identified as priorities. Research grants are counted and if exceptional grants come in they are counted toward the total the same as private donors.

Noting that working through the administrative structure of chairs and deans is limited, CPB recommended that development officers attend department meetings on a regular basis to get faculty buy in. This will help faculty develop fluency with the fundraising enterprise that includes feed back loops so that department faculty understand what development is doing to help achieve the department priorities. CPB noted the “laundry list” nature of the priorities that could be applicable to any university, and asked that they be defined in such a way to show the uniqueness of UCSC.

VCUR Murphy stated that UR is focusing on creating the priorities as transformative ideas that will appeal to donors who can see how their donations will transform the campus. Chancellor Blumenthal added that faculty is needed to give talks in Monterey and the Silicon Valley where potential donors exist. Donors find it far more interesting to speak with faculty rather than administrators. VCUR Murphy said that UR is working on training programs focused on development principles and techniques for administrators. VCUR Murphy explained that the campus is young and many of the development officers are inexperienced and also getting training. UR is considering training programs for faculty as well. Over the past few years the foundation leadership has changed and the new leadership is under going training too. VCUR Murphy’s goal is to double fundraising in the next three to five years. She also said that all campuses report fundraising totals in the same way, all private gifts and agencies are included in the their totals through out the system.

CPB asked if it is responsible to have an internal document that measure effectiveness and performance of University Relations. AVC Sivhus explained that the operational plan for development officers serves this purpose. Although the measure seem qualitative to CPB AVC Sivhus explained that the effectiveness of the development officers does emerge from monitoring these metrics. The plan is reviewed monthly with the development officers and shared with the deans. The first years UR did this exercise it was disappointing but not unusual given that it is a big culture change for the development officers to be accountable in this way.

Finally, there was a discussion about the central development officers. There is currently only one such officer on campus but a search is underway for another. The development officer reporting structure of the 51 percent central and 49 percent division split is used on other campuses. There are also other models where the funding comes either all from the center or all from the division and there are structures that assess divisions to pay for the campus capital or comprehensive campaigns.

CPB agreed that it would like to have the VCUR and AVC back again soon because there was not time to discuss the priorities. The committee finds the priorities bland and

generic and does not understand why it took eight months from the time the units were requested to submit priorities to produce them.

Community Studies External Review Discussion

CPB commented Community Studies does not have a lot of counterparts elsewhere, so there is no model for what this program will look like. CPB questions for the closure included:

- What are the priorities for the dean to build the department?
- It is not clear whether the innovative social documentation program should be the sole investment or split with the civil society focus. By requesting the public health position next year it seems the dean is splitting the difference to maintain the tradition focus of the department. Could this lead to an erosion of the distinctiveness of the department?
- What is the justification for the number of FTE needed for the overall program?

Professional Schools Pre Proposal Discussion

CPB discussed overall questions for the proposal. Questions included:

- Is there an alternative structure that would satisfy the same need?
- What sort of financial commitment is required by the campus?
- Are there sources of external funding? What contacts have been made?
- What is the intellectual and financial added value?
- How does the potential school build on specific strengths of the campus?
- Are there faculty strengths that do not exist on campus that must be recruited?
- What is the best estimate of student demand?
- Is there competition from other UC's?
- What are the overall risk and benefits?

The CPB subcommittees will re-review the proposals to determine if they have already addressed some or all of these questions. CPB will distribute its comments and additional questions by the end of the spring quarter.

Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG)

CPB reviewed the Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG) which addresses the administrative rate of pay that is associated with transitional leave. The committee endorses the principle in option #2 that separates transitional leave, which is associated with an administrative appointment, from sabbatical leave, which is associated with a faculty appointment. This principle is sound from a variety of perspectives. First, it acknowledges that different types of leaves serve different purposes. Second, it delineates the appropriate rate of pay corresponding to the nature of the leave: sabbatical leave is calculated at the faculty rate of pay and transitional leave at the SMG rate of pay. Finally, CPB will recommend that Option #2 include the same return-to-service provision as Options #1 and 3 since the intent of the leave is to support the transition back into teaching, research and service at UC, not to retirement or another administrative post.