

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of May 22, 2008

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

Absent: None

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels, and Planning and Budget Analyst Troy Lawson

Members Items

CPB member Pogson reported that the Advisory Committee on Facilities (ACF) met earlier in the week. ACF still does not have a target from the UC Office of the President (UCOP). The campus is considering purchasing the Borland facility and ACF is discussing building the new Social Sciences building on the north campus. There is concern that there are a lot of different projects (Borland, Delaware, Silicon Valley and north campus) that are not coordinated.

CPB member Ottemann attended the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) meeting. CFW is pushing an initiative to move childcare out of Student Affairs to the Education Department. It is a vision that would align childcare with both education and psychology's missions. This year CFW is working on the mission and next year the planning. CFW has letters of support from both the Education and Psychology Departments. CPB is concerned about whether the VC of Student Affairs has adequate knowledge of the childcare budget. CPB would like to consult with the VC of Student Affairs in the fall.

Senate Chair Williams provided an update on Silicon Valley. Things have started moving rather quickly on the development of a research park at NASA/AMES. The contract has to be in place by December 31, 2008.

Sociology External Review

CPB discussed three main points. Overall the committee finds the external review report quite positive, but very general and in some ways vague. CPB had previously asked about the proposal for the integrated service learning projects and the review did not address the issue. Finally, the report did not address the relationship between using the clusters as a hiring strategy.

CPB found the dean's response to be vague and noncommittal, particularly about the future of the department.

CAPM for Faculty Retention

CPB had a brief discussion. The committee feels the letter should just explain the vote, and the language should be neutral. Also, CPB is not clear on what it means to take salary increases into consideration at the time of subsequent reviews.

Implementation of Strategic Action Plan

CPB had a number of initial comments about the plan, including:

- The extent to which these criteria pre-judge what constitutes excellence for differential investment among divisions.
- NRC Ranking: the construction and application of rankings is problematic. Most departments at UCSC are too small to get into these rankings. Generally large departments are ranked higher.
- There are a lot of tradeoffs implicit in the document that are not addressed between graduate and undergraduate, between disciplinary focused entities and interdisciplinary structures, and between professional schools and general campus. This points to the relative weighing of the many goals that are presented in the document, especially since some of these goals require monetary investment. What criteria will be used?
- The plan raises the issue of accountability and assessment of progress towards goals. If we achieve some of the goals in the different categories does it mirror back in the performance evaluations of relevant administrators/units?

CPB will continue this discussion next week.

Consultation with EVC Kliger

There was a discussion about master capital planning. Without the states budget for capital programs it is hard to plan. ACF's approach is to give a best guess and set priorities. CPB cited concern about the inclusion of the Chinquapin Extension. CPB will wait for the official request before it responds.

Information User Model Consultation with Planning and Budget's Troy Lawson

Planning and Budget Analyst Lawson explained the Information User Model Proposal (IU). The IU model is neither a recharge nor core funding. It is scalable, like a recharge, but also recognizes the need for investments in Information Technology Services (ITS).

Various weights were applied to each population. Analyst Lawson came up with the weights based on what he thought was equitable and fair. The Funding Model Advisory Group challenged the weights and suggested a method which is based on population.

CPB believes that philosophically-speaking, students are the responsibility of the whole campus. Analyst Lawson said that the alternative would be to spread out those costs in the remaining populations. CPB agreed with the idea, but VC Michaels believes the administration's response may be there is an allocation to the academic divisions that takes into account there are I & R costs. CPB also stated concern about the graduate student model, saying the committee believes graduate students, too, are the collective responsibility of the campus.

CPB will continue to discuss this issue at future meetings.