

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of May 29, 2008**

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

**Absent:** Olga Najera Ramirez (with notice) Kyle Simerly

**Guests:** EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels, and Vice Provost Joe Miller

**Members Items**

Senate Chair Williams provided an Academic Council update. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) proposal to revise UC eligibility was endorsed by the Academic Council with severe revisions. The previous proposal involved the top five percent of all California high school students, and 12.5 percent in the local context. The Academic Council decided to forward the top nine percent in the local context and the top nine percent in the state.

The Academic Council also reviewed UC Riverside's medical school proposal and approved it with the caveat that the state must fund it at the \$100 million level.

**Implementation of the Strategic Action Plan**

Based on last week's CPB conversation and further review by committee members, the committee flagged the following issues:

- Research questions with policy implications and implications for measuring expenditures versus awards.
- What kinds of large projects could there be outside of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) and Engineering? The notion of "large" is subjective and division specific. The campus needs to acknowledge that there are growing niche areas, which are small but important and innovative.
- The entire document, especially the research section is division specific. Metrics/goals will vary on a divisional basis. The document is in need of an introduction that explains this and contextualizes the measures to illustrate that some of the measures are department or division specific.
- Differential costs and return. There is no discussion of tradeoffs or the relationship between the goals and what it will take to attain them. The document does not recognize the trade offs and stress that are related to the practicalities of managing these sometimes competing goals.
- The undergraduate section is formalistic and does not have enough nuance.
- The document is presented as a unified vision oriented towards the sciences, leading to crude measures that are not necessarily relevant (like number of post doctorates per faculty and number of licenses).
- There is no distinction between measures that are rolled up to campus level and those that have validity only when applied to departments or divisions.

- The document does not make clear accountability in the job description of any vice chancellors. It does not differentiate between metrics that are campuswide and division-specific. There is concern that research allocations will be based on the campus goals that are not relevant to all divisions.
- The actions listed on page three are loaded with implications for resource allocations. The VPAA is not involved in resource allocations, deploying FTE, etc. The VPAA is responsible for the overall academic planning on campus, and it has not been campus practice to have the VPAA involved in resource allocations.
- The strengths of the campus are based on departments, yet departments are entirely absent from the document. The measures and overview of the document are fundamentally misaligned with the units that actually generate excellence, overhead and attract faculty.

### **Consultation with EVC Kliger**

EVC Kliger informed CPB that there is a potential problem with the capital planning budget because the state is likely to make a decision that any capital projects in the pipeline will not be funded, creating a statewide freeze on building.

CPB and EVC Kliger discussed the School of Engineering (SOE) and Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci) off cycle requests. CPB found the SOE request unproblematic and will invite Dean Thorsett in to discuss the PBSci requests.

The EVC then laid out two scenarios for budget reductions. One is based on the May revised budget, which is congruent with the targets distributed by the EVC. The second is based on the governor's January budget, which is a much larger cut. The EVC is asking units to plan for the larger cuts, given that it is more prudent to plan for the worst west scenario.

The EVC also distributed a chart showing the effects of cumulative permanent budget cuts from 1999-2007. The analysis comes as a result of units asserting that academic divisions and academic support units has been more adversely effected by these cumulative cuts which have not been restored, than other non academic units.

### *Consultation with Vice Provost Silicon Valley Center Joe Miller*

VP Miller proved an update on Silicon Valley (SV) initiatives. He has been following the principle that SV's influence and impact on the world is very profound. UCSC has formed a partnership with Santa Clara, Foothill DeAnza, and Carnegie Mellon to develop a parcel of land as a new community. SV challenges include:

- Physical separation. SV does not want to drain resources from the campus, they want to be an enhancement and advantage to the main campus. This requires close ties with faculty on campus, so they see the advantage of involvement. The emphasis has been switched from offering academic programs to research and outreach to industry and potential donors.
- Working with others. VP Miller's Lick Observatory experience tells him that by joining forces with other institutions, they can provide services that no one institution can provide. They are working on a "meta-university" at NASA which is a major

research entity with a housing component. The plan is for a green, off the grid, generating its own energy, water recycling, sustainable community in Silicon Valley.

The University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) has a \$330 million contract with NASA that over the years has produced significant overhead for the campus. The scientists there are mostly civil servants who have moved over to UARC. VC Miller is trying to set up research groups that interface with UCSC faculty interests and with what NASA is capable of working on. NASA has certain interests that they are willing to fund, and there are places that intersect with UCSC faculty interests.

CPB responded positively to the shift in focus that SV will have a stronger research focus and is being conceived as an enhancement, rather than UCSC providing most of the support. VC Miller envisions a collaboration that will create seamless pathways based on the master plan that will move student through the three segments: CC, CSU and Ph.D. at UC.

VP Miller was frank in saying that there will not be state funds for this venture, so priorities will be dictated to some degree by where the money is.

Once the lease is set, CPB would like to understand the financial implications. VP Miller was clear that in the long term the SV Center will be a revenue generating unit for UCSC, but in the shorter term CPB needs to understand the research implications for the campus for the next few years, especially given the budgetary declines projected for the future.