

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of June 5, 2008

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

Absent: None

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels, Dean Steve Thorsett. Chair Dave Belanger, Acting Dean Isaacson, Chair Phil Berman, Planning and Budget Director Robin Draper and Planning and Construction Director John Barnes

Members Items

CPB discussed Dean Kamieniecki's response to CPB's FTE recommendations. The dean's memo seems to reflect department desires and consultation with the departments.

Implementation of Strategic Action Plan

Chair Gillman will revise the draft letter using examples of trade offs, such as investment in Silicon Valley rather than academic departments.

Information User Model

The three areas CPB would like to focus on are the funding model and the base, the weighting, and governance. CPB questions what is the optimal structure for oversight, lines of accountability, and how to manage infrastructure and systems in the future.

CPB feels students should be accounted for as an institutional responsibility, not just the responsibility of academic divisions. In the Information User Model (IU) weighting for graduate students was based on their roles as TAs which seems to contradict the way graduate students are seen in the divisions, primarily as students.

In principle CPB thinks the model may a good idea, but the implementation is problematic and should be fixed. The committee agrees that the governance structure needs work and next year's CPB should take this up with the VCIT.

Consultation with EVC Kliger, Dean Thorsett and Physics Chair Belanger

The committee and guests discussed the two physics requests. Responding to a question from CPB, Dean Thorsett said the department has not started negotiations with either of the potential hires, so they do not have start up estimates. The Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics (SCIPP) holds four state funded adjunct positions, all are quite senior. Three of the four are close to retirement. Dean Thorsett and Chair Belanger both feel the candidate would emerge to the top in an open search. The department needs a mid career candidate for eventual retirement of the SCIPP director because resources do not allow for a higher level search. It is expected that once the new hire is here there will be a one

year overlap with the current SCIPP director. Both the dean and chair acknowledged that diversity in the department is a big issue. In the open search there were three applicants from underrepresented groups, none of which rose to the top.

Consultation with Acting Dean Isaacson and Chair Berman

Acting Dean Isaacson explained that the BME candidate proposed for a TOE is a dry lab scholar, who does computational work. CPB asked about the need for a BSL3 level facility, which is the highest and most resource intensive level, and Chair Berman said he didn't think that is necessary. The EVC added that he can not see the campus having resources for a BSL3.

Acting Dean Isaacson said if they ran an open search they would not find anyone of this caliber. This is a unique window of opportunity; the candidate already has offers at Maryland and Irvine.

Consultation with EVC Kliger

Following the consultations with the deans about CPB's review of FTE requests, EVC Kliger informed the committee that a recent meeting all divisional the deans expressed concern over CPB consultation. The deans are concerned that CPB's request to get department votes and departments plans about their requests indicates the committee has no confidence in the deans. The EVC suggested a consultation in the fall establishing what CPB wants to review so there is no misunderstanding later. It was agreed that requesting this information now is essentially a change to the process.

Consultation with Planning Director Robin Draper and Planning and Construction Director John Barnes

Director Draper providing an update on the 2008-09 master capital budget. The campus still does not have a target for the 2009-14 Master Capital Improvement Plan (MCIP). The worst case scenario is that the target will only be 105 million dollars, which is the same as last year. In the absence of a target amount, the Advisory Committee on Facilities (ACF) has been discussing what they see are the full space needs necessary to meet the strategic academic plan when the campus reaches its near term enrollment numbers. The consensus at ACF is the next academic building should be the full Social Sciences facility at 50,000 square feet.

The plan also includes a placeholder for the associated infrastructure project that is an extension of Chinquapin Road. This would be the first north campus project. CPB noted that the estimate seemed extremely low for such a project and Director Barnes indicated that a full financial analysis for planning and constructing the project had not been done. CPB noted that b/c a comprehensive site plan has not been done for the campus, but only for sections, so it is impossible to know if a north campus extension is necessary or if growth to build out can be accommodated by infill.

In terms of planning for academic adjacencies Planning and Construction wants to think about how to reinforce those academic centers, but Director Barnes said that siting at UCSC is challenging. Planning and Construction has considered many sites for the new

Social Sciences building. Director Barnes added that one thing to consider is 50 or 100 years from now there will be multiple buildings in the north campus. While one may solve today's problem by building the Social Sciences building somewhere such as on the Communications Building site, there is only room for one building.

Planning on Budget plans to embark on an area plan for Social Sciences in the fall, which ideally takes one year to complete. By spring 2009 they should have site plans.

Planning and Construction has not done a site analysis on the north campus. CPB asked about the elevation of the north campus and the issue of isolating Social Sciences. Director Barnes responded that he does not think it is very steep, and eventually there will be other buildings there.

CPB asked why Silicon Valley is in the plan. Director Draper explained that the Office of the President (OP) gave the campus an extra 20 million dollars for a Silicon Valley center. OP is threatening to take away the money, if planning is not moving forward. The campus does not want to jeopardize the funding by taking it out of the window.