

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of October 11, 2007**

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

**Absent:** Karen Ottemann (with notice)

**Guests:** EVC Dave Kliger, AVC AHR Pamela Peterson, Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele, Dean Sheldon Kamieniecki, Acting Dean Margaret Morse, Chair Rodney Ogawa and VC Meredith Michaels

**Member Items**

CPB discussed the October 10 Professional Schools Forum. The committee is pleased with the exchange of information and agrees there is much more work to be done. Many questions remain unanswered but the committee is hopeful that pre-proposals will address these issues. CPB decided that a professional schools subcommittee is necessary to help guide the larger process and move forward with next steps. Michael Brown, Emily Honig and Lori Kletzer agreed to serve on the subcommittee.

**President Dynes Pre Consultation**

Based on President Dynes's request to meet with faculty to discuss the long range planning process at the University of California (UC), CPB agreed to only have CPB members present at the November 1 consultation. CPB noted that VPAA Galloway has been invited to attend the November 1 Senate Executive Committee consultation with the president.

During an initial discussion CPB developed the following questions for President Dynes:

- How do the president and OP invest differentially in campuses? What is his view of the funding differential necessary to ensure the success of campuses at different levels of development: mature, maturing, and nascent campuses?
- Capital planning funding is a particularly serious problem for our still growing campus. What are the capital funding priorities for UC, and what should UCSC expect in terms of funding in upcoming years? What innovative strategies, in addition to fundraising, would you suggest?
- The UCSC administration is currently working to link academic, budgetary and capital planning on our campus. How does this coincide with or diverge from the system wide effort?
- UCOP funding for develop and related activities at UCSC in 2006-07 was \$1.3 million. What is the rationale for this support of individual campus fundraising? What is the underlying system wide policy for assisting campuses in their fundraising goals? (This is another issue of differential investment.)
- What is the president's view of UCSC's potential role in Silicon Valley?

- What is the president's philosophy on bringing together the UC priorities of enrollment targets with eligibility reform? What is the status of the system wide matching funds for scholarships?
- What is the president's view of how to balance state priorities with criteria used in national rankings? Diversity, for example, is a state priority that is not considered in national AAU or NRC rankings.

### **Consultation with Dean Van Den Abbeele**

With CPB member Emily Honig recusing herself, Chair Gillman began by stating that while it appears this is a well justified transfer, CPB has a number of questions about the health of the Feminist Studies program. CPB questioned the Dean about his strategy for maintaining the department. Dean Van Den Abbeele described his divisional strategy of building up the four classic disciplinary departments. These departments are strikingly small in relation to their counterparts at other UC's. Because the smallest departments in the division (Feminist Studies, American Studies and History of Consciousness) rely on affiliated faculty, strengthening the four disciplinary departments will actually make the others stronger and build better divisional support. There are other campuses that have very large history departments (90 FTE) and only one fulltime feminist studies faculty member. He did not recommend this as a strategy but to illustrate that that it is a viable model. On our campus the Feminist Studies department has an excellent track record, and the dean feels it can operate with a small core faculty and a substantial number of affiliates. Ideally he would like eight FTE in Feminist Studies but with this proposed transfer there will only be four remaining. With one additional FTE replacement, the department will return to five and the dean does not want to go below that.

The dean is crafting better guidelines and protocols for FTE transfers for his division. There has to be some programmatic value added in the shift and some leveraging of resources.

Responding to a question from CPB, the dean said that he does not see the evolution of Feminist Studies, American Studies and History of Consciousness moving toward joining on a graduate group model. He acknowledged that while the three departments tend to get clustered together, they do not work on the same areas. He envisions a significant number of faculty affiliated with the departments and reminded CPB that Feminist Studies was founded by faculty who came from other departments.

### **Consultation with EVC Kliger, Dean Kamieniecki, Chair Ogawa, Acting Dean Morse and AVC AHR Peterson**

The consultation began with discussion of the Arts FTE replacement recruitment. Acting Dean Morse explained that HAVC needs to recruit two faculty in the area of Asian arts. This is a strength of the department needed to balance the western focus of the department. Recruiting the two together will maximize already limited faculty time. The Arts department also has a vacancy in architecture. CPB understands that at the moment no ladder rank faculty teach in architecture and questioned the acting dean about that

search. The dean is unsure about its status but will investigate the issue and get back to CPB.

CPB and the dean briefly discussed the lack of Arts representation on CPB. Acting Dean Morse acknowledged that CPB is important but explained that the Arts faculty is stretched very thin at this point. The acting dean agreed that in order to help fill the CPB gap, she will attend regular consultations.

Next CPB consulted with Dean Kamienicki and Chair Ogawa on the Education change in focus. Chair Ogawa explained that the position will play a principal role in elementary school training. CPB expressed concern over a perceived lack of collaboration between education and other departments and divisions such as the School of Engineering (SOE). Chair Ogawa agreed collaboration is important, that it is being developed in some areas and that his department is very interested in doing more.

### **Faculty Salaries**

EVC Kliger and AVC AHR Peterson proved CPB with a handout which included principles, options, and 2007-08 estimated costs for the faculty salary increases. EVC Kliger asked CPB to consider the following:

- What are the factors that should be determine when to market adjust unfilled faculty FTE?
- What information is needed to help make these decisions?

CPB inquired if faculty who have small or no off-scale salaries are being rewarded more by the new scales. The EVC responded that there are going to be faculty who are more or less advantaged but there is no way that could have been avoided. Eighty percent of the faculty system wide is off scale, and this is a system wide plan to address the problem.

CPB determined a number of questions to be answered before it can move forward with the discussion. CPB requested VC Michaels compile the following information:

- How are open positions used at the divisional and central levels?
- What is the ratio of personnel to non personnel use?
- Curriculum leave over a specific period?
- Historically how has each division used their turnover savings?
- What are the different scenarios, assumptions of what might happen the next two to four years?
- Positions for ongoing programmatic needs?

CPB stressed the need for a four year funding plan which OP has yet to develop. CPB commented that it will be very difficult to address this issue without the long term plan.

### **University Extension (UNEX)**

Chair Gillman noted the three UNEX areas CPB is tracking: leadership issues and administrative structure, financials and increasing revenue, and the integration of UNEX into larger Silicon Valley Planning.

The administration is scheduled to provide the Senate with a UNEX update and plan at the November 9 Senate meeting. CPB understands that UNEX has closed the Humanities and Arts programs but there is still an extremely large deficit. CPB notes that UCSC faculty need to be better informed of the differences between Silicon Valley, UNEX and a school of management (SOM). While UNEX does not grant degrees, for example, the SOM would do so, and Silicon Valley is simply a physical space. CPB is eager to review the administrative plan and timeline for UNEX. This will be an agenda item for CPB after the Senate meeting.

### **Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 636 Writing Cap**

CPB agreed that in theory it supports this proposal but still has questions regarding funding and how it will be implemented. The general principle of lowering the cap to 20 students per section for all is pedagogically sound for all the reasons enumerated in the document. But for Santa Cruz there are two key caveats.

For the Santa Cruz campus, where the ELWR is satisfied by examination (for which the course is a support mechanism), the language of the proposed amendment will need to be altered to incorporate the distinction between fulfilling the ELWR by course and/or by examination.

On the lack of funding that has prevented UCEP from endorsing the proposed amendment: a nearly complete cost analysis conducted by the UCSC CEP indicates that funding for the reduced cap should not be a problem for our campus. Overall, however, funding for the new cap will require analysis and consideration of the differential costs associated with the various models used on the campuses to satisfy ELWR.