

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of October 25, 2007**

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

**Absent:** Kelvin Cen

**Guests:** EVC Dave Kliger, VC Meredith Michaels, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) Chair Richard Hughey, Dean Michael Isaacson

**Member Items**

The Chicano Research Center is sending a letter to the Social Sciences dean regarding the retention of Community Studies faculty member Paul Ortiz. While the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) is concerned about the potential loss of Professor Ortiz, the committee does not have the purview (or the requisite information) to intervene.

Chair Gillman confirmed the UCPB chair will attend academic council and represent his own view of the BOARS proposal, which may or may not reflect the committee view.

**BOARS UC Freshman Eligibility Reform**

CPB discussed whether or not the BOARS proposal should be on the agenda for the November 9 Senate meeting. The committee decided this is a Committee on Affirmative Action and Financial Aid (CAFA) issue and will ask the CAFA chair to consider a presentation at the Senate meeting.

Chair Gillman summarized CPB's opinion of BOARS' to date.

1. There are four separate pieces of the BOARS' proposal. Two are unobjectionable and could possibly even be considered good. The two other pieces have a set of domino effects that end in a lack of transparency in the admissions process as a whole. The BOARS' document is most murky with the shift of 12.5 percent to four percent guaranteed eligibility at the high school level. This seems to result in elimination of guaranteed admission unless the student is in the top four percent of their high school class. The proposal seems to be counter to UC's transparent planning process. Applications will not even know the mechanism by which they get into the system. CPB questions the differential effect of each of these changes.
2. CPB questions the budgetary implications for increased applications. Where is the money going to come from?

**Consultation with CAFA Chair Richard Hughey**

The topics of discussion with the CAFA chair were enrollment management and the BOARS' proposal. CPB began by asking the CAFA chair if he intends to put BOARS' on the November 8 Senate meeting agenda. The Chair Hughey responded that CAFA

will discuss the issue at its next meeting. They might consider putting the BOARS' proposal in the call as an information item.

CPB then asked Chair Hughey about the increasing eligibility in the local context component of the BOARS' proposal. CAFA has only had one discussion on the proposal. CAFA has asked Acting Director of Admissions Michael McCawly for data on some of the implications and will discuss the data at its next meeting. CPB and Chair Hughey discussed the difficulty in accessing the affects of the proposal as each piece is complicated in its own right. The proposal does not spend much time talking about the eligibility in the local context and admission by exception. Admission by exception is currently six percent by campus. Most campuses do not use their full six percent. UCSC does fairly well.

Next Chair Gillman explained what CPB is looking for in terms of enrollment management. CPB is thinking about academic capacity and academic excellence and trying to put undergraduate education in the mix. CPB is not looking for just a one time single measure. Chair Hughey said one of the biggest things he has noticed is the need to separate degrees and enrollments. This is based on a system where we have explicitly split these apart, as the School of Engineering (SOE) has done. SOE has analyzed how much capacity a standard program has and how real the actual enrollments are. SOE agreed on a formula how to allocate. The next effect is that it has individual departments, who operate very differently, looking at what they do positively. Chair Hughey will provide written information on the SOE formula to Chair Gillman.

### **Consultation with EVC Kliger**

The EVC presented the enrollment target templates developed by the Office of the President (OP). The EVC said the campus should be somewhat ambitious with the numbers but no be so unreasonable that the campus is not taken seriously. The EVC is not sure why some programs are broken out other than they may be areas that the state has identified those programs as areas of interest. The EVC asked CPB to review the templates and respond within two weeks.

### *Consultation with Acting Dean Isaacson*

CPB expressed uncertainty about the SOE space plans. SOE's space plan was based on what SOE could do if mathematics and all non academic units moved out of Baskin. Also, the SOE space needs are evolving from needing dry labs to wet labs. SOE tries to plan based on what they think their needs are but they really will not know for sure what faculty needs until they arrive on campus. CPB is concerned that the space plan is largely a set of contingencies based on certain events. There needs to be some level of contingency planning.

CPB and EVC Kliger had a brief conversation about Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA). There is still a question of whether COLAs are for base salaries versus entire salaries. The difference between base and entire salary is \$65,000.

*Enrollment post consultation conversation*

CPB would like to know what the enrollment numbers are based on and what instructions the deans have been given. It seems that there was little to know consultation with the exception of SOE. How do these projections fit within the FTE targets? How much is growth in brand new programs? How much is in incremental growth? Those are two very different ways of growing graduate programs.

**Auxiliary Support Units**

CPB discussed the auxiliary support unit document which was provided by VC Michaels. CPB expressed shock and concern over the University Inn deficit. In order for the University Inn to be financially viable it has to have 100 percent occupancy year round. Other campus unit deficits that CPB would like to continue to monitor are: Shakespeare, the Arboretum, new teacher center, transit fees and printing services. CPB will monitor those deficits and see if there are patterns the committee can identify.

**External Review Overview**

CPB usually adds a couple of questions to universal charges. CPB's real value added is at the closer point. To prepare to comment on the charge CPB members should read previous review closing comments and final report, the self study, charge and other available comments.

*History of Consciousness*

CPB found the dean and VPPA letters to be quite divergent. The VPAA letter indicated that there would not be any future searches based on the current financial situation. There is a terrible lack of clarity about resources which CPB would like to bring up. There are three areas where there are good ideas about what the department should do including: Faculty structure (hiring and the structure of participation in this unit), programmatic identity, and students (moral, courses and plan for curricular reform). There is a question about what mix of faculty are full dedicated FTE versus affiliated/associated faculty.