

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of October 23, 2008

Present: Gildas Hamel, Lori Kletzer, Herbie Lee, David Marriott, Cindy Pease-Alvarez, Grant Pogson, Quentin Williams, Kevin Schlaufman and Mary-Beth Harhen

Absent: Chair Susan Gillman, Amy Beal, Piero Madau (with notice)

Guests: CPEVC Kliger

In Chair Gillman's absence Vice Chair Herbie Lee led the CPB meeting

Members Items

Senate Chair Williams attended the Academic Council meeting and provided the following update.

The Office of the President (OP) faculty salary plan is officially on hold. Mid year budget cuts are now expected in addition to cuts next year. At this point a mid year cut of 33.1 million dollars is expected. Two internal mandates that were funded this year are 10 million dollars in graduate student support and ten million dollars to the California Institute of Science and Innovation. This was made possible by cuts to labor funding by the governor and a ten percent cut to various other programs. This seems to be a reallocation of the UC budget by the legislature.

President Yudof and the council discussed 2009-10 enrollments. The council asked how to make it clear to the legislature that campuses are suffering due to the additional students who are unfunded. President Yudof said that the political ramifications of freezing enrollments are too great, and UC will take the enrollments. CPB expressed great concern over this, and would like to know how the chancellors responded to President Yudof's statement.

Pre Consultation for Vice Chancellor University Relations Donna Murphy

CPB discussed the upcoming consultation and determined the committee would like to be updated on the most recent version of the comprehensive campaign priorities, a tentative timeline moving towards the silent launch of campaign, how University Relations plans to react and respond to the results of the feasibility study, and what the plans are for the appropriate level of staffing for launching the campaign. CPB would also like to know if University Relations is receiving the support it needs from the academic side of the campus, and if not can the Senate help with the process.

Report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate

Under the California Master Education Plan, Cal State was configured as a more vocationally, practically oriented enterprise. Historically UC received a higher amount of money per capita from the state because of its research component. The statement on

doctorate being UC only extended for all doctorates. The dilemma that comes in is that if Cal State wants to justify more funding per student, providing doctorates will help. Currently CSU can offer a doctorate in Education. UC feels it must maintain its hold on research oriented doctorate, but if they are areas that UC deems less important it should work with UC. There is an attempt to come up with a more academic approach to who gets what degree title.

CPB agrees that intersegmental coordination is lacking, and UC and CSU should get together to create new programs or invigorate old ones. There are serious resource questions that are not addressed in the report. The committee is in broad agreement with the report overall.

Consultation with EVC Kliger

The EVC provided CPB with an update on the 2009-10 faculty recruitment letter, which he should have to CPB by early November for committee review.

The EVC expects the mid year campus budget cut to be between 1.8 and 2 million dollars. He also expects cuts for the following two years. The campus has been informed by OP that there will not be any faculty or staff salary increases this year, other than things that were negotiated through bargaining agreements. There will be money for merit increases, but the four year OP salary program has been deferred and there will not be any cost of living increases.

Next the committee and the EVC discussed the possibility of mid year changes to the 2008-09 recruiting plans. The EVC stated that President Yudof has talked about a soft hiring freeze on the staff side and that the Council of Vice Chancellors' (COVC) meeting there was a discussion regarding a current year hiring freeze. Both the committee and CPB agreed that the campus is not ready to do that at this point, and what is really important is reassess campus goals and priorities and make sure that the 2009-10 recruitment plans meet those criteria.

CPB and the EVC commented on the previous week's Silicon Valley site visit. CPB felt the visit was informative, but too rushed. Also the committee would have liked to learn more about the overall infrastructure, and questioned the value of the distance learning. The committee agreed that once the lease is signed, they will request more detailed information.

Campus Unit Deficits

Following the October 9 CPB discussion on campus units deficits, Chair Gillman drafted a letter to EVC Kliger requesting an accounting of all income and expenditures for the Arboretum, Shakespeare Santa Cruz, and the transit fee. In addition CPB requested the deficit reduction plan for the Arboretum, Shakespeare Santa Cruz's plan for increasing revenues.

External Review Charge Discussion

Feminist Studies

CPB expressed concern over the lack of a self study. Due to separations the previous external review is no longer relevant. CPB questioned whether the department should be maintained as an entity. The committee also had questions about the status of the previously proposed graduate program, how the department has progressed since the last review, the perceived lack of leadership, and why a department would not produce a self study.

Film and Digital Media

CPB discussed what they viewed as fundamental issues that need to be addressed such as the problems with the Digital Arts and New Media (DANM) problem. Also, space continues to be an issue and resources are a concern. The previous dean's promise to purchase the department new equipment was not kept. How is the department maintaining equipment without resources?

History

There is an issue about history as a satellite department hosting an umbrella of issues. In the previous report there was mention of public history. The review committee questioned why the department didn't focus on that area. This report did not mention the issue. The pressing question is one of expansion, the department wants to increase to a more critical mass and increase their National Research Council (NRC) ranking. How does the department plan to do that in terms of FTE and funding?