

**Minutes - Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB)
March 31, 2011**

The Committee on Planning and Budget met on March 31, 2011, from 8:30am-12pm, in 307 Kerr Hall.

Present: Brent Haddad, Chair, Robert Boltje, Susan Gillman, Joe Konepelski, Sriram Shastry, Gene Switkes, Lynn Westerkamp, Erik Green (GSA), Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Stephanie Casher (ASO).
Absent: Patty Gallagher (participated via conference call for first half of meeting), Andy Szasz

Guests: EVC Galloway, VCPB Delaney, IR Director Fernald

Members Items

The DANM lead reviewer provided a report on DANM's second closure meeting. Moving forward, DANM is faced with three options – being subsumed into another dept; becoming its own dept; or becoming an Interdisciplinary Graduate Program (IGP). Eventually they would like to move to a 3-year MFA. Chair Sack is going to focus on strengthening research in the program, so they can fund students through TAships and GSRships.

CPB promised a report to the Senate on the Retirement Plan at the next Senate meeting. UCPB is taking the lead on data collection. Chair Haddad will attend the UCPB meeting next week and hopefully have a draft of CPB's report soon.

Senate Chair Gillman attended the Academic Council meeting. Yudof's budget people reported that they were working on a Plan B scenario in case tax extensions don't make it onto the November ballot. Yudof is planning on the assumption that state support will be minimal. Most plans include annual tuition increases, and staff and faculty merit increases.

Consultation with VCPB Delaney and IR Director Fernald on Retention Data

Director of Institutional Research & Policy Studies, Julian Fernald, gave CPB an overview of the retention data and a tutorial on how to read and interpret the various charts and graphs. Some statistics of interest:

- Graduation in six years is the national standard
- UCSC has been having an upward trend in graduation rates
- Our graduation rate is strongly related to our retention rate in Year 1
- For underrepresented students, the transition away from colleges, into the majors, seems to have a relationship to retention.
- The later a student declares a major, the less likely they are to graduate.
- Our first year retention rates are comparable to other institutions... Our 6 year graduation rate lags behind everyone except UC Riverside.

Interesting stat: In the predictive vs. actual graduation rate chart, our underrepresented groups are actually graduating at higher rates than predicted.

UCSC seems to do a good job with social integration, but could probably do better with academic advising and preparation.

It appears that UCSC's *problem* is that we are enrolling a large number of students who are not likely to graduate. We are also seeing an underperformance of our most highly qualified students.

Many of the students transferring out of UCSC are transferring to other UCs and graduating. This could be due to greater opportunities (i.e. a Medical School), or a perception that another UC is more 'prestigious.'

CPB would like to look more into the question – “What are the on-campus ‘predictors of departure’?” Director Fernald shared that Planning and Budget is also looking at patterns of engagement.

A member wondered how much of the retention issue could be attributed to financial issues. Director Fernald responded that it's hard to say, because this data is very difficult to obtain and track. The financial aid piece is probably a lot bigger than we realize, but in the absence of data, it's hard to know for sure.

Planning and Budget is also gathering data on student satisfaction with value of education vs. cost of attending... UCSC is doing poorly on the satisfaction statistic... Course impaction and difficulty getting into classes has to be affecting this. Planning and Budget will be preparing a white paper on the UCUSE satisfaction survey.

One issue that comes up a lot is the availability of Honors programs and Honors level tracks (UCSC doesn't have one). Does this cause high-achieving students to leave?

Another member asked if there was an Exit survey for students leaving? Should UCSC formalize this procedure?

Consultation with EVC Galloway

- Budget plans are due from the Principal Officers today, and she will make sure they filter down to the Senate in a timely manner.
- Her office is interested in assessing UC and UCSC policies and processes that might not be useful or efficient.
- Re: Faculty Salaries... the data out of CAP shows that we seem to be making progress in this area. Unfortunately these gains are not being reflected in the CPEC data. We will be continuing the accelerated augmentation program for Junior faculty into next year.

- The searches and reviews in process are moving forward. Depending on the size of the applicant pool, May could be a very interview-heavy month, so CPB should set aside time for this.

CPB raised an issue about Presidential PostDocs (five-year tenure track position + start-up funded by UCOP) being turned down at the Divisional level because Deans are uncomfortable committing to funding the position beyond the fifth year. EVC Galloway responded that those issues don't usually float to her level, because it really is in the purview of the Deans. However, a statement from CPB about the importance of this program could be useful to keep this issue on everyone's collective radar. For example, Presidential PostDocs were created to increase numbers of underrepresented faculty. This could possibly help some of our retention issues.

CPB also asked for clarification on the amended Arts faculty recruitment request.

Faculty Recruitment Requests

CPB discussed the draft response to the Divisional Faculty Recruitment requests. CPB decided to add a sentence encouraging departments to consider hiring Presidential PostDocs to augment faculty size.

CPB also wants to draw attention to the administrative commitment to Engineering to cover the salary upgrades for specific provisions through 2014. CPB acknowledges the special provisions made for Engineering by EVC Kliger, but recommends that no further augmentations beyond those promised through 2014 be granted. Also, why is Engineering receiving a subsidy, when divisions like the Humanities, who could greatly benefit from a subsidy, are not being helped out at all?

CPB also updated the letter to reflect their thoughts on the amended Arts recruitment request that was received on 3/29/11.

Community Studies

CPB discussed the various actions regarding the Community Studies department, namely the requests to:

- Disestablish the department of Community Studies
- Transfer the Administrative Oversight of the Social Documentation MA program from Community Studies to Film and Digital Media
- Transfer the FTEs of John Leanos, B. Ruby Rich, and Renee Tajima Pena from Community Studies to Film and Digital Media
- Transfer the FTE of Marcia Ochoa from Community Studies to Feminist Studies

CPB identified the most critical issues as:

- Possible loss of a popular undergraduate major
- Rights and intellectual future of two remaining faculty

Chair Haddad will draft CPB's response, for continued discussion at the next meeting.

Master Capital Improvement Plan

CPB reviewed the Master Capital Improvement Plan materials, to prepare for next week's consultation with Robin Draper, Director of Capital Planning and Space Management.

One CPB member wanted to draw attention to the plans to go forward with planning for Social Sciences 3 and several classroom buildings. While the advancing of projects is sometimes strategic to get it into the Bond queue, we need to look closely at what kinds of campus funds these projects may require in the near-term. CPB members were directed to the 'CPS February 15' document for more information.

CPB should also look closely at the phasing of proposed Capital projects. (See 'CPS Jan 18 2011 agenda item 6.pdf')

Also, in looking at the "Total Cost to Student" numbers, some of these capital projects to build/renovate additional student housing will increase the cost to student over a number of years, but those funds will not be flowing back to departments to support the academic mission. Who makes the call of what is more important to preserve – housing options or quality of education?

One member also was curious about how is Family Student Housing funded.

Questions for Director Draper next week:

- Where is the funding going to come from for these proposed projects? What are the numbers looking like?
- How are these proposed capital projects related to our agreement with the City of Santa Cruz to house a certain percentage of UCSC students? Is our building still tied to enrollments?
- What is the likelihood of getting bond funding, and under what schedule?

The meeting adjourned at 12pm.

So Attests,

Brent Haddad, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget