

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of November 17, 2011**

**Present:** Lynn Westerkamp, Chair, Robert Boltje, David Draper, Daniel Friedman, Patty Gallagher, Susan Gillman, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Deanna Shemek, Sriram Shastry, Andy Szasz, Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Jessica Greenstreet (SUA), Stephanie Casher (ASO).

**Absent:** Alexander Hirsch (GSA)

**Guest:** EVC Galloway, VCPB Delaney,

**1. Announcements / Routine Business**

Senate leadership met with the VPAA. The WASC visit is in two years, and the bulk of preparation will occur next year.

Chair Gillman reported on the system wide discussions surrounding the handling of the Occupation movements by campus administrations and police. UCSC was one of campuses where protests remained peaceful.

SUA is creating the new classroom and course availability survey, and invites CPB to add any questions that they may feel useful.

CPB members suggested some revisions to the 11/10/11 minutes. Analyst Casher will revise the minutes and circulate for approval at a future meeting.

**2. Post-consultation with VPDUE**

The VPDUE is thinking about technological solutions to the advising problem, to increase the ability of students to self-advise. CPB feels it is important to realize that this is only *part* of the solution to the problem. Self-advising also hinges on revamping the AIS system, which will take time, and the advising problems really need to be addressed now.

The Chair of CEP will be producing a letter to departments outlining a timeline for major mapping (including short- and long- term tasks and activities). CPB agrees that the Senate (particularly CEP) should take the lead on this.

One member had questions about the VPDUE's plan to increase retention by two percentage points. CPB would like clarification on this point. What are the current retention rates? Are they trying to increase retention in the first year? After two years? CPB anxiously awaits the Retention Report, so they can work through the data themselves.

One member also wanted to push back on the VPDUE's claim that if the Colleges lack funding for Core, they should just pay for it themselves, like the departments do. The only academic budgets colleges uniformly manage are precisely for core courses, which are per-

student 19900 funds. Their gift funds resources, the magnitude of which varies extremely among the different colleges, are not intended to fund required campus curriculum.

CPB members expressed interest in looking more closely at the funding of the Colleges.

### **3. Language Program External Review**

CPB discussed the response to the Language Program External Review. There seems to be a disconnect between the long-term goals for growing the program and the immediate service need to provide language instruction. There is also a budgetary disconnect between the weaknesses of the programs that exist, and the ambitious plans for the future. What are the budgetary implications in the short term for providing language instruction to the campus?

CPB would like to see a statement on the role of language service courses on this campus and a commitment of resources to support this need. In EVC consultation, VCPB Delaney mentioned that there is an MOU between the VPDUE and Dean of Humanities that provides such a statement. Since the MOU was not included in the External Review materials, CPB asked VCPB Delaney to forward a copy of the MOU to CPB for review.

CPB will also ask that the language program faculty and Humanities Dean lay out a 3-5 year plan, under various budget scenarios, to be included in the midcycle report.

### **4. Consultation with EVC Galloway**

EVC Galloway informed CPB that recruitment plans are due back from the Deans in January. The Deans are being asked to lay out separations and possible retirements, recruitment plans, and anticipated areas of need.

Planning and Budget is hoping to release the final Retention Report after Thanksgiving. VPDUE Hughey is also putting together a Retention Task Force, and the draft slate will be submitted to COC soon.

CPB expressed concern that the ‘Major Mapping’ project should not be hijacked by WASC review. The Senate would like to create a strategy for departments to link major mapping to the WASC review process, and collaborate with the administration on developing a strategy and determining timelines. EVC Galloway is very supportive of this joint senate-administration effort.

### **5. Pre-consultation for Director of Admissions and AVC for Enrollment Management, Michelle Whittingham**

CPB generated a list of questions for the upcoming visit of Michelle Whittingham, Director of Admissions and AVC of Enrollment Management.

- What are her specific plans for increasing the number of nonresident students? What specific activities is her office engaged in?

- VPDUE Hughey mentioned that two people have been hired to assist with this task – how are they doing, and what are the metrics for success? What other resources are being made available?
- Describe the outreach and activities aimed at increasing Hispanic enrollments? How close are we to reaching HSI status?
- How has the transition been from moving out of Student Affairs? How have operations changed? What has the impact been post-transition? Are you getting the necessary support from the VPDUE's office?
- Can you explain to the committee the functions of Enrollment Management? What data do they regularly track in the Enrollment Management?
- Can you give us an orientation on the Financial Aid packages available to UCSC students? How are financial aid packages put together? What are the eligibility guidelines? What are her expectations with the multi-year increases in tuition?
- What is the process for targeting/recruiting in-state students? How is the holistic review process going, and how successful is it? What selection criteria are we using that is different than other campuses, and why? Is there any connection between recruitment criteria and future academic success? Is there any comparison data?
- Can you comment on the BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal?
- What are some of the issues unique to transfer students?

## **6. Community Studies Disestablishment Proposal**

In Spring 2011, CPB first discussed the proposal to disestablish the Community Studies department. In a memo dated April 15, 2011, CPB declined to respond to the proposal until they received additional information. The requested material has now arrived, so CPB resumed its discussion of the proposal to disestablish the department.

CPB agrees that the Community Studies undergraduate major is highly distinctive, one of the few majors on campus that offers research opportunities in social change. Community Studies also has the potential to integrate with many future initiatives, such as the office of Undergraduate Research, the Extraordinary Student Experience, and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies.

CPB supports the reinstatement of a vibrant, and viable major. The question CPB wrestles with is: does a major require a departmental base?

CPB does not feel they can consider the disestablishment of the department in the absence of a plan to continue the major. CPB would like to direct the planners to look at other interdisciplinary models and alternative structures on campus for ideas on how to reconstitute the major.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.