

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of November 3, 2011

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

Absent: Sriram Shastry

Guest: EVC Galloway, VCPB Delaney

1. Announcements

The minutes of 10/27/11 were approved.

Chair Westerkamp reported on the recent UCPB meeting, including a lively discussion on rebenching. Many representatives at UCPB were just learning the scope of the inequities and the proposals to meet them. The conversation will be continued at the next meeting.

UCPB also discussed APM-668, Negotiated Salary Plan. Most campuses echoed CPB's sentiments and concerns, and are opposed to the proposal.

2. Member's Items

A member raised the issue of instructor evaluations moving online, with elimination of the scantron forms possibly as early as next quarter. There is concern in his department that the new system will not only negatively impact the response rates, but will oversample extreme viewpoints.

This led to a general discussion of effective Senate consultation. The Committee on Teaching has been working on the online evaluation issue for several years, and the administration has been pushing online evaluations asserting that the processing of scantrons is cost prohibitive and labor intensive. CPB decided to add this item to the list of questions for the VPDUE at next week's consultation.

Chair Gillman announced that there is a Senate meeting next Wednesday, in Stevenson Event Center.

3. APM-668 Negotiated Salaries

CPB discussed their draft response to the Negotiated Salaries proposal. The draft letter was approved for submission.

4. SR610 – Residency

CPB discussed the proposed amendments to SR 610 which seeks to add language that would expressly permit students to be recognized as “resident” on the basis of their enrollment in an approved University of California program of study without regard to their physical location. CPB members noted the various situations in which this type of flexibility is truly necessary for students who may not be able to complete their degree otherwise.

From a resource perspective, CPB sees no problem with the proposal. Members on the committee have concerns about credit transfers and the process of online course approval, but acknowledge that these issues are in the purview of CEP or the Committee on Teaching.

Chair Westerkamp will draft a response letter to that effect.

5. Draft Charge for Art Department External Review

CPB discussed the supplemental questions to be included in the draft charge for the Art Department External Review.

A question was raised about conflict of interest at the level of decanal review when it is the Dean’s department. CPB’s understanding is that the Dean does not participate in the review at the department level.

CPB noted the following issues that should be addressed by the External Review Committee: counting of courses and faculty workload distribution, resource implications of a proposed student portfolio review, faculty hiring in the department including geographic diversity, reliance on the Visiting Artist program, a proposed senior hire vis-à-vis current department demographics (no junior faculty) and the relation of the proposed M.F.A. to the upper division curriculum.

CPB will forward their questions to the Dean for inclusion in the Charge to the External Review Committee.

6. Consultation with EVC Galloway

The search for the next Provost of UC is getting underway, but the EVC does not have much information on the status of the search.

CPB asked EVC Galloway about the upcoming WASC review. She suggested that we talk to VPAA Lee for more details on the process and challenges.

CPB has discovered a difficulty in consulting on administrative proposals that cross several years, and wanted to know the EVC’s thoughts on shared governance in regard to long range, multi-year planning. The EVC and VCPB both agreed that consultation procedures could be approved across the board, and that turnover amongst Senate Committees (and administrators) can cause lags and gaps in the decision-making process.

Regarding administrative proposals, the EVC felt that the framing of the question is important. For example, instead of asking, “What do you think of this change?” the question

posed could be “We have to make this change—how can we make the implementation smooth for your department/unit?” CPB also suggested that the Senate Executive Committee take on a stronger role in assigning committees to review issues.

7. Post-Consultation

Chair Gillman has heard from several former senate committee members that the Course Time Slots proposal is not contextualized as it was when it was informally presented to committees last year.

CPB discussed how overarching issues such as the Course Time-Slots proposal and online evaluations should be communicated to the larger campus community and how to best deal with issues that cross years. There was a general sense among some members in CPB that more issues that come to the Senate need to be pushed out to departments for comment.

8. Student Recusal Policies

Chair Westerkamp raised an issue regarding student participation in discussions regarding faculty personnel issues. The students had no objections to recusing themselves for personnel discussions.

9. Pre-consultation for Convener of Council of Provosts and VPDUE

CPB discussed the draft questions for the upcoming consultations with Helen Shapiro, the Convener of the Council of Provosts and Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education.

One member suggested posing the question regarding Core Courses to the Convener of Provosts, rather than the VPDUE. CPB agreed to pose the question to *both* parties, as they may have different, but relevant, perspectives on the issues.

Another member suggested that since the Convener is not a regular visitor to CPB, we should invite her to come with questions for CPB.

CPB members had the following additions to the consultation questions for the visit of VPDUE Hughey:

- What are his plans for attracting and retaining nonresident students? What resources are being dedicated to these efforts?
- What is his strategy to address the retention problem? When will CPB be receiving the Retention Report?
- What is his view of the curricular review process, and the status of major mapping?
- What is the role of Regents scholarships in the Honors programs?
- What are his thoughts on the advising structure at UCSC?

A discussion emerged about some of the flaws and limitations of our current advising structure. The advising that occurs at the department level seems to be adequate in most departments, but the advising at the college level, before students declare a major, could be improved, and

improving this system may have a positive impact on retention rates. The coordination of advising at the college and departmental levels could be better.

One member remembered when faculty were tapped at the college level to advise a cohort of first-year students, and that the students were not allowed to enroll in courses for the next quarter until they had met with their faculty advisor.

It was also suggested that CPB resume our investigation of the “Total Cost to the Student.”