

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of October 13, 2011

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

Guest: EVC Galloway

1. Routine Business

A few members suggested some clarifications to the minutes. The 10/6/11 minutes will be revised and submitted for approval at the 10/20/11 meeting.

2. Announcements

At SEC, the CFW Chair made a presentation about their faculty salary study, and initiated a discussion about faculty merits. One preliminary observation is that our salary structure seems to encourage people to look for outside offers, creating a culture that can be disruptive and detrimental to departments.

3. ITS External Review Response

CPB noted that in the consult with the EVC last week, she indicated that the VC IT would not be providing a written response to the ITS External Review. CPB would like to see administrative responses incorporated into the process of External Reviews for Administrative Units (along with a closure letter from the EVC), and will write to a letter to EVC Galloway to that effect.

The draft response to the ITS External Review was approved for distribution.

4. BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal

CPB reviewed the draft response to the BOARS proposal. The draft letter was approved for distribution.

5. Future Consultations

During preconsultation for the visit of EVC Galloway, a set of issues emerged regarding the Student Affairs realignment. CPB identified two individuals they would like to invite to CPB for consultation in the near future.

VPDUE Hughey

- Priorities for the year
- Thoughts on class times proposal
- Thoughts on the Writing Program
- Plans for the Honors program
- Compensation for faculty teaching during summer session

- College Core Courses... what is the role of colleges in the first year, and the transition for students into departments. What is the financial impact on colleges to offer core courses?

Convener of the Council of Provosts

- How are the colleges responding to the realignment?
- How are their concerns being navigated?

6. Consultation with EVC Galloway

CPB asked EVC Galloway her thoughts on the Course Time-Slots proposal. She has not made a decision on this yet, and can see pros and cons to the proposal. She looks forward to Senate input on this issue. She did note that due to campus scheduling patterns, the soonest it could be implemented is two years. CPB also asked if the Classroom Auditorium building was factored into the Classroom Utilization studies. EVC Galloway responded that it is uncertain when any of our building projects will be able to move forward due to the budget situation. EVC Galloway also does not expect enrollments to decrease in coming years.

One member asked about the way space is calculated at OP (i.e. the way aggregate square footage is used to calculate instructional space, irrespective of individual classroom sizes), and if there was any way to push back on the formula, which disadvantages UCSC. EVC Galloway responded that they have been trying, but without much success.

CPB inquired if there was any more information on Summer Session. It is the EVC's understanding that summer session will remain with the VPDUE. The intent is to involve the departments more in the planning and determining what courses are necessary for the curriculum, rather than just putting forward courses that the graduate students/lecturers/faculty want to teach.

One member raised the question of the relationship between summer enrollment and time to degree. It was noted that resources during the summer are limited (library, computer labs, shuttle service), so courses taken during the summer are not necessarily on par with those offered during the academic year.

CPB asked about the EVC's priorities for the VPDUE's office. EVC Galloway's top priority is addressing the retention problem. There is also a need for internal restructuring within the VPDUE's office to accommodate the additional functions assigned to his office.

Another priority is receiving HSI status. We are currently at 23.3% Hispanic-identified students. We only need 25% to qualify as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), which will give us access to a wide range of grant opportunities.

Responding to a question about how the Student Affairs realignment is resonating at the college level, the EVC commented that she has not met with the Provosts yet, but things seem to be going well.

CPB asked about which unit was up next for an administrative review. The Office of Research was slated to be next, but due to other pressing projects, and the unit being short-staffed, this might not be the best time. The EVC is trying to decide if she should postpone the Office of Research review, or have another unit reviewed during the coming year. One possibility is to start the Office of Research off-cycle in the Spring 2012, do Planning and Budget in the 2012-2013, and then BAS the following year. The problem with doing the BAS review now is the current recruitment for a new Vice Chancellor of BAS, and a useful self-study may not be possible until that officer is in place.

In regard to Principal Officer responses to administrative reviews, EVC Galloway feels that rather than having POs respond to External Review reports, it may be more useful to have the POs respond with what they plan to do, and the changes they plan to make, based on the External Review recommendations. CPB was happy to hear that some sort of response will be incorporated into the formal review file.

7. Course Time-Slot Changes

The justification for the change is solely based on access to facilities, and there is no discussion of the implication for the academic mission. While sympathetic to the need for more access to larger classrooms, there are great concerns about the consequences of reduced class times on academic quality. One member stated that he did not feel he could deliver the content of his courses in a shorter time frame.

However, one member argued that the lack of large classrooms is a significant issue because it requires some faculty to have to teach in the evenings. But is it reasonable to change the practices campus-wide for a problem that affects a small portion of the population? Also, what would happen if student enrollments increase?

One metric missing from this discussion is the number of faculty. The problem is not just about student FTE, but also at the proportion of students spread across the divisions, in relation to the faculty FTE shrinkage, which would require some faculty to teach larger courses.

The comparative data supporting this proposal is somewhat flawed. One member looked at the curriculum at another campus for his department. For an equivalent course at UCLA, the same course was indeed taught in shorter course times, but taught across double time-slots.

Also, if courses are now going to be worth fewer credits for students, students will take longer to graduate.

At other campuses, students are taking four courses per quarter for 16 units, whereas at UCSC, they take three courses per quarter for 15 units. The difference between a 4-unit and 5-unit course is what justifies the additional teaching load. This important distinction is missing from the data provided in the proposal, and dramatically alters the hypothesis.

In short, the framing of these issues is strictly from a facilities perspective. The academic quality and faculty workload issues definitely need to be addressed by the relevant Senate committees. This seems a very major change to deal with a relatively small problem.

Lynn will draft CPB's response and circulate for comment.

8. APM 200 Policy and 205 Recall for Academic Appointees

CPB reviewed and discussed proposed revisions to APM-200 and the proposed new policy APM-205, Recall for Academic Appointees, which revise and clarify the existing policy for recalling retired academic appointees to active service in academic titles.

Regarding APM-200, CPB felt the distinction between quarter and semester system should be clarified.

CPB has no problem with the proposed new policy APM-205, Recall for Academic Appointees.