

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of May 24, 2012

Present: Lynn Westerkamp, *Chair*, Robert Boltje, David Draper, Patty Gallagher, Susan Gillman, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Deanna Shemek, Matthew Mednick, Committee Analyst, Mary-Beth Harhen, Senate Director

Absent: Daniel Friedman, Sriram Shastry, Andy Szasz, Valerie Poyner, GSA,
Jessica Greenstreet, SUA

Guests: VC BAS Valentino

Members Items

The committee approved the minutes of May 17.

Senate leadership met with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Tyrus Miller about how UCSC will address the aspirational growth goal of 12% graduate students (compared to undergraduate population) which is included in the rebenching implementation. The current version of the implementation assumes a six-year phase in period, which may not be long enough a time frame to achieve the 12% benchmark. Senate Chair Gillman clarified that the aspirational funding is based on the difference between the current graduate student enrollments and the 12% goal, with 1/6 of the difference in funding level provided annually each academic year. The meeting was very useful in defining the current level of graduate support and possible solutions for increasing graduate growth at a pace that will achieve the 12% goal.

Member Helmbold reported on new SIR data his department distributed. Specifically citing the growth in first generation students, students from low API high schools, lower SAT scores overall, and the growing gender gap between women and men. The committee discussed the overall selectivity of the campus as well as the growing applicant pool. The committee is aware of CAFA efforts to analyze the admissions profiles of the students that apply, are admitted, and who enroll at UCSC. In addition, Analyst Mednick will provide information as compiled by AVC Whittingham on overall campus demographics with the next CPB agenda.

Senate Chair Gillman reported on issues addressed at Academic Council including UC leadership focus on the ballot measure slated for the fall with some emphasis on the fact that the Regents have still not endorsed the ballot measures. Academic Council is working on revised language to clarify the somewhat vague language of the Memorial to the Regents. There have been changes made to the ballot measure that change the California tax code to lean more progressively. It is unclear what effect this change will have, but some hope it will make it more palatable to voters.

The committee briefly discussed [SCA 22](#) which is a bill which proposes to cap non-resident student admissions to UC at 10% systemwide and by campus.

Budget Reviews

CPB reviewed and discussed the budget cut proposals from the EVC and Planning & Budget. The committee discussed how variability in the information provided throughout the process as well as incomplete submittals have hindered their review. In particular, the committee remains concerned that CPB was not consulted on the budget request before it went out.

In addition, there was discussion of the varied types of analytical staff on campus, and the importance of providing adequate data to decision-makers on pending critical action areas such as retention, enrollment, curricular planning, academic progress, etc.

Consultation with VC BAS Valentino

CPB consulted with Interim Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services Valentino about specific areas of her large (recently grown) portfolio, following up on questions identified through the budget submission review process. Topics included: exemption from cuts for critical service areas, UCPATH implementation, staff resources including the Ombuds Office, Financial Affairs, use of one-time funds, and the recharge services funding model.

VC Valentino engaged with the committee in a fruitful dialogue both sharing her impressions of the Student Affairs realignment, and soliciting feedback on how the faculty view BAS' absorption of Housing and the Colleges. VC Valentino also spoke to a number of questions from the committee related to compliance and the campus climate of risk aversion. VC Valentino explained her methodology for taking cuts and how regulatory requirements, fiduciary responsibility, and public safety play a role in her considerations. Member Draper inquired about how UCSC measures against the other UCs in terms of overall risk aversion, its associated costs, and where the Vice Chancellor believes adjustments should be made.

Budgetary Principles

The committee reviewed its new principles as identified in this year's budget cycle. After some edits to clarify the language, the committee discussed at some length the role of these principles, and how they should be circulated to the principal officers for their review. Ultimately, the committee agreed the principles should be included as an appendix both to CPB's response on the budget cuts to the EVC, and potentially as an appendix to the EVC's request out at the beginning of the process.

There was discussion of the "shifting functions to appropriate fund sources" principle, which included interesting examples of both existing inappropriate uses of funding streams as well as funding models which could potentially empower functional areas while freeing up 19900 funding for appropriate academic uses.

Preliminary Critical Race & Ethnic Studies (CRES) Proposal

The committee reviewed the pre-proposal for CRES. Aside from some concerns regarding the need to establish long-term MOUs, the funding model for the CRES core courses, and the program's governance structure, CPB did not have much to comment on as the proposal does not include much resource information at this time.