

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of February 28, 2013**

**Present:** Lynn Westerkamp (Chair), Zsuzsanna Abrams, Sue Carter, David Draper, Daniel Friedman, David Helmbold, Susan Schwartz, Don Brenneis, Auralee Walmer (SUA), Matthew Mednick (ASO) Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO)  
**Absent:** E.G. Crichton, Susan Harding, Joe Konopelski, Valerie Poyner (GSA)  
**Guests:** CPEVC Galloway, VCPB Delaney

**Member's Items:**

Chair Westerkamp and Senate Vice-Chair Brenneis reported on the February 26, 2013 CAB/SEC meeting at which they consulted on international recruitment and yield efforts. SEC was concerned with the low enrollment goals identified by the VPDUE and with the overall appearance of a relatively disorganized scattering of efforts rather than a specific implementation of a targeted plan. Seemingly, the responsibility for these yield efforts have been spread across a number of offices. Further discussion on this issue will take place at the March 8, 2013 Senate meeting, which will hopefully spark additional discussion and concern for this critical issue.

Member Helmbold reported that his draft of the Ambassador Fellowship proposal has been revised, and CPB will review the changes at the next meeting, after which it will be circulated to the other related Senate committees.

CPB discussed the recently received response from the University Librarian. Primarily, the feedback disputed CPB's assertion that the sunset on the student measure supporting library hours was not intended to lapse. CPB referred to the CPEVC's memo to COLASC Chair Manduchi of March 28, 2011 which explicitly supports CPB's position:

*"I (CPEVC Galloway) respect COL's position on the issue of student support of library hours. As you know, we have set aside some funds to reconfigure current library space to accommodate longer study hours for students with less staffing. We expect to have this in place by the sunset date on the student-approved Measure 42. I am grateful for the student support but do not anticipate their measure being the solution for the long term."*

**Financial Aid**

CPB reviewed the systemwide financial aid proposals. The committee found the document opaque and difficult to decipher the differences between scenarios, especially in light of the multiple levels of assumptions which change the financial landscape which will be implemented for all of the proposed changes. The absence of background detail or financial implications makes taking a strong position difficult. CPB was strongly supportive of the plan to develop or use a more accurate measure of student financial need. This change will free up resources for those who need them most by more accurately distributing aid. It is worth noting that the

implementation of Blue & Gold “Light” will lessen the impact on those families who are moved up the income scale due to newly available data.

Senate Chair Konopelski and Member Helmbold will meet with VCPB Delaney and Assistant Director Moini to discuss the campus impacts of these proposed policies prior to CPB finalizing its position.

### **Consultation with Campus Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Alison Galloway**

CPEVC Galloway updated the committee on several emergency situations which have arisen over the past few days/weeks, and construction issues which have arisen at the infill apartments which will require some units to be taken offline for repair.

The CPEVC provided her impressions from the CAB/SEC consultation on international yield efforts. She reported that a report will be available by the end of winter quarter which will detail the recruitment plans which will begin implementation in Spring. There were no details forthcoming pending the reports finalization. There was some discussion of the scholarships which are provided to National and International students, and the possibility of redirecting these funds to other purposes. There is no data supporting the notion that the absence of this tuition support would prevent students from enrolling at UCSC.

Finally, there was discussion of plans which have been circulated by the “South Campus Council” to the VPAA, VCPB and EVC. There is some concern that these plans eclipse the original scope of this group as charged by the Dean of Social Sciences as they would require collaboration with a variety of campus stakeholders. Despite these logistical issues, their plans merit discussion and will be brought forward for CPB review when they are ready.

### **Review of Budget Submissions**

CPB discussed the budget reduction scenario for BAS, Planning & Budget, and Silicon Valley Initiatives. The committee developed questions for the VCBAS for consultation in Spring.