

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
February 5, 2015
Minutes

Present: Dan Friedman (Chair), Don Brenneis, Ólöf Einarisdóttir, Suresh Lodha, Loisa Nygaard, Eric Porter, Rick Prelinger, Abel Rodriguez, Danilyn Rutherford, Bruce Schumm, Jin Zhang, Hannah Tuong (UG), Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Matthew Mednick (ASO)

Guests: CPEVC Galloway

Member's Items

In follow-up to last week's meeting, enrollment planning data were forwarded to the committee on the comparison of fall 2014 admitted resident and non-resident students. CPB discussed academic disparity between fall 2014 admitted resident and non-resident students, noting that there is a clear tension between the UC "compare favorably" policy and the administration's desire to rapidly increase the proportion of nonresident students given the current size of our applicant pool. For fall 2014, nonresidents were admitted at a selectivity rate of 74%, which seemed disproportionately high to CPB. It was reported that the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid was looking into this issue specifically for the fall 2015 cycle.

Art and Design: Games and Playable Media B.A. Proposal

The committee reviewed the Games and Playable Media B.A. proposal. While very supportive, CPB would also like to see articulation of the differences between the Computer Science and Arts paths. There was also a question of whether or not Introduction to Programming level students would be able to perform well in the established Computer Science track for coursework.

CPB Memo on Shared Governance

The CPB analyst will draft memo from CPB to SEC, informing them of the routine and non-routine reviews or processes which have discontinued this year. CPB provides the primary Senate feedback on multiple areas of campus resource allocation which continue, but without input.

CPB commented that the recently reviewed LREP plans for no undergraduate growth, which called into question why the committee was reviewing a new undergraduate program. One role of the curriculum is to respond to student needs and desires, and there is an entrepreneurial desire to grow enrollments. It is difficult when the committee is asked to review contradictory proposals.

The committee would like to have a discussion with leadership about the lack of clarity about who is making decisions, when, and what data are used to inform those decisions. Many operations seem thin on the ground.

Capital Planning Pre consultation Memo

Based on a discussion at the last meeting, the committee will formulate a preconsultation memo addressing major concerns with the capital planning process formally administered by the Capital Planning & Stewardship committee, and the sub-committees which plan specific academic and housing building projects.

CPB discussed the memo, noting that it should include that every campus is facing the same issue of lack of dedicated resources from the state. The cost of construction and major maintenance are ongoing. It should also note the issue of the high outlay costs as there is no budget to cover maintenance and replacement.

Consultation with CP/EVC Galloway

EVC Galloway reported that she is finalizing a presentation on Envision UCSC, including revised goals and action items. The intention is to present them at the upcoming February Senate meeting. CPB asked to see an advance copy, with the intention of providing useful feedback in advance of the meeting. The EVC provided the draft presentation for CPB input later in the day. CPB members commented that while the content of the planned presentation are updated, the website has not been even though a campus announcement went out. CPB cautioned that sending out update announcements may be ineffectual if the content of the six goals remains unchanged.

CPB offered feedback on the campus Long Range Enrollment Plan prior to the meeting. The campus has asked for an extension to continue revisions to the plan, given the changing instructions from Office of the President (OP). After clear instructions to reduce “over-enrolled” CA residents (to zero over 2-3 years) there is not ongoing vigorous discussion at/with OP for the buy-out of “over-enrolled” students. It is currently unclear what the outcome of this discussion will be, though the more pressing enrollment matter will soon be the admitted class for fall 2015 (decisions made the second week of March).

The EVC provided a short update on the status of the Coastal Biology Building. According to VC Planning & Budget Delaney, there have been normal hang-ups in the bid-review process, which are being ironed out by related staff. She reported that the project is still on time, but there are some issues with infrastructure costs trying to stay within the current cost envelope. CPB asked to be kept in the loop as this process resolves itself.

The committee raised the issue of a new gaming BA proposal in the Arts with the EVC. While not critical of the proposed program, CPB did raise the issue that it is hard to judge the merits of undergraduate and graduate programs against the context of other campus priorities as these all serve different interests. We have no set campus strategy for investment. CPB cited the issues surrounding “just-in-time planning”. The EVC agreed that there are advantages and disadvantages, and agreed that her office could improve communication by more clearly explaining decisions once made. This would give the campus a better idea what and how decisions are made, and foster understanding of campus priorities as they are developed.

The EVC affirmed CPB’s interest in reinitializing the campus budget review process next year. The primary goal will be to plan a template of the process for next fall (starting this spring), which the principal officers can review, respond, and agree to. This will help with interdivisional communication and coordination as well as provide the process by which budgetary review of investments and cuts can be undertaken.

Consultation with Vice Chancellor Research Scott Brandt

CPB and VCR Brandt discussed the status of contractual research support being handled by University Relations (UR) as philanthropic gifts. CPB was supportive of OR and UR working strategically to address how to optimally administrate research funding of all kinds.

The consultation also addressed the current Silicon Valley planning efforts within OR and for the campus. It will be important for CPB to continue to consult with the OR as it reviews administrative support modeling, and vet the pre-proposal responses from faculty.

There was unfortunately not sufficient time to fully discuss campus research infrastructure. CPB had hoped for a more robust discussion of how OR will partner with the central planning, Information Technology Services, and the Academic Divisions on restoring research support as well as building, replacing and/or acquiring new (shared) research equipment. We look forward to consulting on this topic more in the future, perhaps in the context of VC Brandt's stewardship of the Envision: Research Goal.

CPB raised the issue of faculty in fields in which the most prestigious research grants and fellowships don't fully cover salary replacement. This external funding is key in fields in which the constraint on research excellence is not a lack of facilities but a lack of time. Awards such as a Guggenheim Fellowship or an NEH may not immediately bring overhead to campus, but they are key factors in putting our faculty into a position where they have the prestige to win the small set of major grants now becoming available to scholars in the humanities and arts. (Winning a Guggenheim, for instance, puts a scholar on the map as a serious candidate for larger grants; this was the case for Anna Tsing, the first social scientist to win a Niels Bohr Honorary Professorship, which came with a million dollar award.) The lack of a clearly articulated campus policy addressing this problem is a disincentive for faculty who might otherwise seek external funding. CPB hopes the VCR will devote some energy to thinking through this problem and seeing whether resources could be made available to supplement these awards so that faculty can retain their full salary.