

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

January 29, 2015

Minutes

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

Guests: CPEVC Galloway

Member's Items

CPB approved the draft minutes for January 8, and 15, 2015.

The committee then addressed proposed changes for two of the CPB administrative committee assignments. Member Porter will temporarily be joining the Miscellaneous Fees Committee, and member Nygaard will attend the Classroom Subcommittee in the month of February.

Member Rodriguez gave updates on the Student Success Steering Committee (SSSC), reporting that while Faculty Assistant on Retention and Graduation, Jaye Padgett, is working hard building consensus, the committee has yet to arrive at any final decisions. There is still no customer relations management (CRM) system. The Student Success Steering Committee (SSSC) also wants to pilot a program that would put students in cohorts when they arrive to help foster a sense of community, but within that plan there is not yet a definitive target. Whether that would be retention, academic performance, etc., needs clarification. SSSC also may evaluate the Summer Academy for incoming frosh. No decision has been made toward this yet. Jaye Padgett has expressed interest in tracking majors for Summer Session. He has scheduled a time to meet with the chairs of the five biggest majors to discuss this.

CPB discussed the academic space planning meeting, which focused on the 2300 Delaware Building C. The committee may want to work with interested parties to draft a policy for management of interdisciplinary space.

Consultation with VCBAS Latham

The committee met for the first time this year with VC Business and Administrative Services Latham, with another planned consultation on February 12, 2015. VC Latham began the consult with updates on her division, elaborating on the written response to CPB's pre consultation questions which addressed myriad areas of her operation, including staffing, budget, and campus services/recharges.

The Vice Chancellor informed CPB that two "external reviews" will be conducted on Physical Planning and Construction (PP&C) and the Bookstore this academic year. Both are long planned, and the Bookstore is closer to underway. CPB was keenly interested in these reviews, and requested that they be allowed to submit questions to the review committee (like for academic department external reviews) and participate in the post-review report. VC Latham was supportive of the request and agreed to provide the self-studies to CPB once they are available, but did not confirm that CPB would have the opportunity to submit questions.

On the topic of recharges, VC Latham was engaged in discussion of a few service units within BAS, but directed CPB to take up wider issues of the campus recharge system with the Office of Planning & Budget since that office designed the system. CPB wanted to engage more with the scale of savings which have been achieved with unit and service restructuring. VC Latham committed to include this information in the pre consultation packet for the February 12 meeting.

VC Latham then provided a short update on the progress of restoring Staff Human Resources (SHR) staffing levels and service model to adequate levels. The unit has completed several hires, and a re-hire which has helped to stabilize the unit, and multiple services and processes have been restructured to streamline and enhance the service provided to campus constituents.

CPB concluded the consultation by asking several additional questions to be followed up on at the February 12 meeting. What BAS units could be advantaged by Senate input? What is the total core campus funding level (19900) for all BAS units? What budget format is most informative for looking at all BAS units at the divisional level?

Enrollment Planning – Long Range Enrollment Plan

The committee reviewed the draft LREP submission discussed at the January 22, 2015 CPB meeting. Members highlighted specific figures which need clarification. In particular, nonresident (slightly reduced from 600-650 to 500), graduate (reduced and smoothed out between 2017 and 2022), and summer enrollments should have been adjusted to more realistic figures, compared to the 2013 version. CPB will respond in writing to make these recommendations. It is the committee's hope that these figures can be updated prior to submission to UCOP.

For nonresidents, CPB understands that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has decided to draft a letter stating that the presented acceptance rate (75%) for nonresident students is unacceptable. If UCSC is looking to build a pool of well-qualified students, then we need to maintain selectivity, which will be difficult with such a high acceptance rate. CPB noted that we may need to rethink the structure of support that has already been invested in. There has also been an influx of international students which has impacted departmental hiring plans and curriculum across campus. It will be critical for Senate input, related to the identification of international (and out of state) pipelines be prioritized for recruitment. This will allow the campus to enroll well-prepared nonresident students which will not likely require intensive english language or other coursework prior to entering their majors.

The Office of the President has also directed campuses to drastically reduce the over-enrollment of CA resident students. This population has in recent years been an important feature of the UCSC campus, and includes a tuition revenue stream (though these students are not supported with state funding). With this directive, the the enrollment of (well-prepared) nonresidents becomes even more critical, and for budgetary comparison, the campus must replace every three lost CA resident over-enrollment with one nonresident to break even monetarily.

Capital Planning

CPB reviewed a briefing packet on the Capital Planning process at UCSC. The goal of the committee's deliberations was to identify the specific parts of the process, which until recently relied on external requests for prioritized campus lists. The committee hopes to revitalize the capital planning prioritization and review process as well as determine the best staff to engage with on the overall cost of construction.

The questions CPB identified earlier are:

- Are the current staff and process appropriate going forward?
- Why is cost of construction so high at UCSC?
- Monitor specific projects for housing, academic buildings, classrooms
- Financing state funded vs. campus funded buildings.
- How are decisions about campus debt-limit made?

Member Schumm and representative De Vos updated the committee on the Housing Planning Committee, which has transformed from specific planning for West Campus, i.e. Family Student Housing, Graduate Housing, and new undergraduate dorms/apartments to a full-scale assessment of potential housing locations across the entire campus.

One primary conclusion from the discussion is that the campus prioritized list of capital projects has not been reviewed in several cycles now. Regular conversations have broken down on this subject, and the Capital Planning & Stewardship meeting is also not convening regularly. CPB will request that this list be resurfaced, and reviewed at minimum annually. CPB's standard review includes advising the EVC on which projects should be prioritized and takes into consideration academic space needs (classrooms and research), housing (student and employee), infrastructure and overall debt service. The committee will draft a letter asking for the current list of prioritized projects.

Social Sciences Presidential Post Doc Request

CPB reviewed a Presidential Postdoctoral Scholar request from the Social Sciences Division. The committee will draft a letter to the EVC in support of the hire, given eventual divisional resourcing for the provision. .