

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
MINUTES
October 15, 2015**

Present: Abel Rodriguez (Chair), Don Brenneis (ex officio), Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Adrian Brasoveanu, Cormac Flanagan, Loisa Nygaard, Rick Prelinger, Danilyn Rutherford, Bruce Schumm, Marilyn Walker, Jin Zhang, Whitney De Vos (Graduate Rep), Guillermo Rogel (Undergraduate Rep), Hannah Tuong (Undergrad Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

Absent: None.

Member's Items

The WASC site visit was completed this week.

External Review Process Overview

The committee discussed the external review process for departments and programs, and the two major stages for committee input into the review process 1) providing supplemental questions to the External Review charge, and 2) commenting on the External Review Report and responses for the closure meeting. Responsibilities of lead reviewers were also discussed.

Enrollment Data Consultation

The committee received materials from Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Delaney related to preliminary admissions outcomes, graduate student growth, and a proposal for UCSC enrollment growth submitted to UCOP by the campus. VCPB Delaney was joined by Director of Institutional Research Fernald and Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Hughey, who discussed the data provided to the committee. The review of the data was preliminary. Topics of discussion included competing directives from the Office of the President on over-enrollment, the proposal for 5000 additional undergraduate student enrollment systemwide, transfer student enrollments, and non-resident enrollments. CPB discussed its role in advising the campus in achieving enrollment targets and will continue to discuss how to engage proactively on this issue.

Consultation with CP/EVC Galloway

CPB consulted with CP/EVC Galloway on the topics of Silicon Valley planning and the Vice Provost searches.

The committee expressed its interest in collaborating with the CP/EVC's office to ensure progress in planning for Silicon Valley (SV) investments. CP/EVC Galloway agreed to provide a list of planned investments (student support, information technology) that have already been identified as required to initiate a basic academic program in the new building, as well as drawings for the new Silicon Valley building. She also agreed to provide, by the end of fall quarter, a clearer picture of campus investments required to launch new academic programs in Silicon Valley, and the funding model for those investments. The committee was pleased to hear CP/EVC Galloway express support for providing seed funding for events in SV to make use of the space in the near term, with the goal of generating presence for planned programs.

The Vice Provosts for Student Success is filled on an interim basis and a job description is expected next fall. Members expressed concern about getting the Vice Provost for International Engagement search underway as well, and developing a campus strategic plan for internationalization. CP/EVC Galloway

noted there are still questions about what the search will look like for this position, including scope of search.

Members raised that the Committee on International Education is willing to help in the search process, and referenced a memo CIE sent to the CP/EVC on the topic of the VPIE search in June 2015.

Post-Consultation Discussion

The committee discussed the need to follow up with the CP/EVC on areas of agreement on Silicon Valley planning, as well as the need for continued proactive discussion of the Vice Provost for International Engagement search.

Library Proposal

The EVC requested Senate review of a revised proposal to alter the methodology for allocating library startup funds for new faculty.

The committee acknowledged the cumbersomeness of the current system and the bookkeeping problems that go along with tracking many individual accounts. However, the committee expressed concerns not addressed in this version of the proposal, namely that the proposal transforms a portion of what are now one-time funds into permanent funding. The committee also critiqued ambiguous wording in the draft, and questions remained—will the library funds be allocated directly to the library (CPB assumption) or will it be used as part of startup packages? Will the one-time component of the allocation be reduced to \$2,500 (CPB current assumption), or be maintained at \$5,000? The committee recommended a clear statement in this regard should be included in the final version of the proposal.

Members noted that the proposal seemed to be aimed at increasing funding for the Library. Members also expressed that there are good arguments to be made for enhancing the budget of the Library, which suffered along with many other units during the period of severe budget cuts and which remains of central importance to the entire academic enterprise. However, any increase in funding, CPB agreed, should be done upfront and with open eyes rather than through the backdoor of startup funding.

CPB members also expressed concerned that “allocations are no longer clearly tied to specific new faculty members.” The 2013 Library Startup Funding Proposal explicitly stated that “Neither the permanent nor the one-time funds would be tied to or controlled by the individual faculty member hired.” CPB agreed that while it is true that faculty make uneven and limited use of these funds, their provision represents an effective recruiting tool, especially in fields like Humanities, Arts, and some of the Social Sciences that are heavily dependent on library resources. If these funds were eliminated from startups, then packages in the fields just mentioned, already slender, would become even slimmer.

CPB members expressed appreciation to the Library and to the CP/EVC for drawing its attention to at least two key problems. 1) The Library acutely feels the need for more permanent, ongoing funding. 2) The current way of tracking faculty library startups via individual accounts is too labor-intensive. While members acknowledged the problems, the committee agreed that undermining current faculty startup provisions is *not* the best way to solve them, and that the campus should search for other, more creative and more sustainable solutions.

External Reviews

Stage 1: Supplemental Questions

Ocean Sciences

CPB discussed the upcoming review of the Ocean Sciences Department. The committee noted that space continues to be an issue for the department, and is interested in the External Review Committee (ERC)

perspective on how the department might plan to address space issues prior to the availability of space released by the movement of other units to Coastal Biology. The committee is also interested in the ERC's perspective on how the department might best prioritize the extra hire the Dean is willing to commit. Finally, CPB is interested in the ERC's assessment of whether it is realistic and achievable for the department to lead the development of the Environmental Sciences major.

Stage 2: Comments on ERC Report

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

CPB commented on the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) external review report, and commended the favorable review it received from the External Review Committee (ERC). CPB concurred with several ERC recommendations, specially that the department develop a strategic academic plan, a plan for chair succession, that the department aims to maintain its strength and international standing in marine mammal biology by making a senior hire replacement, that the advising situation be addressed. CPB also raised concerns including that many of the same recommendations in the ERC report were made in the previous closure report and concern about space issues. CPB also cited the high quality and reputation of the EEB Department, and wondered if the department has the potential and advising capacity to accept more Ph.D. students.

Computational Media M.S. and Ph.D. Revised Proposal

The committee considered the revised proposal for Master's and Ph.D. degrees in Computational Media. CPB comments are routed to the Graduate Council. CPB raised questions about the number of graduate students per FTE, expected to be around 9.5, including students from the Ph.D. program as well as the academic and professional Masters programs. While the committee noted CCGA will review whether or not this is sustainable, it recommended that the proposal aid the review process by providing a breakdown of the total number of expected students per FTE between the three categories (Ph.D., academic Masters, and professional Masters).

CPB also noted that GC raised some concerns about the adequacy of the space available on campus for the proposed academic graduate programs. CPB shared these concerns, and noted its support of the Council in its careful consideration of the response provided by the proponents, and a request for more detail by GC if warranted.

One member of CPB who has been on CCGA in the past noted that it is not uncommon for proposals forwarded to CCGA to be accompanied by the "paper trail" associated with the Senate review of the proposal. CPB agreed it would be particularly helpful in this case to include this material when the proposal is sent to CCGA, as it casts light on the nature and depth of the issues raised and addressed during the campus review, and may help CCGA in its own review.