

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
MINUTES
April 13, 2017**

Present: Abel Rodriguez (Chair), Kimberly Lau (*ex officio*), Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Elizabeth Abrams, Cormac Flanagan, Lindsay Hinck, Tracy Larrabee, Lourdes Martínez-Echazábal, Rick Prelinger, Carl Walsh, Graeme Baird (Graduate Rep), Allyson Guo (Undergrad Rep), Tias Webster (Undergrad Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

Absent: Adrian Brasoveanu

Member's Items

Member Hinck provided a brief report on the Miscellaneous Fee Committee meeting of April 10.

Senate Chair Einarsdóttir provided an update on the Academic Assembly meeting of April 12. She provided a summary of topics of discussion, which included nonresident enrollment caps.

Target of Excellence: Waiver of Open Recruitment

The Theater Arts Department in the Arts Division submitted a request for a waiver of open recruitment in order to propose a Target of Excellence (TOE) appointment. The committee reviewed the request and will forward its recommendation to the interim CP/EVC.

Audit Report: Summer Session

The committee continued review of the Internal Audit and Management Advisory Services (AMAS) review of Summer Session operations. The committee considered the report and examined the recommendations for future work on budget restructuring. The committee will continue discussion of the report at its next meeting.

Review: VPAA Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity and Program Enrollment

Acting VPAA Berger requested Senate review of the revised guidelines for managing curricular capacity and program enrollment. These guidelines have been substantially reviewed after first round feedback from the Senate and campus administrators.

Members expressed appreciation for the work acting VPAA Berger has done to revise the document thus far. They noted that this draft represents a great improvement over its previous iteration, however the committee raised concerns about a few broad issues. CPB agreed that the process of impact management must consciously evolve into a process of campus-wide curricular and capacity management. Capacity analysis, currently occurring at the departmental level, should properly be a concern of the center and occur in consultation with but above the purview of individual departments. Curricular management (as practiced at all UC campuses except Merced) should guide our admissions maxima for impacted and near-impacted programs, and be a *proactive* rather than an *ex post facto* process. Member also expressed concern about whether advising was consulted in the preparation of this guide, noting that frontline commentary from those working directly with students is essential.

Members also noted additional, more granular concerns, including in the following areas: further refinement of aspects of process, the data required for requests, responsibilities for resources, review process for impactation continuance or discontinuance, and CPB's role in the impactation review process.

Petition for Impacted Department Status

With members Flanagan and Larrabee recused, the committee reviewed the petition from the Computer Science Department for designation as an impacted program. The committee appreciated the precarious situation in which the department finds itself and noted the need to urge the Dean and CP/EVC to work with the department to allocate additional resources that can help maintain the quality of the educational and research programs housed in the department.

CPB focused on the immediate requests from CS, which were as follows: for UCSC application and admission information to include “a statement to the effect that the choice of major may be taken into account in the admission process for UCSC” and to have their BS and BA programs receive a formal declaration of Impacted Status. On the first request, the committee noted this request falls within the purview of CAFA, but nonetheless noted its strong support that the type of statement requested by CS be included in application and admission materials, and we urge CAFA and the VPDUE and Admissions offices to proceed as soon as possible. Indeed, the inclusion of this type of statement is an indispensable step in the implementation of our new impactation/capacity management policy, and is in many ways independent of whether impactation status is assigned to CS or not.

On the second request, members noted that while the CS department made a compelling case that student demand has outstripped its ability to meet that demand, the request failed to provide key details, which CPB found generic and inadequate. CPB made several comments, including in the following areas: that the request must include a careful capacity analysis that discusses available resources and information on curricular offerings, class sizes, and enrollment targets; that the request provide additional quantitative data to assess the request; need for quantitative analysis of currently proposed gating policy; and need for discussion of workload implications of major declaration policies and admission policies. Overall, CPB commented that the capacity to provide the type of analysis needed for these types of proposals be developed within the Office of Planning and Budget, perhaps within Institutional Research,

Systemwide Review: Proposed Revised APM 285, 210-33, 133, 740

This item was moved to the next meeting.

Planning: April 20 Meeting

The committee briefly discussed planned items for the next meeting.