

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
MINUTES
October 20, 2016**

Present: Abel Rodriguez (Chair), Elizabeth Abrams, Adrian Brasoveanu, Cormac Flanagan, Lindsay Hinck, Lourdes Martínez-Echazábal, Rick Prelinger, Carl Walsh, Graeme Baird (Graduate Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

Absent: Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Kimberly Lau (*ex officio*), Tracy Larrabee, Ray Inoue (Undergrad Rep)

Member's Items

Chair Rodriguez updated the committee on his conversation with the Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections (RJ&E) chair regarding a potential issue with CPB's proposed guidelines for reviewing second hire requests. RJE will review and CPB should have a response in the near future.

Consultation: VPDGS

The committee consulted with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies (VPDGS) Tyrus Miller on the status of graduate education, with specific discussion of graduate enrollments, sustainability of recent increases, status of nonresident tuition remission (IDRF) and Centers of Excellence proposals, and Master's Incentive Program (MIP) allocation and implications of funding allocations in context of movement of students among graduate majors (students taking courses in unit different from unit student was admitted to).

VPDGS Miller addressed the issue of sustainability of recent enrollment increases. He noted that his office has done an analysis of the overall support profile, and Graduate Division provides about one-fifth or one-sixth of the overall support over a graduate students' career. The constraint, he noted, is instructional support and GSR support, and there needs to be careful consideration of undergraduate enrollment patterns and movements.

VPDGS Miller provided an update on three initiatives/proposals (Centers of Excellence, expanded use of GSI's, and the IDRF proposal). The Centers of Excellence proposal addresses the relationship between doctoral growth and research development. It is intended to catalyze additional graduate growth through extramural funding. Members asked if this meant that departments that do not traditionally raise large amounts of extramural funding would be precluded. VPDGS Miller noted that given the strong interest of the Office of Research to catalyze extramural funds, a significant portion of COE funded be primarily in the STEM areas. However, the COE is looking to encourage creativity for central funds across divisions. He then provided preliminary data on size and scope of the proposals. The committee also expressed the concern that COE might fund new projects at the expense of strengthening what we already have. VPDGS Miller noted he is aware of that concern, and to address this, the initiative is taking careful measures to build in accountability and meet metrics. He also noted the proposal is with the EVC, and the committee could request to see it.

The expanded use of graduate student instructors intends to examine the possible use of TAS funds, with the cost differential between a lecturer and a graduate student cost made up or evened out centrally. The

IDRF proposal, for nonresident tuition waivers, intends to remove the obstacle of nonresident tuition after the first year, and expand the applicant to admit more of the highly qualified applicant pool.

The Master's Incentive Program discussion elicited several questions from the committee. VPDGS Miller explained that the master's funding was taken out of the block allocation and is now providing funds at more than twice what was provided in the old block formula. He acknowledged that some of this is "recycled" money, but a significant amount is new money put forward by the EVC. In addition, there is a supplement that comes with nonresident student enrollment. The question of, do we have resources to make these sustainable, is what he termed the second stage of the conversation, on the basis of a clear picture of what resources exist and how these should be expended. Members raised examples of specific programs, and that for one department as an example, the "incentive" may not be sufficient to cover the cost that rapid growth has brought forward. The department is now also wrestling with the implications for the doctoral program. A member asked if there is evidence that there is a broad understanding among departments about whether it makes sense to expand. Departments thinking of adding new programs should know enough to make intelligent decisions and not end up with "buyers' remorse." VPDGS Miller acknowledged this remains a work in progress, adding that the MIP has been successful in changing the ecosystem of programs in positive ways, and the fact that it requires adaptation is not surprising. Adaptation includes one department's recent strategy to streamline its master's project requirement.

The committee raised two related questions related to sustainability of the MIP, 1) is the size of the MIP large enough, and 2) if we don't want master's enrollments to collapse due to lack of sustainability, then we need to think about what can be done in terms of TA allocation and TAS allocation to support the programs that have grown. VPDGS Miller noted that one of his goals is to have the MIP continue to succeed, to influence admission and to increase master's students. He also reminded the committee that he has an advocacy role in addressing this issue. He is pragmatically open to opening up mechanisms to allocate TAs, and will give thought to the issue of TAS allocations, however, the Graduate Division does not have authority or resources to effect that.

Specifically turning to the issue of "migration" among graduate majors, members asked VPDGS Miller to comment on the fact that some departments are seeing increases in enrollments driven by other departments, which makes specific departments shoulder the burden without additional funding for this. VPDGS Miller noted the migration data is muddy. The committee noted this may be more of an issue when departments are cross divisional, which may become increasingly common. The committee wondered if there is a general solution to help departments avoid reducing enrollments, which would run counter to MIP goals. A related question revolved around students in professional development supplemental tuition programs (PDST) taking courses with students paying PDST fees, and how this may also increasingly become an issue. VPDGS Miller responded that as far as pragmatic principles for addressing this question, numbers do matter. If it is a few students, this can be accommodated. We need to understand how many courses, and what courses we are examining. PDST are state funded programs, and students have some significant right to access programs state is paying for. VPDGS Miller agreed that if program proposals come forward, the expectation should be that they address these issue, and even provide an MOU.

Consultation: CP/EVC

The committee consulted with the CP/EVC on the following topics: transition to Interim CP/EVC, LREP update, and campus LRDP process update. Herbie Lee, incoming Interim CP/EVC and current VPAA, attended the consultation.

The committee began with a discussion of the LREP. The committee reviewed the campus enrollment targets for 2017-18 submitted to UCOP, provided by the CP/EVC. The committee acknowledged there is not a lot of control over California resident enrollments, and that the CP/EVC and VCPB have tried to emphasize keeping the size of entering cohorts constant. The projected size of the entering cohort is lower for next year than last and asked about the implications for addressing enrollment spikes. CP/EVC Galloway noted getting the word out earlier and having longer discussions with the deans about implications as two ways to address this. She also acknowledged that in areas where disciplines require early entry into the major, impacts will be felt sooner. Members asked if, given campus patterns for allocation of over-enrollment funds, do we have the capacity for quick enough response times to enrollment spikes. CP/EVC Galloway stated that part of the issue is that the campus needs to think about what students we are taking in, and CAFA's role in that process. VPAA Lee stated that the Major Impaction Working Group has begun meeting and is trying to coordinate policies, bringing together the administration, CAFA, CPB, and CEP chairs. In addition, the issue of giving priority to certain students in a major so they can enroll in courses for that major or pre major might be a strategy to create strong incentives for students to declare and keep their major.

The committee also expressed concerns about international enrollment targets. The challenge, members noted, is maintaining quality vs. our ability as a campus to attract the numbers desired. Members questioned the feasibility of an international enrollment target of 600, noting the campus has had trouble reaching lower targets in the past. CP/EVC Galloway stated that she is putting additional funding in the International Education Office to bring in visiting and summer session students, and start building bridges for FWS enrollments. She noted there is a need for a stronger international presence in the admissions office, and a culture change is needed. Members expressed a lack of clarity as to how bringing additional students for summer session would build bridges, and suggested that what is needed is a link to those that are not yet in college. CP/EVC Galloway also noted that the campus is working on a process for 3+1+1 enrollments, the expected range is five to ten students for each program. The Economics/NAU partnership is the only 3+1+1 program currently about to start.

The committee informed the CP/EVC about the earlier consultation with VPDGS Miller. Members raised that sustainability at the masters and doctoral level is an issue to think more about as a campus. For example, separate courses are needed at the masters and doctoral level, which has become particularly clear in one division. CP/EVC Galloway responded that in certain areas you can overlap master's/Ph.D. level students. In the social sciences, for example, the numbers are smaller so it is less of a problem. The areas where it becomes difficult are those with large undergraduate majors, a large masters' track, and large Ph.D. programs. The campus may need to rethink TAs at the master's level, and about how to generate new revenues in a way that doesn't take from one group and give to another. Regarding MIP funding, the committee noted the issues with a small incentives and the cost if enrollments grow quickly.

Turning to a discussion of long term projections, the committee asked about the vision for growth. CP/EVC Galloway noted that she sees continued campus growth, and that she would like to see the campus grow more thoughtfully, and to see that incorporated in the LRDP. She noted the campus will always be tuition dependent—we cannot grow departments unless we are growing enrollments. She noted support for growing masters' program, and there are multiple ways in which that growth in masters could

take place (5th year programs, one year programs, professional programs). When asked if she sees self-supporting programs playing a role, CP/EVC Galloway responded that they could, but it needs to be run in a disciplined manner, with constant vigilance, and an academic leader who is fiscally sound to keep it on track.

Members then asked about the LRDP process, asking about the campus progress, and the upcoming CPB meeting to further consult on this topic, which will include Chancellor Blumenthal. CP/EVC Galloway noted the campus is in the initial stages of the LRDP. Our current LRDP expires in 2020. It takes about five years to work on it, and then five years of litigation after its complete. It also comes at a high cost. She pointed out several key issues that are the focus of the beginning of the process: a survey planned for the community to assess the community's understanding of and their perceptions of UCSC. Second, internal initial discussions focused on size of the campus, timeframe, and critical factors within that. She noted her preference for thinking big—what is the biggest that we can envision at this point in time, and then think about what it would take to get there, in terms of classroom, housing, faculty, support structure, water, transportation system. She would like to be more open ended rather than set a specific number by a given year, which is how we have approached the process in the past.

Members noted that it is hard to think about space needs without a strategic academic plan, and that although an LRDP is not a strategic academic plan, the campus still needs to know (and plan for) the size and shape of the divisions if we reach a certain target enrollment. CP/EVC Galloway responded that one way to think about this would be the kinds of spaces research faculty will need might provide a handle on the issues, without necessarily where faculty will go, and leaves openness for new disciplines coming up and student and faculty interests shifting. Members also raised online education, which CP/EVC Galloway noted has a limited role. Committee discussion ensued about perhaps the campus resigning itself to a smaller enrollment number. CP/EVC Galloway responded that needs to be deliberated, with knowledge about what the campus impacts will/might be. Other ideas discussed included clusters of UCSC in separate physical locations. Members raised that given the fixed costs of the LRDP, it might be better to go with a bigger target envelope. But issues such as flexibility for growth (and how that flexibility would be viewed by UCOP) are questions that remain, and the CP/EVC agreed required much internal discussion as well as discussion with UCOP needs to take place.

At an upcoming consultation, CPB will continue to discuss the LRDP, and specifically, the committee's role in the planning process.

Post-Consultation Discussion

Members raised several points, including the close relations between strategic academic planning and the LRDP process and early CPB involvement in the LRDP planning process.

External Reviews

Stage 1 (Supplemental Questions)

Education

CPB discussed the upcoming review of the Education Department. The committee raised questions related to the MA/C program and department governance.

Stage 2: (Comments on ERC Report)

Sociology

The committee commented on the Sociology external review report. The committee commended the department for a very positive external review. The external review committee (ERC) praised the department “on the cusp of transition” to greatly increased standing and excellence, but one which must also be supported through new FTE and robust graduate packages. Issues raised by CPB included the need for a department plan for allocating FTEs, Dean assessment of the optimal size of the department, staff workload restructuring, and department communication channels with the Research Administration office.