

## **Committee on Planning and Budget Annual Report, 2015-16**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) worked on several issues this year, including a) strategic academic planning, engaging specifically with academic metrics, major impactation, and enrollment and capacity planning, b) reviewing divisional faculty FTE requests and participating in shaping the planning process for future cycles, c) general budget review, d) review of Silicon Valley programs market studies, and e) graduate growth. The committee also continued monitoring and engaging with several issues proactively, which included extensive consultation with the Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE) on several issues, review of the Transportation and Parking Services parking rates proposal, and participation in capital planning and housing issues. Extensive routine business for the committee included review of new degree program proposals, participation in external reviews of several departments, and review of off-cycle and waiver of open recruitment FTE requests. A detailed summary of CPB's work in 2015-16, as well as a list of anticipated issues for 2016-17, is provided below.

### **Strategic Academic Planning**

#### *Metrics*

In an effort to contribute to campus efforts to enhance academic planning, CPB formed a subcommittee to work on the issue of academic metrics. CPB believes that this is an extremely timely discussion, especially as the campus engages in the process of creating a new Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and enters a transition phase in leadership. The subcommittee's work became the basis for a report addressing three questions: Why do we need academic metrics, what metrics should be used, and how should we use these metrics? The report reflected the general consensus that, when combined with other sources of information, academic metrics could be a good means by which to initiate a data-driven conversation about allocation of FTEs and other resources and, more broadly, about academic planning. Metrics could also help guide enrollment management and admissions decisions.

An important outcome of the conversations with the Deans and other campus leaders was the realization that different fields face different limits with regard to expansion. The use of data comparing UCSC departments to departments in comparable institutions and to disciplinary norms would allow for a better-targeted allocation of FTEs and other campus resources. Tracking the evolution of metrics over long periods of time could provide early warnings about impending trends. Furthermore, the creative use of metrics could help decision-makers think outside the box. For example, supporting undergraduate programs that even out enrollments across disciplines and divisions could have the effect of enhancing graduate education in fields in which graduates are not supported through faculty research grants. Instead of metrics being used as evidence of areas where departments and divisions are falling short, metrics, the subcommittee came to recognize, can be used to identify opportunities. As such, metrics have the potential to provide the necessary background for a thoughtful and contextualized discussion around resource allocation.

In the report's summary, CPB urged the administration to use metrics in a thoughtful and contextualized manner. The reputation of programs and departments within their respective

disciplines might not be adequately reflected in some of these metrics. External reviews of departments and programs provide substantial qualitatively oriented information that can be used to interpret metrics (and, at the same time, metrics can highlight critical issues to be addressed during an external review). As the system of metrics matures, it should be more tightly integrated into the external review process.

#### *Enrollment and Capacity Planning*

UCSC has recently faced significant enrollment pressures, and substantial additional growth is expected over the next few years. Due to the changing nature of student interests, this growth has impacted some divisions and departments much more than others. In particular, the most striking enrollment growth has occurred within the Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE), which added 850 student FTE over the last four years, while the rest of the campus actually shrank by 77 students.

As we plan for future growth, it is appropriate to consider where this growth can be expected to occur; the proposed majors of incoming frosh can serve as a helpful leading indicator of future enrollment changes. These data show that frosh interest in BSOE majors almost tripled (from 340 to 1007) between fall 2011 and Fall 2015, while frosh interest in other divisions stayed steady or declined. Consequently, it appears that BSOE enrollment pressure will intensify further over the next few years. Within BSOE, this enrollment surge is focused predominately within Computer Science and Computer Engineering. Elsewhere across the campus, a number of other departments also have enrollments that are disproportionately large in comparison to the size of their faculty, potentially degrading the undergraduate experience.

Addressing these issues requires a multipronged approach involving changes in policies used to allocate resources (faculty FTE, TAs, supplementary instructional funds, etc.) to departments and divisions, adjustments in our admission policies (e.g., to increase the number of students pursuing careers in disciplines with additional capacity), better curricular planning (to ensure that enough seats are available in key courses in impacted majors), development of new multidisciplinary undergraduate programs that can relieve the loads of intensive programs in high demand, and possibly the creation of policies to gate access to specific programs based on available capacity. Accordingly, CPB engaged with the administration and other Senate Committees (particularly CEP and CAFA) in exploring these options. This has led to the creation of Major Impaction Policy Working Group that will meet during the coming 2016-2017 academic year.

One policy change that CPB has been particularly interested in investigating is the possibility of gating access to certain high-demand majors. Unlike many universities, UCSC does not currently have a formal process for declaring certain high-enrollment majors to be impacted and for limiting student access to those majors. CPB has had some discussions with CEP Chair Tamkun about developing such a process, but it is not clear how soon such a process could be finalized and implemented. In the absence of such a policy, access to classes in popular majors is problematic; long wait-lists are increasing time to graduation and adversely impacting student retention. Recent faculty FTE authorizations have been helpful, but are not commensurate with the disproportionate enrollment growth due to competing campus priorities. Enrollment growth has also put significant pressure on classroom space, particularly for the few large lecture theatres on campus.

#### *Salary Upgrades*

During our regular consultations with divisional deans it became clear that funding faculty salary upgrades, specifically for divisionally-held FTEs, is a growing concern. To investigate the issue further, members of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) met with staff and/or Deans of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Physical and Biological Sciences. Two main insights arising from those meetings follow:

1. For faculty hires on the regular salary scale, the existing system that allows divisions to retain salary savings for up to the salary of an on-scale Professor step 1 (currently, \$85,500) seems to be operating more or less as intended. In particular, it encourages divisions to hire most of their faculty at the Assistant Professor level while providing enough flexibility for them to cover salary upgrades for new faculty, and to hire at a higher level when appropriate. We do note, however, that the gap between starting salaries and on-scale Professor 1 salaries is shrinking, which is beginning to limit the flexibility of the divisions. Changes introduced last year to the funding formula for salary upgrades for centrally-allocated FTE have been helpful, but might prove insufficient in the medium term.
2. For faculty hires on the Business, Economics and Engineering (B/E/E) scale, the situation is more muddled. The situation of greatest concern arises in the Economics Department, where recent starting salaries (in the \$120,000-\$125,000 range, based on data provided by the Division) far exceed the on-scale salary for a B/E/E Professor 1 (currently \$105,100). Although the Social Sciences Division receives additional support from the center to cover 75% of the salary upgrades above B/E/E Professor 1, it is still the case that the Social Sciences Division currently needs to generate permanent savings elsewhere of at least \$5,000 to fund each replacement hire in the Economics department, even if that hire is at the Assistant Professor level. The Baskin School of Engineering is currently covered by a special policy, and average starting salary, although close to the B/E/E Professor 1 rate, has not yet exceeded it. Hence a similar problem has not arisen there yet, but is likely to come up in the not-too-distant future.

At this point it is not clear what changes in policy (if any) the committee should recommend, and this is a matter of on-going concern.

### **FTE Review**

CPB devoted significant effort this year to FTE and recruitment planning, with the committee's role being to offer advice to the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CP/EVC). Always an important part of CPB's charge, academic planning is especially critical now because the campus is approaching the end of the "rebenching" period that has provided a stream of new FTEs to the campus.

Before offering its response to the decanal FTE plans submitted to the CP/EVC, CPB consulted in person with each of the deans, including, in the case of the Baskin School of Engineering, both the incoming and acting deans. The committee invited the chairs of CEP and the Graduate Council to sit in on its consultations with the deans and solicited the input of these two chairs as well. We are grateful to all who took the time to consult with us, and are particularly grateful to the CP/EVC and to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) for their willingness to consult regularly with the committee and to strive to answer questions that came up in the course of our

deliberations. Cooperation between the faculty senate and the administration on such a fundamental, cross-cutting matter as academic planning is critical to the long-term health of the campus.

CPB agreed with the priorities that the CP/EVC laid out in her Faculty Recruitment Call to the deans, where she highlighted: “1. Enhancing the campus’s research profile by supporting doctoral growth in existing programs or new programs with high growth potential”; and “2. Maintaining or increasing the excellence of existing undergraduate programs, or improving the educational experience for a substantial number of undergraduate students.” CPB found these goals usually easy to reconcile, since the programs with the potential for responsible graduate growth were often the same as those attracting increased levels of undergraduate student interest and high enrollments. However, requests contained in decanal responses often addressed only one of the two main drivers; requests that addressed both drivers were a relative minority.

In response to the individual recruitment plans submitted by the deans, CPB stressed the desirability of cross-divisional planning and coordination. CPB identified several areas where this will be particularly important in the future, including: mathematical sciences (both pure and applied), statistical sciences, language and linguistics, gaming and computational media, human-computer interaction, psychology and neurology, biological sciences, material science, Latin American and Latino studies, race and ethnicity; and writing. CPB worked with the CP/EVC and the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) to develop a planning calendar for next year in which due dates will be moved up to allow more time for collaborative planning between and among units, including divisions (see below). Like the previous year’s CPB, the 2015-16 committee continued to stress the importance of developing an overall strategic academic plan for the campus to guide both shorter- and longer-term hiring decisions. An overall academic plan will remain important even after the current period of rebenching has come to an end, since anticipated retirements and planned UC-wide enrollment growth mean that the campus will continue to reshape itself.

A key goal of CPB this year was to improve the planning process and to make Academic Senate input both more timely and effective. To this end, CPB worked with the CP/EVC to arrange a joint meeting between the academic deans and representative members of CPB to discuss what worked well this year, what needs to be improved, and what kinds of changes to processes are most desirable. The CP/EVC, VCPB, and vice provosts were also present. One of CPB’s main concerns, as outlined in a memo which the committee forwarded to all participants prior to the meeting, was the timeline of the FTE-planning process. The committee suggested that the FTE call be prepared in the summer and released by the CP/EVC in early fall to allow adequate time for both Senate consultations and internal consultations within the divisions. CPB also emphasized that all FTE requests -- not just requests for new positions allocated from the center, but also requests to fill divisionally-held FTE or to reauthorize recruitments -- needed to be backed up by a strong rationale. Other recommendations from CPB included more coordination of recruitments across divisions to avoid overinvestment or duplication, and putting in place mechanisms to address campus-wide needs, such as undergraduate service curricula, that do not always align with divisional priorities. CPB also recommended that the FTE process be rendered as transparent as possible. In particular, as the vice chancellors and vice provosts have come to play an increasing role in providing input to the CP/EVC on FTE allocation, it is crucial that their recommendations,

like those of CPB and the deans, be formalized in writing and backed up with supporting arguments, and that they be shared with the different stakeholders. Having found the post-FTE-planning process meeting that took place this year to be useful, CPB proposes that it be repeated in the future, with the difference that all participants submit their concerns in writing in advance in order to give ample opportunities for meaningful discussion at the meeting itself. CPB also recommends that a separate meeting be devoted to future strategic academic planning.

### **Budget Review Process**

Using the guidelines set forth by the CP/EVC in her letter of December 8, 2015, CPB evaluated the budget submissions from the Academic and non-Academic units in two primary categories: requests for one-time funds, and permanent funding. Due to the nature of the budget submissions, CPB focused its recommendations to the CP/EVC on proposed reductions/cuts and augmentations, and, where possible, the committee tried to group requests that were complementary in nature. One of the inherent values of performing the budget review as a comprehensive campus effort is that the Senate and administrative leadership can see how to combine or leverage investments to best serve students and faculty.

CPB prioritized augmentations that provided services with direct impact on students, addressed potential campus liabilities, enhanced our campus visibility, and provided long-term efficiencies or led to ongoing savings in the permanent budget, in that order. Similarly, when evaluating reductions our focus was on avoiding those that could negatively affect these areas.

Reductions: The committee found most proposed reductions appropriate. Our only concern in this area related to a temporary structural issue, by which reductions were passed through from one unit/Principal Officer to another in an amount CPB questioned. CPB is confident that as the campus financial system adjusts to organizational restructuring over time, this matter will resolve itself.

Augmentations: CPB's recommendations for permanent funds prioritized support for advising services, student support services, and positions addressing key campus system user-experience and vulnerabilities that if unremedied might lead to important financial and reputational costs. As for one-time requests, CPB recommended investment in instructional equipment, student learning management systems, a variety of services focused on the student experience, and career planning. Additionally, CPB strongly supports the use of GSRs to enhance capacity in support units. In principle, such appointments seem a good use of internal university resources and align with the campus graduate growth and professional training goals. We view the routine institutional barriers to this distribution of labor as correctable, and hope to see progress made in this area next year.

The usefulness of the budget review process is reliant on the emphasis placed on its exploration/discussions/outcomes by the Administrative Leadership of the campus. CPB continues to hold out hope that full-unit budgets (rather than just marginal augmentations and reductions) will be the focus of these reviews, as reviewing only the delta of augmentations/reductions often obscures critical economies of scale and duplication of efforts. Although the budget review process is cumbersome, CPB holds it to be one of the most critical the campus undertakes. We believe that such reviews should take place on an annual basis and not only be deployed in times of financial stress to identify budget reductions. During the academic year just concluded, CPB

reviewed in detail the budgets of the Library as well as campus Grounds Services and Custodial Services. Units that the committee would be interested in investigating in upcoming years include housing, dining services, student business services, University Relations and IT services.

### **Silicon Valley**

CPB continued to pay close attention to UCSC's nascent Silicon Valley Initiative. We consulted on preliminary infrastructure, space, and support staffing plans. We also evaluated campus FTE requests in light of how these positions might best fold into proposed Silicon Valley programs.

Perhaps most substantively, CPB reviewed and discussed the Silicon Valley Programs Market Studies prepared by UPCEA (University Professional and Continuing Education Association). The studies analyzed seven programs, one of which we had not previously seen. Given the risks incumbent in this initiative and the presence of potentially competing programs, we had strongly advocated for these studies, and found that in most instances they were in concord with our original spring 2015 recommendations. We reassessed our earlier rankings in light of the new details provided by the studies, finding the original Computational Media pre-proposal (now broken into three parts: Serious Games, Human-Computer Interaction, and Computational Linguistics/Natural Language Processing) strongest, and the Data Science proposal second-strongest. The remaining programs continued to raise unresolved questions: we felt that Global Technology for Social Innovation could benefit from further scoping and reconceptualization; that the lapse of the UCSC/NAMS contract rendered the Aeronautics proposal not viable at this time; and that the newly proposed Multidisciplinary Master of Engineering program needed further development and articulation before its merits could be fully evaluated.

CPB continues to feel that Silicon Valley programs must meet certain criteria in order to succeed. We expect to revisit these criteria in the course of our continuing reviews:

- 1) **Strong faculty hires, ideally with industry ties.** Industry leaders interviewed by UPCEA regularly stressed that the programs should seek to hire first-rate faculty.
- 2) **Commitment from faculty on the main campus.** Faculty backing is essential for a program to proceed expeditiously through the process of further planning and implementation, and for the two sites to maintain vital interactions.
- 3) **Resilience.** Since the industries targeted by these proposals experience periods of boom and bust, UCSC should develop an array of programs that meet the needs of prospective students and employers during cycles of both economic expansion and contraction. Such programs will likely prove more resilient and durable over the longer term.
- 4) **Synergies.** Some overlap and/or interconnectedness among programs selected for implementation will make it easier for faculty and students on this Silicon Valley campus to develop a thriving intellectual community.

For the upcoming year, CPB looks forward to reviewing program proposals to be implemented in Silicon Valley and learn more about the campus investments in the SV Center that will support the implementation of these programs.

### **Graduate Growth**

The imperative of graduate growth was a key context for many of the issues discussed by CPB

during the 2015-2016 academic year, including FTE requests, budget recommendations, program reviews, and metrics for resource allocation. The report from the Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Graduate Growth (TFGG), which was submitted in June of last year and included three CPB members, was presented at the Academic Senate meeting in the fall. A subgroup of members along with the Chair of Graduate Council met with the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate studies (VPDGS) Tyrus Miller in September, October, and December of 2015 to provide feedback and get updates on the implementation of the recommendations of the TFGG. The recommendations were also discussed with the CP/EVC. While some of the recommendations have been implemented, including partial carry-over of block funds, others are still in progress. CPB members consulted with Vice Provost Miller on a variety of issues, including sustainability of graduate growth, the changing numbers of Ph.D. and Master's students over the last several years, and lessons learned from pilot plans to incentivize graduate growth. CPB also discussed with the VPDGS the timeline for implementation of the TFGG recommendations, including progress on the non-resident tuition remission for foreign students after one-year residency, and the need for information on the size and quality of the applicant pools to the various campus graduate programs in order to determine where faculty allocation could have the most impact with respect to graduate growth. CPB continues to closely monitor the issue of graduate growth and urges the administration to put resources toward the non-resident tuition remission initiative and professional development for graduate students.

### **VPDUE Consultations**

In the course of the 2015-16 academic year, CPB consulted several times with the vice provost and dean of undergraduate education (VPDUE). The following is a list of some of the key topics the committee discussed with him.

**CORE proposal:** One important topic was the draft or pre-proposal for revising the lower-division writing and College core course requirements submitted on January 14, 2016 by the Council of Provosts (CoP), which was considered by CPB over the course of several meetings. CPB focused on the proposal's budget and planning implications with the aim of informing the deliberations of CEP, the committee holding primary authority in matters to do with undergraduate education. Prior to submitting its response to the draft proposal, CPB consulted with the chair of CEP as well as with the VPDUE. After its first consultation with the VPDUE on the issue, CPB sent a written request (on Jan. 25) asking him for cost estimates for the various possible models for configuring Core and writing requirements put forward by the Council of Provosts. While CPB is keen on improving the quality of writing instruction and retaining a core-course experience for incoming students, the committee is concerned about the budgetary implications of the CoP's pre-proposal. As this revision is currently configured, it will almost certainly increase costs; however, if properly done, it should also increase educational effectiveness. Therefore CPB believes that it should be supported by a reasonable level of investment. At the end of the 2015-16 academic year, the committee remained worried that the cost of the options presented so far probably goes beyond what the campus can reasonably afford. The committee is convinced that the process of revising core and writing requirements would greatly benefit from the leadership of the VPDUE and of the Deans of Humanities and Social Sciences to provide the CoP with a clear envelope of resources that the campus is willing to commit to this effort. CPB also recommends that the Council of Provosts considers making more use of graduate teaching fellows in core courses, which would increase graduate support and also give departments and programs a greater stake in their

continuance. This approach would also have the advantage of giving undergraduates more meaningful contact with advanced graduate students.

**Enrollment Management:** CPB is looking forward to the development of the Curriculum Management Project (CMP). One of the problems with the current Curriculum and Leave Planning process has been that class-size forecasts are based on the most recent offerings of courses. These projections have proven brittle and unreliable when it comes to making predictions for disciplines that have experienced large increases (or decreases) in enrollments within a short time frame. The committee would like to see course enrollment forecasts take into account data on projected majors from student SIRs for the current and/or most recent year(s) (as appropriate), as well as major declarations and enrollments in key prerequisite courses. This will enable planning to more closely track trends in student interest and to adapt to rapidly changing environments. Greater accuracy in projecting course enrollments will facilitate appropriate classroom and TA assignments which, in turn, will have the important outcome of making it easier for students to get into the courses they need.

Regarding admissions of both new and transfer students, CPB concurs with the VPDUE about the need to upgrade our modeling capabilities so that we can obtain more reliable and precise yield predictions. The committee therefore appreciates the need to use external consultants in the short term, but also believes that, in order to save money over the longer term, the campus must move immediately to build its own internal capabilities in this area. In particular, CPB has strongly recommended discontinuing the use of the Ruffalo Noel Levitz consultants and working with our own faculty to develop similar in-house capabilities. Cost savings would be significant. We look forward to receiving an update from VPDUE early in the fall quarter on: undergraduate admissions outcomes, the effectiveness of the Ruffalo Noel Levitz prediction tools, the details of the most recent contract with them (scope, expiration, length and cost), and the VPDUE's plans for discontinuance.

**Multilingual Curriculum (MLC):** CPB believes the VPDUE's office should now have enough information to generate an estimate of any incremental costs of this program, which is designed to assist international and multilingual students with their English-language and writing skills, and that such information should be used in evaluating its continuation. Looking forward, the committee believes that the VPDUE should collaborate with the Writing Program and the Humanities Division to generate a proposal that satisfies the requirements outlined by CEP's correspondence dated June 2, 2016. CPB urges that this proposal clarify the role of the VPDUE's office in mounting this program; while the MLC proposal was originally forwarded to the Senate from the VPDUE's office, the Writing Program and the Humanities Division appear to fund and run the program. CPB could provide more useful advice if it was clear what unit has primary responsibility for the curriculum.

**Summer Academies:** CPB agrees with the goals for these programs: enhancing student success, improving retention, and easing the adjustment of international and other new students to the campus. The committee looks forward to receiving information about the 2016 Summer Academies that could address our concerns about their financial structure and the impact on enrollment planning. In particular, CPB would like to see budgets that lay out both income and costs from these well-supported and well-staffed academies. The VPDUE has assured us that the

summer academies are self-funded and revenue-neutral -- but what precisely do “self-funding” and “revenue neutral” mean in this context? How do we reliably measure the impact of these academies on student success given that they are more likely to attract motivated students to begin with? What metrics should be used here? CPB is firmly of the view that Summer Academies constitute an academic program and are therefore subject to Senate review, their self-funding / revenue-neutral nature notwithstanding.

### **Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS)**

CPB spent considerable time reviewing the TAPS Three-Year Fee Increase Proposal. The committee appreciates the efforts of VCBAS Latham and VCPB Delaney in deploying a much more transparent and inclusive rate review process this year, beginning with the constitution of the Advisory Committee on Campus Transportation and Parking (ACCTP) in fall 2015 and extending to their receptiveness to consultation with the committee in response to CPB concerns about the TAPS parking fee increase proposal.

The final proposal reviewed by CPB involved a complex array of variable rate increases. Although there were some important differences from last year’s rate increase proposal (maintaining the existing definition of carpools as two or more persons and preserving the “B” permit for graduate students, both recommended by CPB), the structure of the rate increases was very similar to last year’s proposal, and hence, concerns raised by CPB in the previous year (May 8, 2015) remain.

Given the need to increase parking and transportation revenue, both to fund new projects and to maintain current service levels, and given that rates have remained constant over a period of ten years for many programs, CPB supports increasing fees, and recognizes the need for a system that incorporates annual automatic increases (May 13, 2016 correspondence). However, CPB raised concerns about assigning differential rate increases to all services, both in regard fairness and to the potential effect of these increases on user behavior. The strategy of holding down the costs of “A” permits while applying large increases to other programs could potentially change the transportation equilibrium on campus, a possibility which the proposal does not take into account, and which could lead to increased environmental impact and parking congestion on campus.

CPB supported ACCTP’s decision to retain “B” permits for graduate students as an option, and wondered if the opportunity exists to differentiate the rate structure for A and B permits. CPB suggested evaluating the possibility of linking parking rates to staff and faculty salaries as a way of addressing affordability issues. CPB also wondered why a uniform percent increase in rates was not considered by the ACCTP, which might be better received by most constituents than the proposed non-uniform increases. Moving forward, CPB recommends that a mechanism to track and evaluate the change in user behavior and its impact be put in place *prior* to the increases taking effect in order to make any needed corrections for the second year of proposed fee increases. Requesting and analyzing this information, particularly in light of the reduction in Transit services to campus that the city plans to implement, is a pending task for next year. CPB also recommends that the basis for formulas used by TAPS for determining “equivalent” fees for dailies based on A permits should be reviewed by CPB and other representatives. CPB recognizes the importance of robust Senate engagement on this matter, and will continue to monitor these issues in the next year, both through its ACCTP representative and through full committee consultation as needed.

### **Capital Planning & Housing**

During the 2015-2016 academic year, the Committee on Planning and Budget devoted a significant amount of attention to issues associated with capital planning, maintenance and construction. The campus continues to face significant challenges in meeting its capital infrastructure needs, given the pressures associated with expanding the faculty and opening new programs and areas of inquiry, meeting the LRDP requirements as our student numbers continue to increase, and addressing problems arising from aging facilities, particularly in Kresge College and Family Student Housing. Efforts to address these issues have been hampered by the transition to a new policy whereby the Office of the President will now provide funding for no more than 50% of approved campus capital projects, with the remainder needing to come from campus resources by increasing our debt burden or from tapping private sources. These circumstances led to a number of challenges requiring significant consideration and discussion over the course of the year, and in some cases, ongoing work that will warrant further Senate consultation and oversight well into the 2016-2017 academic year.

CPB provided a member for three capital-planning committees. The Academic Space Plan (ASP) Task Force considers issues associated with the allocation and development of campus space assigned to academic functions, including both teaching and research. The Kresge College Project (KCP) Committee was convened to re-design Kresge College in view of its deteriorating physical condition, the need for more beds on campus, and more up-to-date notions of how best to provide a supportive environment for its residents and to embed academic, service, and administrative functions within that environment. The Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS) committee considers the "big picture" of the capital planning and maintenance process, evaluating reports and recommendations from groups such as ASP and KCP, providing critical review, and eventually forwarding its recommended capital projects to the EVC. A single CPB member represented the committee on all three capital-planning committees, which had the advantage of providing continuity and a consistently informed perspective.

The primary focus of the ASP task force was the continued development of the 2300 Delaware facility. During the prior academic year, funding had been approved for the development of "warm-shell" space that would provide infrastructure improvements generic to any research activity that would be housed there. During this academic year, consideration was given to the office, meeting, and classroom space that would be needed to house the academic groups and provide administrative support and appropriate amenities for their activities. A funding proposal was forwarded to CPS for consideration.

The KCP Committee met several times during the academic year. The process began with a "visioning" exercise brokered by the Brightspot consulting agency, whom UCSC had worked with before on the development of the Institute for Arts and Sciences. Major stakeholders (current and past provost, college advisers, students and faculty) along with other expert staff discussed the positive and negative aspects of the current design of Kresge College and how to design a new college that would appropriately interconnect (increased) residential space with academic and administrative space while holding true to a Kresge College ethos that was itself clarified during the engagement with the consultancy. This work resulted in a set of parameters that will guide the

specifics of the proposal for the redesigned college. The development of this proposal is underway as the 2015-2016 academic year comes to an end.

Over the 2015-2016 academic year the primary focus of the CPS committee, at least from the perspective of CPB, was the prioritization of capital projects in face of the limited funding available to the campus for design and construction. Several dozen projects were divided among five categories: academic buildings, gift-funded initiatives, housing, infrastructure projects, and transportation projects. Some projects fell into more than one category (primarily academic projects for which the campus hopes to obtain substantial gift funding). The CPS membership was divided into five subgroups, with each subgroup responsible for prioritizing proposals in one of the five categories. In a subsequent meeting, the full membership of CPS took these categorical prioritizations as input for the development of an overall prioritization to be used in formulating the campus's official, externally directed, ten-year capital plan. The impression given at the April 19, 2016 meeting was that the result was a straw prioritization that would then be subject to further critical review, particularly by the Academic Senate.

As a final point, CPB was visited earlier in the academic year by Sarah Latham, Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (BAS). Vice Chancellor Latham expressed a concern that initiating planning activities for numerous projects, irrespective of their worth to the campus or likelihood of being built, was consuming a disproportionate amount of BAS's resources. CPB discussed possible ways of evaluating and selecting or rejecting projects before the start of the planning process within BAS. These ideas were presented to Peggy Delaney, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, who agreed to consider the issue. A more recent follow-up discussion with Vice Chancellor Latham suggested that no significant measures had yet been introduced to address her concern. CPB will continue to monitor this issue in the next academic year.

### **New Vice Provost Offices**

The most critical recent campus organizational changes have been the creation of two Vice Provost Positions, Vice Provost for Global Engagement (April 15, 2016) and Vice Provost for Student Success (November 24, 2015). CPB has been actively engaged with the work of these officers pre- and post-appointment, and looks forward to continued momentum in both areas in 2016-17. The committee has struggled to fully understand the purview of these positions, particularly given that no job description has been created for the VPGE (current responsibilities are defined by those of the former position of Senior International Officer [SIO]). CPB is also concerned that both offices have very limited staff, and that some of the functions key to accomplishing their mission are not under the Vice Provosts' direct supervision.

CPB consulted with VPSS Padgett on May 10, 2016. The focus of the consultation was on understanding the scope of this position and its relationship with other campus officers (as understood by its current holder), as well as on the allocation of investments from the UCOP Student Success Initiative (supporting disadvantaged undergraduates, use of ALEKS for mathematics placement, funding EAB Student Collaborative software, mental health, and advising), the reformulation of writing/core requirements following the CoP proposal, and the metrics of success by which the office should be evaluated. In addition, CPB consulted with VPSS Padgett on May 26, 2016 regarding his proposal to expand the scope of the Student Success Evaluation and Research Center (SSERC). CPB was supportive of most of the goals of the

SSERC, but was concerned about the high cost of a full-time faculty director. The committee recommended that the Center proposal emphasize quantitative analysis that would directly inform faculty decisions about curricular matters.

Given that the VPGE position was not formalized until the spring 2016 quarter, CPB did not consult in person with this officer during the current academic year. However, the scope of this office was a frequent topic of discussion with the CP/EVC during weekly consultation. For the upcoming year CPB looks forward to working with the VPGE, Committee on International Education, and Senate Executive Committee, and to participating in the search for a permanent VPGE.

### **Shared Governance and Consultation Process**

CPB is grateful to CP/EVC Galloway for consulting regularly with the committee. During the 2015-2016 academic year, CPB developed a consultation calendar in collaboration with the Administration that outlines key training sessions and deadlines associated with the committee's regular business. This year CPB also started submitting in writing a list of consultation topics for the CP/EVC in advance of each week's meeting. These two measures proved very effective in improving the timeliness and effectiveness of the consultations. We believe that other committees would benefit from adopting similar practices.

One area where challenges remain is the faculty FTE allocation process. CPB firmly believes that the process could be substantially improved and Senate consultation facilitated if FTE planning started earlier in the academic year. Based on our experience from the last two years, the committee has advocated for the Office of Planning and Budget to prepare a draft of the faculty FTE call during the summer so that consultation with the committee can proceed during the first three weeks of the fall quarter, with the final letter sent out to the Deans no later than mid-October, with a deadline for Decanal response no later than mid-December. Moving to this earlier schedule could be further facilitated if the criteria on the basis of which FTE are to be allocated were to remain more or less stable for next academic year. A full set of recommendations to improve the faculty FTE process was transmitted to the CP/EVC and the VCPB, and CPB will follow up during the summer to facilitate the adoption of this new timeline.

Looking forward, a major challenge for CPB will be to continue the tradition of close consultation with the CP/EVC (through weekly visits to the committee as well as through weekly private meetings with the Senate leadership, including the CPB chair) as we transition to new campus leadership.

### **Regular Committee Business**

#### *New Program Proposals*

CPB reviewed proposals for the establishment of a B.S. in Environmental Sciences, M.S. in Coastal Science and Policy PDST program (professional degree with supplemental tuition), M.F.A. in Dance SSGPDP program (self-supporting program), M.F.A. in Social Documentation, and M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Computational Media.

#### *External Reviews*

CPB supplemented the universal charge with specific questions for the departments of Astronomy & Astrophysics, Biomolecular Engineering, Digital Arts and New Media, Feminist Studies, Ocean Sciences, Politics, Sociology, and Community Studies (the last named a purely internal review). Committee responses to the external review reports for discussion during closure meetings were prepared for the departments of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Computer Engineering, Anthropology, Computer Science, Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology, Economics, and Community Studies (again, an internal review). CPB also reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on length of review cycle for Science Communication, Environmental Studies, History of Art and Visual Culture, and Music (deferral request).

On the administrative side, the committee also reviewed and commented on the Campus Bookstore Consulting's (CBC) external review report on the Bay Tree Bookstore.

#### *Off-Cycle FTE Requests and Waiver of Open Recruitment Requests*

CPB reviewed and made recommendations on eight additional or second-hire requests, three Presidential Postdoctoral Scholar hire requests, one Target of Excellence waiver of open recruitment proposal, and two Spousal/Partner waiver of open recruitment proposals.

#### **Local and Systemwide Issue Review**

In addition to the issues discussed in earlier sections of the report, CPB reviewed and commented on the following issues and/or policies:

- Proposed Economics Department and Hastings M.O.U. for an MS in Applied Economics and Finance (November 2015)
- Library Proposal for Use of Start Up Funding (November 2015)
- Faculty and Staff Child Care Services Model Report (December 2015)
- VPDUE Winter Admissions Feedback Request (December 2015)
- Biology Minor Administrative Oversight Change Proposal (January 2016)
- VPDUE Proposal to change Standard Classroom Time Slots, Passing Times, and Final Exam Block Time (January 2016)
- Review of Retirement Task Force Options Report (February 2016)
- SIO/VPGE Proposal for 3+1+1 Guidelines (February 2016)
- UC Recruit Governance Board's proposed guidelines: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the UC (March 2016)
- VPAA Draft Memo Calling for Updates to Department Instructional Workload Policies (March 2016)
- Employee Housing Program Resale Pricing Proposal (April 2016)
- Proposal for Discontinuance of Education Department's Collaborative Leadership Ed.D. (April 2016)
- SIO/VPGE Study Abroad Student Processes Proposal (April 2016)
- VPDUE UCSC Scholars Program Proposal (April 2016)
- Review of Systemwide APM 360; APM 210-4 (May 2016)
- Games and Playable Media Recruitment FTE Transfer Proposal (May 2016)
- Nanjing Audit University and UCSC Economics 3+1+1 Pilot Proposal (May 2016)
- Art Design: Games and Playable Media B.A. Administrative Oversight Change Proposal (June 2016)

- VPSS Proposal to expand the scope of the Student Success Evaluation and Research Center (June 2016)
- Review of VPAA’s Draft revisions to *Academic Programs and Units: Policy and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment, and Change* (June 2016)

**Continuing Issues for CPB 2016-17**

- Strategic Academic Planning—continuing to engage with this issue, including academic metrics, major impaction, and enrollment planning
- Graduate growth—monitoring the Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force for Graduate Growth recommendations, specifically for Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition funding.
- Faculty recruitment requests—continue to monitor and participate in implementation of changes to the FTE planning process
- Long Range Development Plan—engage with the administration in the early stages of development.
- Capacity planning—continued committee participation in the Major Impaction Policy Working Group.
- Silicon Valley—Monitor progress of programs being developed.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Adrian Brasoveanu

Cormac Flanagan

Loisa Nygaard

Rick Prelinger

Danilyn Rutherford

Bruce Schumm

Marilyn Walker

Jin Zhang

Don Brenneis, *ex officio*

Ólöf Einarsdóttir, *ex officio*

Abel Rodriguez, Chair

Whitney DeVos, Graduate Representative

Guillermo Rogel, Undergraduate Representative

Hannah Tuong, Undergraduate Representative

August 31, 2016

### **Appendix A: How CPB Functions**

CPB consists of ten regular members (one of whom serves as Chair), including two *ex officio* members, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate. All members are selected by the Committee on Committees (COC) and are subject to Senate approval. CPB brings a balance of perspectives to campus issues by including members from each academic division. CPB also had a graduate student representative and places for two undergraduate student representatives to sit with the committee throughout the year. Members represent CPB on other academic and administrative committees and share the tasks of writing and editing documents. The duties of the Chair include setting meeting agendas, facilitating meetings, assigning tasks to CPB members for preparing reports and written responses, meeting commitments in terms of timely response to consultation, signing CPB documents and attending UCPB meetings. All CPB letters and reports, unless otherwise noted, represent the consensus opinion of CPB.