

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of January 27, 2005

Present: Chair Paul Koch, Faye Crosby, Margaret Fitzsimmons, Alison Galloway, Ray Gibbs, Wentai Liu, John Lynch, Onuttom Narayan, Margaret Morse, Don Rothman, Marina Sarra, Mary-Beth Harhen

Guests: CPEVC Peggy Delaney, VC Meredith Michaels,

Members' Items/Committee Business

The minutes of January 6 and January 13, 2005 were approved with corrections. There was brief discussion of the UCOP appointment of the Chancellor's partner that has garnered much attention. CPB understands that the salary for the new position, which the press reported as a large increase, was actually based on a standard UCOP calculation converting the candidate's current 9-month salary into a 12-month salary, and then adding 10%. What was not formulaic was the moving expense allowance.

For years, because of the *ad hoc* nature of off-cycle, potential spousal hires on which it has been asked to consult, CPB has requested that a more formal campus spousal hiring policy be established. There was discussion of the situation of academic departments that are asked to accept administrative appointees into academic positions. In the unlikely event of a negative departmental vote, the appointee could always be a divisional appointee. Tangentially, CPB briefly discussed the problems of divisional appointments, of which there are many in the School of Engineering; that those faculty do not have Bylaw 55 rights in a department, that personnel committees are established *ad hoc*, and the particular problems of Assistant Professor approaching tenure outside of the departmental structure.

The Chair gave a brief report on the Digital Arts New Media (DANM) building committee, which is meeting today with all constituents represented. The building, still in the planning phase, is now over budget and CPB will need to follow the solutions to this problem closely.

Gartner Report Summary

The Chair clarified that what the committee received with the agenda was a summary written by the Gartner consulting firm based on campus data collection and comparison data with like institutions. Also included in the agenda was the Information Technology Services (ITS) response to the Gartner Summary. Gartner has proprietary rights over the data and therefore the campus's access to the data is limited.

The committee noted the difficulty of discussing IT when only qualitative information is offered. With qualitative data, campus constituents cannot understand the range of

choices and tradeoffs that would justify planning. For example, the consulting firm AVCOR, which initially assessed campus IT, developed a working figure of \$32million spent on IT, arguing that campus was overspending. The Gartner summary does not indicate the amount that we are currently spending, but it suggests that reorganization might reduce costs by ~ 2 million. Neither provided empirical data to justify their positions. This lack of detail is causing concerns about IT planning.

The Gartner Summary notes that of the \$2million in savings that consolidation may generate, most would be realized by having fewer employees. The ITS response argues for reinvestment of savings into the new, consolidated organization, using the argument that UCSC is under spending in a number of categories. But without any data, how can we judge these claims?

CPB would like to see a full analysis including: numbers on staffing, headcount, and hours spent on redundant services. The committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting to refine the request for analysis in preparation for an upcoming consultation with VPIT Larry Merkely.

Bylaw 55 and Partial Appointments

Following on the previous week's consideration of the request for an 80-20% split of an appointment in the School of Engineering, the committee discussed the issue of split appointments at UCSC. The committee must investigate current policy and practice before advising VPAA Brown on the current request.

Consultation with CPEVC Peggy Delaney

CPB asked the CPEVC about the issues raised by the hire of the Chancellor's partner at UCOP. This hire has brought up the many unresolved issues of spousal hiring on our campus. There will be a fact sheet about the appointment from UCOP and a statement from Chancellor-designate Denton. The CPEVC reminded the committee that for faculty spousal hires there are no free FTE. She has reviewed the policies of other campuses (UCI, UCD), which clearly lay out the responsibilities of the sponsoring and receiving departments. The Council of Deans agreed that: 1) they did not want waivers of recruitment and 2) positions must have academic and budgetary priority for the department and the division. CPB added that even if this policy remained in place, there should be consideration of some incentive for the receiving department beyond an accelerated hiring schedule. The Committee and the CPEVC agreed to discuss spousal hiring again in the near future.

Consultation with CPEVC Peggy Delaney and Humanities Dean Gary Lease

CPEVC Delaney discussed Humanities submission of three requests to pursue UC President's Postdoctoral Fellows. The program was established in 1984 to encourage diversity in the faculty ranks. As a hiring incentive for ladder rank appointments of President's Postdoctoral Fellows, UC Office of the President provides five years of forward funding at the level of Assistant Professor, Step III. UCOP does not provide start up costs. Upgrades are covered by the campus and/or division. The Dean was clear in

his letter that after five years, the department hosting the new faculty member will be responsible for the FTE and it will count in the totals put forth in the 10-year plans.

With member John Lynch recusing himself, and after one request was withdrawn, CPB considered the remaining two requests in light of how these FTE fit into the Division's 10 year plans. All agreed that regardless of incentives or what we use to identify an FTE, all hires must be academically and financially justified within departmental and divisional priorities. The position must meet the academic and curricular needs of the department. For both departments under consideration, CPB will need extra assurances of the departments' buy-in because of doubts that the plans from previous years were properly vetted in the divisional process. CPB will send a written recommendation to the CPEVC.