

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of October 19, 2006**

**Present:** Chair Susan Gillman, Ray Gibbs, Emily Honig, David Evan Jones, Tracy Larrabee, Karen Ottemann, Grant Pogson, Ravi Rajan, Faye Crosby, Quentin Williams, Gabriela Sandoval, Sarah Curtis, Bryant Mata, Mary-Beth Harhen

**Absent:** (with notice) Alegra Eroy-Reveles

**Guests:** Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels

**Members Items**

The 10/05/06 minutes were approved with the addition of faculty recruitment and retention as a 2006-07 proactive agenda item.

**Partner Employment Task Force Report (PETF)**

The report lacks guidelines on specific structures for FTE that would allow the flexibility needed for joint appointments. In order to make partner hiring, as well as other opportunity hires, more feasible, the campus needs to decide how to structure split appointments. In the past UCSC had a strong tradition of split appointments when all faculty held were appointed in both their College and the Boards of Studies. When this system changed in the 1970s, the FTE shifted to the Boards. Since then, split appointments were perceived as problematic particularly in relation to personnel actions.

The report lacks specific data about campus practice, the problems that have resulted (failed recruitment or retention) as well as possible approaches to joint appointments. CPB noted that if we are going to have a policy on partner hires, then the resource issue must be addressed. Yet the report fails to make any recommendation about committing campus resources, especially at the center. Multiple units must be willing to contribute resources, but the report does not lay out any mechanisms for putting forward or coordinating resources from various sources. The report also dismisses the idea of a central pool without justification. CPB recommends that a series of general principles be drawn up to provide guidance about when and how partner hires ought to be considered. Departments should be able to take advantage of serendipitous opportunities, whether offered by the individual being recruited, or the partner, or both. In instances when a joint appointment can work and there is general recognition that it should work, we need to build concrete incentives into the structure of the partner program. The role as well as the resource contribution of both the hiring and receiving departments must be clear, and in the case of a joint appointment, the formal division of the FTE and the department in which personnel evaluation will occur must be clear. Finally, CPB recommends that the campus adopt the basic principle that, time permitting, an open recruitment will always be the first line of response. A letter to Chair Crosby outlining CPB's recommendations will be forthcoming.

### **Employee Housing Administrative Plan (EHAP)**

The report is the result of an annual allocation of money used in this case to hire a consultant with experience at many other universities. CPB noted that Chapters five and six of the report are the most relevant for Senate review. The UCSC housing office has been run under the aegis of Student Affairs. The report recommends that UCSC establish a non-profit, chartered entity, specifically a 501c trust, that may function as a developer. This is a salutary effort to reorganize how housing is handled. One of the current failures of our housing pricing policy is that the prices are too low. If prices are too far below market value, owners can neither build equity nor move out. This has evolved into a static situation. In contrast, most campus housing systems are based on turnover, assuming that units come open as individuals move out into the open market. The report attributes this in part to a pervasive ignorance about the university loan programs (MOP and SHLEP) that allow individuals to get into housing without putting a lot of money down. In addition, CPB noted that the report does not consider developing off-campus. Among the CPB recommendations are the following: CPB supports the establishment of a 501c as soon as possible and recommends a review of the Board of Directors configuration. CPB will finalize its recommendations regarding the Employee Housing Administrative Plan at the next meeting.

### **TIM**

There was considerable confusion caused by a letter about Technology and Information Management (TIM) sent directly to committee members from SOE Dean Kang. Ordinarily, all communication from the Deans comes to the committee through the EVC, whom CPB advises. Last year, the EVC and VPAA brought concerns to the committee regarding the fulfillment of commitments made by the TIM program. Dean Kang's letter fails to address the committee's concerns. CPB agreed to send a letter to the deans ( three of whom are newly appointed) about the committee's role in advising the EVC on programs, planning and budget. An explanatory letter will be sent, perhaps jointly with the EVC, to the deans to confirm the specifics of campus consultation processes.

### **Conditions for Growth/Draft Academic Plan**

CPB continued the discussion of the draft Strategic Academic Plan. The committee will continue with weekly reviews of the plan and will submit final recommendations to Senate Chair Crosby by November 30, 2006. (There is flexibility in this deadline, according to Chair Crosby.)

### **LALS External Review**

CPB noted that the external review is extremely positive, describing Latin American and Latino Studies (LALS) as one of the strongest academic programs in the U.S. devoted to research and teaching across the disciplines about both Latinos and Latin Americans. The review applauds the department's transnational and interdisciplinary approach, the strength of the faculty in terms of both research and teaching, the growth of the undergraduate major since the last review, and the potential of its planned Ph.D. program. At the same time, the external reviewers perceive LALS as being at a critical juncture in its development, particularly because of the potential loss of three of its 6.5 core faculty

members. The Dean of Social Sciences agrees with this assessment, praising the Department's strengths and noting the challenges it currently faces with regards to its faculty. A letter to VPAA Galloway with additional comments is forthcoming.