

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of February 7, 2008

Present: Chair Susan Gillman, Michael Brown, Emily Honig, Lori Kletzer, Tracy Larrabee, Herbert Lee, Karen Otteman, Olga Najera-Ramirez, Grant Pogson, Quentin Williams and Mary-Beth Harhen

Guests: EVC Dave Kliger and VC Meredith Michaels

Member Items

CPB discussed the Draft Strategic Academic Plan, Part A, Vision for the Future. Chair Gillman commented that there are a number of issues converging including: budget cuts, faculty salaries, conditions for growth and information from the data subcommittee. CPB needs to think of these things in relation to each other. CPB then discussed what ways the Senate can specifically weigh in on the budget cut process. CPB agreed that protecting the instructional mission should be front and center. CPB also agreed that understanding the Academic Support Units to determine what is really in the budgets for those units will be important. It was noted that UCSB made the overt decision to invest in their academic programs at the expense of infrastructure and support units. CPB feels that UCSC should be looking at similar models which emphasize the academic mission.

Philosophy External Review Discussion

CPB discussed edits to the draft closure letter which had been distributed to the committee. In addition to issues discussed at last week's meeting, CPB is concerned about diversity in the department, issues around the collegial climate and the lack of a plan based on their current configuration of faculty.

Temporary Academic Staff Allocations

Academic units receive their funds for open provisions when those provisions are allocated whereas support units do not receive their funding until the position is filled. The system of allocating funds with the provisions was intended to enable divisions to build up one time money for start up without having to come back and request for funding from the center. VC Michaels explained that funds for merits come from the block allocation from the Office of the President (OP) and the center pays for the overage. OP plans to revisit their merit allocation formula this year in order to make it more transparent to the campuses.

Consultation with EVC Kliger

EVC Kliger stated that the campus was funded for faculty salary increases for the filled FTE but was not funded by UCOP for the increases in the unfilled FTE. He asked for CPB's recommendation on timing and methodology for funding the unfilled FTE. Responding to a question from CPB, the EVC said that OP only gave the campus money for the filled positions but there is no current plan for additional resources from OP which leaves campus with underfunded provisions.

Next, the EVC and CPB discussed the campus approach to budget cuts. The EVC would like to come up with a plan for cuts ranging from six million to 12 million dollars. He would like to begin the process by identifying the maximum amount the campus can take centrally to minimize the amount of cuts that go out to the divisions. The EVC said on the positive side this approach does the least immediate harm to the divisions' current programs. However, this reduces flexibility at the center to give money to divisions for initiatives or opportunities. The EVC believes this is a reasonable trade off. Next week the EVC will present a spreadsheet which will show ways to protect instructional programs while applying cuts to administrative functions. EVC asked CPB to recommend some general principles for the campus to guide budget cutting and any specific areas the committee thinks should be protected or be cut. CPB had an initial discussion on a number of principles such as stopping the practice of scrutinizing the academic divisions first, protecting, if not increasing, faculty salaries and protecting faculty from remedial work.

Professional School Pre Proposal Discussion

A school of public health meeting was held, and some CPB members attended. At the meeting there was discussion about what needs to be done next but no leader has been identified. CPB decided to review its criteria again to ensure it is providing the groups with useful information on the proposals.

Ranch View Terrace Audit

The committee expressed disappointment that the audit report did not address the original question which was a concern that buyers were being inappropriately charged for costs associated with preparation of the site. CPB would like to understand the method of setting the price point which should have been answered by the audit. The report provides no information on this. CPB questions the objectivity of the report which reads more like a narrative of the planning process than an analysis of cost factors for the project.