

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Meeting of October 15, 2009**

**Present:** Chair Brent Haddad, Gildas Hamel, Lori Kletzer, Piero Madau, Cindy Pease-Alvarez, Warren Sack, Gene Switkes, Rob Wilson, SUA Rep Jennifer De La Torre, SUA Rep Kalwis Lo and Mary-Beth Harhen

**Absent:** (with notice) JJ Garcia-Luna, Marc Mangel and GSA Rep, Kevin Schlaufman

**Guests:** CP/EVC Dave Kliger

**Member Items**

CPB member Switkes reported on the Advisory Committee for Facilities (ACF) meeting. ACF discussed two items: the cogeneration plant and citing for the new Social Sciences building. Capital Planning is working on an informal plan that it will be presented to ACF. 2008-09 CPB members informed the current CPB committee that CPB has requested a Social Sciences area plan twice in the past few years and CPB will follow up with the EVC for update on their request for a Social Sciences area plan.

**Budgeting Methodology: Differential Cuts/Allocations**

Chair Haddad began by stating that CPB needs to develop an approach for implementing a broad set of principles to use as an approach for budget reductions. Chair Haddad said the Senate leadership will be working with EVC Kliger, Interim VC Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney and Special Assistant Linda Kittle on a process to determine the 2010-11 budget process. CPB discussed the need to involve the deans as early in the process as possible. The committee is concerned about repeating last year's accelerated timeline where by the time CPB received information from the deans (via the EVC), the budget decisions had already been made.

CPB then discussed the timing and content of information the committee would like to receive. This included a possible base budgeting exercise, CPB members developing areas of expertise concerning academic support units, and local versus global budgets. CPB would like to learn more about how decisions made at the local level affect other units or the campus as a whole. The committee would like to see the local level accountable to campus concerns.

Chair Haddad asked CPB to consider how to turn principles in action. CPB members want to be rational, inquisitive and follow the processes it agrees on, so the conclusion is considered legitimate. At the end of the year CPB needs to be able to say the committee conducted a thorough analysis before it arrived at its conclusion. CPB needs a clear understanding of the campus budget process, to assert leadership, and clearly communicate its recommendations and rationale.

The committee then discussed the difficulties interdisciplinary programs face in a budget reduction. Budgets tend to follow divisional and departmental lines, and while interdisciplinary programs may be important to divisions, they are the easiest to cut. CPB agreed it is important to look at different budgeting structures, and recognize the broader impact of cuts.

Following this discussion Chair Haddad reviewed previously distributed budget materials. This included the two year budget cut comparisons, FTE information, and CPB 2008-09 budget report #3. CPB discussed the need to better understand the academic support units, and question how the administration defines an academic unit, a category that seemed to shift in the materials provided. The committee discussed the cuts to the library as an example of a unit the committee considers as academic, but received cuts like a support unit.

### **Consultation with EVC Kliger**

The EVC began the consultation by updating CPB on Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) efforts (CPB and the EVC had discussed the issue at a previous CPB meeting). UCSC submitted more proposals than it had in the past, and remarks from the reviews were positive about the amount of central campus support. The vice chancellor of research does not believe there is a problem about support from his office in submission of IGERT proposals.

The EVC then informed CPB that the VP of Academic Affairs is working with the deans on a set of principles and criteria for academic planning in the divisions. The EVC has asked the deans to think about the next five years and how many faculty positions they estimate will be vacated, then how many of those positions should be refilled, as well as what areas should grow. CPB asked the EVC about his vision for the budget process, and the EVC said he does not have one at this point. He asked CPB to help determine questions for the deans.

CPB asked the EVC if he sees any other ways to reduce programs, other than by faculty attrition. The EVC responded he does not see the campus eliminating faculty positions and there needs to be a plan to help the divisions phase in their cuts over a number of years. The EVC is looking for bridge funds for the divisions. CPB asked about eliminating institutes or programs and the EVC said the deans have looked at that, but there it does not seem like there is much money to be saved. CPB members cautioned the EVC that if the campus concentrates on attrition as a way to achieve academic division cuts, our nationally ranked programs will be severely affected. The EVC countered that retirement FTEs can go back to the department, so if a dean wants to build a certain program he still has the ability. Hard decisions will have to be made though, because every department will argue excellence. This is why establishing a criterion is so important. The EVC and the committee then discussed the current practice of keeping FTE in a division, and how that hinders cross divisional activities. If FTE go back to the center it will help the problem, but takes away the decision making from the divisions.

Responding to a question from CPB about undergraduate programs, the EVC said the campus has to decide if it is going to keep all its programs. First though the campus has to decide on a process for deciding. Eliminating programs take a long time, so it is not a quick budget fix.

A student representative noted that the reason students come to UCSC is for the individual majors and unique programs. UCSC is becoming the same as other campuses, and losing its individuality.

Next there was a discussion about the pay cut/furlough program. CPB asked the EVC to produce the anticipated savings based on the salary bands. The EVC agreed to provide the information and said that when the Office of the President (OP) proposed the program the Council of EVCs pushed to exempt staff making less than \$40,000 a year, but OP refused. OP reasoned that if they did that the cuts to the other salary bands would have to be larger to make up the difference. CPB then asked for the analysis that OP conducted before the program was put in place. The EVC responded that he is not sure if the analysis is available, but will ask.

**Principles Discussion – Foundation for Budget Planning**

CPB discussed the draft principles document and came up with a number of edits. CPB Chair Haddad will revise the document and CPB will review it at the next meeting.