

MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of February 9, 2012

Present: Lynn Westerkamp, *Chair*, Robert Boltje, Andy Szasz, Daniel Friedman, Susan Gillman, David Draper, Patty Gallagher, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Sriram Shastry, Jessica Greenstreet, SUA, Valerie Poyner, GSA, Matthew Mednick, Committee Analyst, Mary-Beth Harhen, Senate Director

Absent: Deanna Shemek (with notice)

Guests: CP/EVC Alison Galloway, VC Peggy Delaney

1. Members Items

Minutes of January 26, 2011 were approved as written.

CPB member Gallagher reported on the Music closure meeting. CPB had asked the Arts Dean to comment on the facilities upgrades which had been addressed previously. Other topics included curricular revisions which had been implemented, a Graduate Council issue related to graduate student acceptance versus yield, and the elimination of performance tracks.

CPB member Gallagher reported on the February 7, 2012 UCPB meeting at which she served as an alternate. Currently there is an ongoing search for a second suitable site for the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, with a site in Richmond, California under review.

Senate Chair Gillman reported that the Academic Council will be forwarding a Memorial to the Regents to the Academic Assembly, initiated by several divisional chairs, for campus voting. The memorial calls upon the Regents to do whatever is in their power to advocate for additional state support for higher education. It is hoped that the memorial can be passed by the Senate by May 2012 in order to reach the May Regents meeting.

The sub-committee on retention met with Dean of Students Alma Sifuentes and Executive Director Educational Opportunity Programs Pablo Reguerin. Having asked for related data, they were referred to work with Institutional Research. The sub-committee plans to formulate a related data request to Planning and Budget.

It was reported from the Transportation Advisory Committee that there is a proposal to raise A parking fees from approximately \$800/yr to \$1000/yr for the purposes of building additional parking structures proximate to the new Social Sciences building and at the Long Marine Lab. CPB briefly discussed their views on the different parking permits offered by TAPS.

SUA representative Greenstreet updated the committee on proposed structural changes to the SUA bylaws which would change the way representatives to various committees across the campus, including Academic Senate committees, are chosen. Voting will occur in the spring.

2. **Housing Repurchase Program**

During CPB's review of the Campus Unit Deficit Report, Employee Housing was identified as an area of interest. After the review of additional detail, CPB was slightly reassured since the detail shows less deficit than reported in the Campus Unit Deficit Report. The home purchase prices have gone up significantly due to the re-pricing program, which pays for remodeling and the LIO-SHLP loan program. Currently the University is sitting on several vacant units on which it exercised its right to first purchase. Due to several factors, including the lack of faculty hiring as well as overall housing market, many of these units are not current being sold in a timely manner. CPB reviewed CFW's latest correspondence on this topic, and generally agreed that the situation is being reviewed appropriately.

CPB was gratified that there is greater awareness among the faculty of the housing related programs and that they are consistently used in the recruitment process. There was concurrence that the primary concern now is the affordability of these homes for new faculty.

3. **Summer Session – Financial Data**

CPB noted that the distribution of return per course back to the departments is about 2% of the total revenue. If one of the goals of Summer Session is the campus goal of graduating students in four years or less, there is little to incentivize offering courses in summer for departments. It was also mentioned that the VPDUE is considering reducing the ladder faculty compensation for teaching during Summer Session, as is the case on some other UC campuses. CPB was not in favor of this change, with faculty salaries accounting for so little of the overall Summer Session budget, this reverse-incentive could potentially reduce faculty interest in teaching during summer. The committee also noted that keeping compensation at the normal level could help departments to incentivize hosting visiting faculty who will be teaching and conducting research during the summer. If departments can plan with or increase their return from summer courses, it is possible that programs can be built with this in mind and thus could enhance research and generate associated research funding.

Graduate students are compensated less in summer than during the academic year. With summer teaching the primary way many graduate students support themselves, it seems counterintuitive that their compensation would be reduced during this time. CPB plans to request a complete summary of compensation by title to further investigate this situation.

CPB had several questions regarding the percentage of total revenues which is allocated as Return to Aid (RTA). It was unclear to CPB if there is a minimum RTA, or if perhaps this total should be increased. Without additional data, it is impossible for the committee to consider the overall Summer Session goals in relation to the academic year budget.

Overall CPB had many questions about the goals for Summer Session. Most critically, the committee is interested in the expenses paid out of general funds which ultimately support Summer Session, but which were not listed in the budget CPB received (e.g., library access, computer and science labs). Without this data, it is unclear how profitable Summer Session is, and reimagining the program or proposing changes to the allocations, total courses, etc. is difficult. CPB believes that there should be a realignment of purpose that allows departments to use Summer Session offerings in a more intentional way which supports their overall curricular

planning. As noted previously, incentivizing this process for departments as well as clearing articulating the expected funding return will greatly enhance the efficiency with which such changes can be adopted.

4. Consultation with CP/EVC Alison Galloway

The EVC began by giving a brief update on the variability of the possible cuts we face in 2012-13. Ranging from conservatively \$3-4M to as much as \$18M, they will depend on a number of factors not the least of which being two separate automatic triggers and the November ballot initiative. For the campus meeting with President Yudof, with UCSC already having absorbed its permanent cuts, they will articulate which campus units and programs will need to be eliminated if further cuts hit the campus. The EVC will be hosting a faculty and staff forum on the budget on February 27, 2012.

The EVC then updated the committee on the planned March 1, 2012 general strike. While the detailed plans for the strike are unknown, indications are that there will not be any forced road closures. Even with indications that the strike will not disrupt campus services, the EVC stressed that since many individuals live on campus and because Empire Grade is a primary emergency access road, that police may be required to clear the roadways if they become blocked in an unsafe manner.

Senate Chair Gillman reported that the Senate Executive Committee letter summarizing and contextualizing rebenching will go out the campus community prior to the strike. It is her hope that this will assist in adding substance to the strike discussions and for those who travel to Sacramento.

CPB asked the EVC about the dean's faculty recruitment requests and what information and justification she is looking for. They asked for a summary of the priorities she has in mind for critical faculty hiring and how the budget situation impacts her perspective. In response the EVC identified that the arrival of further budget clarity will impact what recruitments she is prepared to authorize. Overall however, the EVC is concerned that if we don't start refilling faculty positions, that ultimately some programs will become non-viable and that current faculty will separate at an increased rate. Her view is that starting to get more faculty appointed is critical not only for workload concerns but to reassure faculty and students that UCSC has a future.

Some divisions have returned permanent faculty FTE prior to actual retirements, thus some faculty lines have been hollowed out causing programmatic, curricular, and research gaps. It is indicated that some areas have been cut too much (TAs in Social Sciences) and some funding must be reinstated. Additionally, are some initiatives that the campus is focused on, for instance the Silicon Valley Center, which will need an investment in order to build a strong foundation of ladder faculty. The EVC expressed some concern that in these uncertain budget times, initiatives like the Silicon Valley Center are without campus advocates, with many leaders focused on advocating for their particular units.

CPB noted that there is high variability in the level of consultation with their faculty by the deans in preparing their recruitment requests. So, there is a concern that what is put forward does not reflect the 'on-the-ground' needs of the departments to address many of the concerns the EVC

has articulated. CPB suggested that the deans should have opportunity to review one another's proposals, and noted that some of the requests are not contextualized by an explanation of the recent recruitment history, which overall the committee found most beneficial. The EVC identified that she would prefer to keep the off-cycle requests to a minimum. She conceded however that as this is a very dynamic situation, some exceptions would be made. Her highest priority is to get the faculty back into classrooms and labs.

CPB noted the policy contradiction of having faculty notify the department of separation. With notice not required until April, this can be disruptive to the planning and recruitment process. This creates a period of useful salary savings, but can create disruption for the departments and generate time consuming ad hoc requests for recruitment from the EVC.

Off Cycle Recruitment Request

The department plans to preempt the candidate from going out on the job market by hiring a President's and Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellow. The concept behind this program was to create, nurture, and supply individuals with a successful trajectory to hire from. It seems a proper and well thought out plan, and CPB was supportive of the proposal.

Recruitment Requests

CPB briefly discussed the recruitment requests which were submitted by all the Deans. Of primary concern was the differential form and substance which was provided by each submission. In general, CPB was more pleased with the submissions which laid out the hiring history and contextualized their requests with both past and future planning.

CPB began the process of crafting specific comments and questions, by division, to be discussed at upcoming decanal consultations.