MINUTES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Meeting of September 27, 2012

Present: Lynn Westerkamp (Chair), Zsuzsanna Abrams, Donald Brenneis, Sue Carter, E.G. Crichton, David Draper, Daniel Friedman, Susan Harding, David Helmbold, Joe Konopelski, Susan Schwartz, Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO), Matthew Mednick (ASO).

Guest: Associate Vice Chancellor of Budget and Resource Management Karen Eckert

1. Welcome, Introductions, Conducting Committee Business
   After introductions, Chair Westerkamp gave the committee an orientation on conducting CPB business, member responsibilities, and confidentiality. Chair Westerkamp also laid out the policy on recusals, and the expectation that when the committee is discussing an issue that pertains to one’s department, or in which there is a clear conflict of interest, a member should leave the room and not participate in the discussion.

   The committee also discussed the role of members serving as representatives on campus committees or task forces, the procedures for authorship on behalf of the CPB, as well as review of minutes and official correspondence, to be revisited in a future meeting.

   CPB approved the confidentiality agreement and consultation procedures for distribution to Deans, Departments, Principal Officers, and the administration.

   Senate Executive Committee Updates:
   Senate Chair Konopelski briefly covered the pending joint Senate-Administrative Task Forces on Pedagogy and “Academic Structures” focused on the multiple learning styles and challenges of our students and how the structures of our campus help and hinder interdivisional relationships and resource allocation strategies.

2. Part I of Budget Training
   Presentation by Karen Eckert, AVC for Budget and Resource Management

   AVC Eckert’s presentation was primarily focused on basic concepts, definitions and a review of the campus/state budget cycles. Items covered a range of subjects including: TA assistance, range adjustments, faculty merits, budget principles, carryforward, divisional allocations, FTE and hollowed FTE. The committee asked for additional data on FTE allocations by campus, which AVC Eckert indicated would be available in a forthcoming presentation from VC Delaney.

   A brief update was provided on recent rebacking developments, which the committee will be considering at length at an upcoming meeting for response to the systemwide Academic Council. The important matter that UCSC has already implemented most of its cuts was discussed, in contrast to the other UC campuses which for the most part have
paid for cuts with one-time funds rather than reducing their base budgets by hollowing FTE or some other budgetary mechanism.

3. **VPDUE Consultation Items**
   With CPB’s first consultation with the VPDUE Hughey scheduled for the following week, the committee outlined the items which are pending for review or require consultation with his office. Issues include: retention, summer session, re-alignment update, resource issues for curricula, non-resident and international student yield and support efforts, “impacted majors” and other capacity issues.

4. **Committee Assignments/External Reviews**
   The committee discussed expectations for the member participation in the various stages of the departmental and unit external review processes. Members were referred to the documentation in the external review subject folder as well as materials on the external review portal which will be provided once materials are submitted.

5. **Committee Assignments**
   Members were asked to review the draft external review, sub-committee, and campus committee assignments for the year and provide any feedback or conflicts by the next meeting. Some specific committees were discussed in terms of content and their critical importance to CPB. In some cases these committees are CPB’s only way of remaining in the loop on impactful campus issues and in particular, capital planning outlays.