

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET  
MINUTES  
November 19, 2015**

**Present:** Abel Rodriguez (Chair), Ólöf Einarsdóttir (*ex officio*), Adrian Brasoveanu, Cormac Flanagan, Loisa Nygaard, Rick Prelinger, Bruce Schumm, Jin Zhang, Hannah Tuong (Undergrad Rep) Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

**Absent:** Don Brenneis (*ex officio*), Danilyn Rutherford, Marilyn Walker, Whitney De Vos (Graduate Rep), Guillermo Rogel (Undergraduate Rep),

**Member's Items**

Chair Rodriguez asked the capital planning subgroup to decide on a representative for the Student Housing West Committee, which is expected to begin meeting.

A member reported on the graduate growth presentation at the Senate meeting of November 13, 2016.

**Review of FTE Letter**

Members reviewed and finalized the committee's recommendations to the CP/EVC's draft FTE call letter. The committee recommended that the list of criteria be amended and the criteria prioritized to include enhancing the research profile of the campus by supporting doctoral growth in existing or new programs with high growth potential and maintaining or increasing the excellence of existing undergraduate program, or improving the educational experience for a substantial number of undergraduate students as primary drivers for this year's FTE evaluation. In addition, the committee recommended that additional complementary criteria, including faculty contributions to diversity, promotion of cross-divisional investments and collaborations, and reinvigoration of areas that have historically been centers of excellence. The recommendations reflected CPB goals of keeping academic excellence, graduate growth, and a transformative undergraduate experience at the forefront of this year's deliberations on FTE allocations, while supporting other worthy goals that can be achieved without sacrificing main objectives.

The committee noted a change in this year's process includes a pre-allocation of FTE to divisions. The committee noted its support and also expressed the need for a campus-wide academic plan to facilitate campus decision making in future years.

The committee also noted that it welcomed the introduction of academic metrics as part of an effort to increase the use of evidence-based decision making on campus. However, members noted that the definition of metrics needs careful consideration, not allowed by the current timeline. With that, the committee raised a set of preliminary recommendations, which would be useful to inform FTE allocation decisions, with further discussion and engagement on metrics to follow.

The committee decided to establish a subcommittee on metrics, deliberated its charge, and established its membership.

**Music Department External Review Deferral Request**

The Music Department requested a one-year extension on their external review that is set for 2016-17, and the Arts Division Dean supports this request. VPAA Lee noted in his transmission letter to the Senate that the six-year review cycle for the department was set due to concerns about graduate curriculum, graduate student progress tracking, affiliated faculty, and ear training instruction. CPB discussed the Music Department request for a one-year extension on their external review set for 2016-17. CPB noted it does

not support the deferral request, and concurred with the VPAA's recommendation for a six-year review cycle.

### **Child Care Services Model Report**

The committee reviewed the Child Care Services Model report prepared by the Faculty and Staff Childcare Services Model Analysis Team. The team produced analyses of two options 1) Dependent Care Assistance Plan (DCAP) or reimbursement model analysis and 2) Contract-for-Service model analysis.

The committee noted its appreciation that the report is another step on the road to reestablishing faculty and staff childcare on the UCSC campus (the only campus in the UC system without any such services since 2010), and its commitment to help find a cost-efficient solution that is satisfactory to all stakeholders as expediently as possible. However, members also expressed major concerns about several fundamental aspects of the report. They noted that the committee membership did not include any faculty. Therefore, a major group of stakeholders was not represented despite the fact that the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) has been consistently involved with child care issues over the last several years. Members also noted that the committee charge was too restrictive, and even the options that were explored left unaddressed important details and concerns. Members noted that timely faculty/CFW involvement would have significantly mitigated issues of this nature.

The committee noted that a third option, namely a child care center run by the campus that could potentially minimize cost to the campus and potentially benefit our research mission, was not part of the charge; the Cabrillo College Children's Center is a successful local initiative of this sort that caters to infants and toddlers (the most needed type of childcare assistance for faculty and staff). Similarly, hybrid options combining reimbursement and on-site childcare were not considered, although such mixed packages have the potential of being the most equitable because the participants would be able to select whatever option is optimal depending on the location of their residence as well as the cost of the UCSC provided care relative to alternative options.

The committee raised that the reimbursement model did not address several questions, including the possible use of reimbursement caps, the present use of childcare reimbursement for graduate student employees on the campus and the apparent contradiction to the report's discussion of the difficulties of providing such a program for faculty and staff, and the potential of this model to provide the most immediate form of assistance for current as well as future faculty and staff. Members also raised concerns about the contract-for-service model analysis, including the conflict of interest in the evaluation provided by Bright Horizons, the lack of guarantee that the childcare costs will stay close to the level estimated by Bright Horizons, and the separation of childcare for infants and toddlers from childcare for 3-6 year olds. Members commented that the most beneficial assistance is for infants and toddlers, but also the most expensive and also potentially disfavored by the service provider.

### **Consultation with VCPB Delaney**

The committee consulted with VCPB Delaney. She provided a high level overview of the operating budget in three areas: academic support, institutional support, and auxiliary units. VCPB Delaney provided her presentation and additional material ahead of the meeting date.

The committee chair updated the VCPB on the committee's plans to create a metrics subcommittee. This group will meet with Planning and Budget staff.

VCPB Delaney noted she is working to get a draft of the budget letter to the committee, and that in future years the budget and FTE call letter will go out as a single letter.

VCPB Delaney began with her presentation slides. Topics covered included an overview of terminology changes (i.e. tuition were previously education fees, student services fees were previously registration fees), and overview of the 2015-16 budget. She noted that tuition exceeds state support. She noted recharges could be covered at a future consultation. Recharge “income” is 31 million, and she clarified that this is not new money for the campus, but money “shuffled” around the campus that supports the operating budget of the unit.

A member raised that faculty and staff salary distinctions are clear, but it is not clear where TAs and postdoctoral salaries, and researchers fall. VCPB Delaney noted researchers fall into extramural funds, and her office is collecting the way revenue flows and that will be data provided to the committee. She also noted that her office produces the “Birds Eye View” for the previous year in December, and at that time can also provide the updated “Central Cash Flow Summary.”

VCPB discussed budget changes from cost of living and non-represented staff raises, and noted these come from the center.

VCPB Delaney noted that different parts of campus rely on a different combination of fund sources. Each fund type has particular policies on its use. A handout provided for reference explains how different units are funded.

VCPB Delaney discussed different unit types (academic divisions, academic support units, institutional support units, auxiliaries). Academic support units include Undergraduate Education, office of Research, Library, SVI/UARC and are funded by core funds, some student service fees, some self-supporting and other fees. Institutional support units include BAS, Chancellor’s and CP/EVC units, ITS, and University Relations, and are funded by core funds, recharges and IU, other sources. Auxiliaries include the bookstore, housing and dining, parking, conference services, extension, MBEST. They operate as self-contained entities (no general funds, expectation that they run in the black). Campus charges an assessment for providing services.

VCPB Delaney noted that useful areas for the committee to raise with principal officers including functions, and ability to support these functions, staffing (i.e. are they short on people), challenges, needs, gaps.

VCPB Delaney discussed that one million dollars in new dollars will go to units, and suggested that some units have done a lot to reorganize and still have resource needs. A conversation ensued about needs of institutional support units and academic support units.

### **Post Consultation Discussion**

The committee raised that there is an issue of scale that is unaddressed when the committee reviews increments but does not see the whole menu of options in budget review. Members raised detail is needed on investments and cuts that non-academic units will be asked to make. The committee also raised the possibility of consultations on the budget for a subset of key principal officers during this year’s budget review.

### **External Reviews**

Stage 2: Comments on the ERC Report (for closure meeting)

#### *Computer Engineering*

The committee commented on the Computer Engineering (CE) external review report. The committee noted several areas of questions and/or concerns, including: the possibility of a merger between Computer Engineering and Computer Science and its impact for CE, FTE plans, M.S. program capacity, department identity, space issues, and costs and benefits of growth in Silicon Valley.

**Planning: December 3 Meeting**

The committee briefly discussed planned items for the next meeting.