

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET  
MINUTES  
January 30, 2020**

**Present:** Bruce Schumm (Chair), Matthew Clapham (Vice Chair), Kimberly Lau (*ex officio*), David Brundage (*ex officio*), Deborah Gould, David Helmbold, Minghui Hu, Dard Neuman, Nirvikar Singh, Marilyn Walker, Matthew Mednick (Senate Director), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

**Absent:** Fitnat Yildiz

**Member Items**

Senate Chair Lau provided an update on the systemwide Academic Council meeting of January 29, 2020. She reported that topics of discussion included tuition, the Unit 18 Lecturers in context of a looming expiration of their contract, and SAT Taskforce results (on which the Senate will be asked to comment). There is also a taskforce looking at salary scales.

A member raised the importance of having Senate CPBs at the divisions take action to raise the need to return to true public funding, which was briefly discussed.

**Pathways to Retirement Proposal**

CPB reviewed the proposal transmitted by VPAA Lee, “Developing a Pathways to Retirement Program at UCSC.” CPB appreciated the effort that went into learning best practices from other campuses that have similar programs. CPB supports the proposal and we agree that this would be a low-cost program to help smooth the transition to emeriti status, strengthening ties with retired faculty and promoting faculty renewal. The degree to which the program increases faculty renewal (i.e., encourages faculty to retire) will likely depend on the nature of incentives provided by divisions, but even if faculty renewal only increases moderately, the low central cost of the program seems to justify the effort. CPB also suggested that the proposal might more prominently highlight opportunities for emeriti faculty who wish to remain engaged in the research enterprise, and more clearly address what would be included in the proposal’s discussion of research funds that would be pulled. CPB requested that the Senate be provided clarification before the policy is enacted. CPB also suggested that a concrete timeline for retirement, with the date firmly set for one or two years in the future, should help department chairs and deans ensure continuity in the teaching and research mission, which some departments may be particularly concerned with.

**Mid-Cycle Reports**

CPB reviewed mid-cycle reports transmitted by VPAA Lee (Astronomy & Astrophysics, Earth and Planetary Sciences, History, Music) and provided recommendations on length of review cycle. CPB Vice Chair Clapham was recused during discussion of the Earth and Planetary Sciences report. Senate Vice Chair Brundage and member Hu were recused from discussion of History. Member Neuman was recused from the discussion of the Music report.

**Consultation: iCP/EVC**

The committee consulted with iCP/EVC Kletzer on the following topics: consultation process for the 2020-21 resource call, succession planning for the Office of Planning and budget, and use of divisional appointments for faculty that don’t fit the conventional department structure. VCPB Delaney and iCP/EVC Chief of Staff Linda Rhoads also attended the consultation.

### **UCSC SSGPDP Guidelines**

VPAA Lee requested Senate consultation on his revised campus guidelines for planning and financial analysis for establishing self-supporting graduate degree programs (SSGPDPs). This iteration of the document was a revision incorporating Senate feedback from review in 2018. CPB raised questions about how the process would fully estimate costs to the campus, and specifically about how costs will be divided between direct and indirect costs, and how the indirect rate would be estimated, an issue that was raised during the previous review of the guidelines. CPB also noted that in its review of the previous version of the guidelines, it recommended that a percentage a percentage of "profits", i.e., net revenue after all costs, including return-to-aid and indirect costs, are accounted for, be returned to the campus in recognition for the work of the campus community to establish and maintain the reputation of the institution, which CPB believes to be an important contributor to the marketability of our professional programs. Most CPB members remain strongly supportive of this idea, and its potential to generate both revenue and goodwill within the community, and encourage the VPAA to think again about whether such a practice should be put in place. The committee also raised a number of more specific comments, including about how the VPAA and/or the Office of Planning and Budget might work with proposers to identify whether a PDST or SSGPDP would be the best path for proposed programs, an issue also raised in its 2018 review of the guidelines.

### **Planning: February 6 Meeting**

The committee briefly discussed items planned for its next meeting.