

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Annual Report, 2018-19**

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) worked on a wide range of issues this year, including (a) the campus Resource Call requests; (b) divisional faculty FTE requests; (c) the campus Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) process; (d) and work in collaboration with other Senate committees and/or the administration on the campus budgetary framework, undergraduate impactation, and TA allocations. In addition, the committee continued to address planning issues, including capacity planning and capital planning. The report documents the committee's ongoing requests for better organized financial information from the Office of Planning and Budget and CPB's consultation process in the context of shared governance principles. Extensive routine business for the committee included review of non-degree program proposals, participation in external reviews of departments, and review of off-cycle and waiver of open recruitment FTE requests. A detailed summary of CPB's work in 2018-19, as well as a list of anticipated issues for 2019-20, is provided below.

**Resource Call Review**

A primary focus of CPB's work in the latter half of the academic year was the review of responses to the CP/EVC's Resource Call (December 11, 2018), and the development and submission of a complete set of recommendations for funding. The Call offered up to \$3M in permanent and \$5M in one-time funding; CPB offered recommendations within two envelopes: full funding, and funding at 80% of the Call. The response to the Call included 138 requests from fifteen divisions/units, including all five academic divisions, and each division provided its own ranking within its list of requests. The total of all requests amounted to over \$27M of permanent and \$13.8M of one-time funding.

CPB began its review by re-classifying any requests involving greater than three years of one-time funding as requests for permanent funding. The committee then divided all of the requests into eleven categories:

1. Academics: Academic programs, professional development, academic components of student success, associated M&S
2. Academic support units: IT, Academic Senate, etc., but in direct support of the academic & scholarly enterprise
3. Diversity initiatives (faculty, staff and students)
4. Academic awards / incentivizers (e.g. research fellows program)
5. Research and Scholarship (support for conference hosting and travel, new equipment, etc.)
6. Student Life (mental health, basic needs, organizations, etc.)
7. Mandates (Title 9, DRC, compliance)
8. Capital / Physical Infrastructure, including operation/maintenance
9. Local Community (concerts, outreach, etc.)
10. Business and Operations (HR, DivData, General IT, etc.)
11. Investments with future promise (UR, international engagement, etc.)

Proposals were ranked within each category, taking into account divisional rankings as well as CPB's own assessments of (not in order of priority) critical need, alignment with the principles of the Strategic Academic Plan, impact on students, contributions to diversity and inclusion, and initiatives that provide tangible incentives. CPB evaluated the relative merits of each proposed use of resource-call funding, and made a recommendation on each of the 138 requests, often recommending funding at a level below the request, and providing justification for the reduced level. The full set of recommendations, for 100% and 80% of the level of the Call, was provided to CP/EVC Tromp on May 29, 2019.

### **Faculty FTE Review**

This year's Faculty FTE Call from the CP/EVC (November 27, 2018) offered an injection of 12-15 new centrally funded faculty positions, as well as entertaining requests to authorize vacant divisionally held FTE positions. According to the Call, positions were to be prioritized according to their alignment with the Strategic Academic Plan's priority areas, their capacity to enhance the research stature of the campus by supporting doctoral growth or new programs with high growth potential, their contributions to the undergraduate student experience, and their contributions to promoting diversity and inclusion within the faculty ranks. CPB also considered the principle of divisional balance in forming its recommendations.

CPB consulted widely as it developed its recommendations. Each of the five academic deans was invited to discuss her/his recommendations during a 60-minute visit to the committee during its regular meeting time. All of these visits were attended by Graduate Council (GC) Chair Gina Dent, while Chair Onuttom Narayan of the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) did not attend but provided written perspectives. In addition, Chairs Dent and Narayan visited CPB for a half-hour discussion after the conclusion of the decanal consultations. While Graduate Council provided its own perspectives and recommendations, CPB's thinking was advanced by the collaboration with the GC and CEP chairs, and our resulting recommendations and perspectives were reflective of their contributions to our process. We also made use of publicly available workload data compiled by the office of Institutional Research Assessment and Policy Studies (IRAPS), and a summary of open searches provided by the Office of Planning and Budget. Finally, three members of CPB were privileged to a lengthy discussion of budget projections with Planning and Budget staff members Kimberly Register and Galen Jarvinen.

When considering the number and nature of possible new positions, CPB felt that each such position had to be justified by a tangible and pressing institutional need, and/or a clear alignment with the conceptual and implementation framework of the SAP. CPB also took into account the general principle of institutional balance, although this factor weighed less heavily in CPB's final recommendations than the principles of workload or scholarly need and the pursuit of compelling strategic goals. Quite generally, but with one notable exception, CPB saw little manifestation yet of broad engagement of the SAP in the deans' FTE requests. The exception to this - the cluster hire in Global Health Sciences put forward by Deans Koch and Mitchell - matched well with several important themes of the SAP's Design Principles and Academic Priority Areas, including attention to addressing problems with diversity and inclusion within the faculty ranks. However, CPB felt that even that initiative lacked core elements, in that there was no graduate degree programming associated with the identification of faculty lines, nor an explicit framework, such as a joint seminar series or visiting scholar program. CPB hopes that such important aspects of the motivation for and application of faculty cluster hires are considered in future cluster hire proposals.

### **Strategic Academic Planning**

CPB reviewed drafts of the Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) on two occasions, with the first draft accompanied by an implementation "playbook," and a second "final draft." CPB provided responses to the first revised draft on February 12, 2019 and on the revised, final draft on May 9, 2019. Quite generally, CPB was surprised by the lack of emphasis on new academic initiatives, finding this component of the plan and its implementation prospects couched in terms of, while reasonably well-devised, still rather abstract principles that provided only vague guidance as to what clusters of faculty, graduate degree programming, and centers of excellence might be enabled by available central resources (accounted, at times, as dozens of new FTE positions). In this sense, as well as in its avoidance of addressing resource issues, CPB felt that the document fell short of an implementation plan. One of CPB's primary recommendations was to focus the implementation of the academic initiatives component of the SAP on a small number of well-conceived and fleshed out initiatives growing out of the prior years' planning exercises, supported by the full weight of the campus' organizations (academic divisions, University Relations, Office of Research, etc.). CPB generally supported the component of the SAP implementation plan related to barrier reduction, and

provided some feedback on prioritization of the various barrier reduction initiatives, as well as identifying some further barriers for consideration.

### **CSE Enrollment Management (Impaction) Plan**

CPB reviewed enrollment management plans for the Department of Computer Science and Engineering (one for 2019-2020 and the second for 2020-2021), following up on earlier proposals within which Computer Science requested and was declared to be an impacted major beginning with the 2018-2019 academic year. CPB supported the major's continued designation as an impacted program, and maintaining the cap at 600 admitted first-year Computer Science (CS) students, arguing that it is too soon to evaluate whether this cap should be adjusted. CSE proposed a cap of 200 admitted CS transfer students; citing prior enrollment levels and the systemwide mandate to enroll one transfer per every two native first-year students, CPB encouraged the department to target enrollment, rather than admission, of 200 CS transfers. A proposal to also cap first-year Computer Engineering admissions at 200, but then allow unlimited transfers between the CS and CE majors, was discouraged for 2019-2020 due to not having been advertised early enough in the catalog, but received majority support for 2020-2021. Dissenting members argued that data from InfoView suggested that the cap wasn't necessary. Finally, while not statistically definitive, the disaggregation of the trend in enrollment of under-represented groups raised some concern about the effect of the impaction mitigation measures on equity and inclusion, and CPB recommends that a close eye be kept on these statistics as they accumulate over the next year or two.

### **Capital Planning**

In 2018-19, CPB participated in the capital planning process via its representatives on capital planning committees, including the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS), the Kresge College Project Committee, and the Classroom Subcommittee. The CPB representatives provide a channel through which the committee can be kept informed of capital planning issues; the presence of a CPB representative on an administrative committee is distinct from formal administrative consultation with CPB. CPB's reviews related to capital planning issues focused on consultations with VCPB Delaney and CPSM Director Smith on the Capital Financial Plan (CFP) prioritization process.

CPB representatives to capital planning committees were updated on academic space issues via these committees. Current campus policies and culture make it extremely difficult to reassign academic space, and current utilization information is often unavailable to the administration. The Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS) discussed the campus-wide space survey that began last year. The magnitude and difficulty of the task has prevented significant progress. Current plans are to form a space task force, and representatives were informed that the first step of creating the task force's charge is in process.

CPB has representation on the Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS) committee, which advises the administration on capital planning and projects. This year CPS has discussed and approved its restructuring, with the approval of smaller (less than \$10 million) projects being delegated to the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Subcommittee, allowing the full CPS committee to focus on the larger projects.

On major activity discussed by CPS was the Kresge expansion plan that will add a large lecture hall, new classrooms, and 400 student beds. Construction is expected to start summer 2019 with tree harvesting, and is planned for two 2-year phases. The Kresge Committee is monitoring the plans and progress, and includes a CPB representative.

The campus Capital Financial Plan (CFP) is updated on an annual basis and then submitted to the UC Office of the President. The Capital Financial Plan ranks new construction and major renovations based on their need, desirability, and feasibility. This ranking is somewhat complicated by the variety and uncertainty of funding sources (including donations, student fees, seismic safety bonds, campus central funds and debt

capacity, and funds from future state bond initiatives) and the fact that not all fund sources are appropriate for all of the proposed activities. This Capital Financial Plan is used to help determine where the campus will invest its planning resources. Although the planning phase is expensive, it is essential for creating budgets and timelines, and when the campus must compete for UC-wide funds.

The spring 2019 CPS meetings attended by the CPB representatives focused on presentations of many projects proposed for inclusion in the campus' Capital Financial Plan. Different projects on the plan would use different funding sources, such as student fees, general obligation state bonds (pending a ballot measure), funds for seismic upgrades, and philanthropic gifts, so one should not view all the projects as being in direct competition. Presented projects included an urgently needed student health center expansion, renovations to the Science Library, major expansion of the Ocean Health building (at the Coastal Science Campus), major renovations to Thimann, a new SOE 3 building, a new Social Sciences 3 building, a new student center, an Engineering integrated teaching and learning center, and reconfiguration of the Division of Global Engagement's space. At the end of spring, CPS voted on a preliminary ranking of these and other projects (about 30 in total) to inform the discussion of their ranking in the campus' Capital Financial Plan.

CPB consulted with Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney and Capital Planning and Space Management Director Karen Smith twice during the 2018-19 year. The first consultation (February 14, 2019) was intended to provide an overview of the capital planning process as well as an update on the submitted Capital Financial Plan, including a list of current, planned, and potential construction projects. At that time, VCPB Delaney and CPSM Smith inquired about the possibility of additional CPB member representation on CPS, however CPB decided to continue with the two CPB members serving on CPS, and full CPB review of CFP materials later in the year. A second consultation with VCPB Delaney and CPSM Smith took place on May 30, 2019. This year, the timing of campus review and prioritization of the CFP did not allow for CPB review. The consultation thus focused on an overview of the CFP process and timeline this year, and how CPB might work with VCPB Delaney to review materials in future cycles. CPB has, over the last two years, sought to participate more meaningfully in the CFP process. CPB understands that part of the issue this year had to do with shifting UC Office of the President deadlines. VCPB Delaney noted that she expects that fall 2019 will be critical to getting capital planning discussions underway. The committee expects to work closely with VCPB Delaney to develop a plan and will advocate for a process that allows for meaningful input into the CFP process. CPB will follow up on this issue early in the 2019-20 academic year.

### **Office of Research Consultations**

During the 2018-19 year, CPB consulted with Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) Scott Brandt. The committee was interested in learning more about the Office of Research, including its challenges and aspirations. The first consultation took place on December 6, 2018. VCR Brandt provided an overview of the Office of Research (OR) day to day operations, a sense of strategic direction, as well as budgetary constraints. During his second consultation (March 14, 2019), VCR Brandt provided more information about his strategic plan and budgetary issues faced by OR. Overall, VCR Brandt highlighted the success of his group handling intellectual property, and his goal of making his office more efficient and more effective in supporting faculty pursuit of external research funds. The committee is interested in following up with VCR Brandt on updates to his strategic plan. Given the transitions in process at the Office of Research, and VCR Brandt's statement that he would welcome Senate feedback on his priorities for improving the campus research enterprise, the committee will follow up with VCR Brandt in 2019-20.

### **CPB Review of CAPM 101.000 Waiver Requests**

During the 2017-18 academic year, CPB developed guidelines for CAPM 101.000 (waiver of open recruitment) requests in an effort to create greater consistency among the divisions and to ensure that requests included all the necessary information, which helps expedite the review process. Based on the

requests we reviewed this year, CPB believes that these guidelines have largely accomplished the committee's goal of thorough information and greater consistency. Our guidelines, however, did not anticipate requests for "pre-emptive" spousal hires, which we were asked to review this year, and CPB feels strongly that this is an area in need of careful deliberation among the CP/EVC, the deans, and the Senate.

CPB understands that spousal/partner hires are important for our campus in terms of faculty satisfaction and morale, in terms of costs for both the institution and faculty member, and very likely in terms of diversity. In terms of "costs," the institution bears the costs of conducting searches, bringing on new faculty, training them, and in many cases providing start-up packages that include individualized/specialized equipment and/or lab renovations; on the faculty side, there is an obvious cost to teaching, research, and service when faculty members must regularly go on the market in order to secure a position for their partners.

The lack of campus policy regarding pre-emptive spousal/partner hires increases the likelihood of individual inequities. Whenever there is an absence of policy, people are (or can be) treated differently. In the case of pre-emptive spousal hires, differential treatment may fall along any number of lines, including determinations about who is deemed worthy of retention and by whom; what kind(s) of work/research is/are valued (e.g., Is research that brings in external funds prioritized over research that, structurally, does not? Is more "marginal" research less likely to be supported with a pre-emptive spousal/partner hire and, if so, does that have a bearing on UCSC's diversity efforts?); and who even knows to ask for a pre-emptive spousal/partner hire (which very likely disadvantages first-generation faculty).

At the same time, the lack of campus policy—together with differential resources across the academic divisions—introduces (or increases) institutional inequities. Without a campus policy, divisions are likely to treat their faculty differently, especially if the divisions are responsible for funding pre-emptive spousal/partner hires. It seems quite likely that the divisions with fewer provisions (e.g., Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences) will be unable to make such pre-emptive spousal/partner hires. This will obviously create (or exacerbate) inequities across the divisions, compound faculty morale issues, and very probably negatively affect diversity initiatives since women and underrepresented minority (URM) faculty are more often in the under-resourced divisions that are least likely to be able to afford such pre-emptive spousal/partner hires. Even more, allowing pre-emptive spousal/partner hires in the absence of campus policy—and without close attention to the funding mechanisms for such hires—could potentially reshape the disciplinary balance of the campus.

For all of these reasons, CPB raised these concerns in one of its meetings with CP/EVC Tromp and incoming iCP/EVC Kletzer; Senate leadership also followed up on the topic. We hope that we can partner in the coming year to discuss the implications of pre-emptive spousal/partner hire requests in greater detail and, ideally, to create a uniform campus policy that doesn't disadvantage under-resourced divisions.

### **Review of Proposed Campus SSGPDP Financial Planning Guidelines**

CPB reviewed draft campus financial planning guidelines for Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) put forward by the office of the VPAA. While as of yet we have no examples of such programs on campus, CPB felt it wise of the VPAA to begin this dialog now, which allows for a collegial and un-rushed consideration of the development of SSGPDPs on our campus - an activity that has generated significant discussion, and at times significant points of disagreement, within the larger UC community.

CPB's response (December 6, 2018) began with an enumeration of what it saw as the pros and cons of SSGPDPs. Foremost among the benefits of SSGPDPs was the potential to meet societal need for graduate and professional study without further burdening scarce state resources, and even generating further resources that could be used to bolster state-funded instructional activity. Foremost among the concerns

was the potential impact upon fair and inclusive access to post-graduate education, and what CPB perceives to be the University's failure to put in place evaluative tools that will allow for the assessment of the burgeoning slate of student-supported programs' impact on access to the highest levels of education. CPB also expressed concern about the unevenness of access to SSGPDP opportunities across the disciplines and divisions. Within CPB's recommendations to the VPAA was a consideration of whether some of the "profit" garnered by successful SSGPDP programs might be distributed into a general campus fund earmarked, for example, to support graduate education more broadly across the campus. CPB was also concerned about financial pressures and incentives that might encourage the reduction of standards in filling the seats needed to make the programs financially viable.

CPB recommended that the office of the VPAA keep itself closely apprised of the system-wide Academic Senate's ongoing review of SSGPDPs as it develops our campus' financial planning guidelines for their introduction. CPB expects to review the VPAA's revised guidelines during the 2019-20 academic year.

### **Shared Governance and Consultation Process**

Shared governance is the cornerstone of the University of California and represents the foundational belief that university governance is strongest when faculty, staff, and students join with campus administration and systemwide leadership to shape, influence, and implement the university's mission. As the Academic Senate committee with the broadest purview—campus planning and budget—and the most comprehensive understanding of how UCSC's often competing priorities interrelate and affect each other, CPB takes shared governance very seriously. As such, the committee invites deans, vice provosts, and vice chancellors to meet with us in both structured and unstructured contexts: unstructured meetings generally provide opportunities for administrators to share their ideas and concerns with CPB and for CPB to understand the vision and priorities for various divisions, while structured consultations focus on specific topics, such as the deans' FTE requests and other principal officer resource requests.

In addition to meeting with deans and principal officers, CPB meets weekly with the CP/EVC, and these regular meetings highlight the positive and productive possibilities at the heart of shared governance. The committee is grateful for CP/EVC Tromp's deep understanding of—and obvious commitment to—shared governance. We have benefited tremendously from the opportunity to converse and consult with her throughout the year, and we very much appreciate the seriousness with which she takes our opinions, perspectives, questions, and recommendations, even/especially when she makes decisions that differ from our positions. During the final months of CP/EVC's tenure at UCSC, incoming interim CP/EVC Kletzer joined CP/EVC Tromp for these meetings, and we have every confidence that iCP/EVC Kletzer will continue this strong commitment to shared governance, especially given her previous experience as Senate Chair. The committee remains hopeful that CP/EVC Tromp's and iCP/EVC Kletzer's clear investment in shared governance, together with iCP/EVC Kletzer's ongoing collaborations with CPB and Senate leadership, will contribute to a campus culture in which shared governance is valued as one of the university's most important and unique principles.

### **Subcommittee and/or Cross-Committee Reports**

#### *Budgetary Framework*

Building on work initiated the prior academic year, a group including members Singh and Clapham, Chair Schumm, and Senate Director Mednick continued to work with divisions/units and the Office of Planning and Budget, to try to help codify, shape, and share budget practices across the campus. The goals of the group were to help shape stakeholder input into the development of the annual budget summary presented to the campus by the Office of Planning and Budget (the replacement for the now-defunct "Bird's Eye View" document) and to catalyze a cross-campus dialog between fiscal experts that would aid them in their work and in the validation of their budgetary summaries and projections by Planning and Budget. Members Singh and Clapham, often accompanied by Schumm and/or Mednick, had numerous meetings with Office

of Planning and Budget and with financial officers and leadership of various units, including all five academic divisions, BAS, ITS and Library. Findings of the group include:

**Consistency and Clarity:** Overall, there is a desire for a consistent set of reports, used at multiple operational levels (e.g., by Office of Planning and Budget and by Divisions/Units), that include, for example, (a) the ability to track carry forward funds, permanent and non-permanent budgets, and actual allocations/revenues and expenditures; (b) the ability to track and separate out contracts and grants; and (c) the ability to track and separate out operational and capital funds (as well as funds for maintenance). Many units feel that a lack of uniformity leads to inefficiencies in communication and planning among themselves and with Planning and Budget, because two different unit heads can be looking at information aggregated in different ways, or including/excluding different categories.

**Capabilities:** Almost every unit currently resorts to creating their own reports outside campus financial systems (e.g., Infoview), typically using Excel, for financial management within the unit. This can involve the creation of tacit knowledge, and decision processes that are vulnerable to changes in personnel. We learned that BAS has largely overcome these problems by developing powerful yet flexible Infoview reports, which suggests that relatively minor software extensions, combined with focused training efforts, can improve financial planning capabilities and lead to more transparent, robust and well-focused decision processes. The BAS process, which involved robust engagement within the unit to develop new Infoview reports, could serve as a model for consistent reports at broader campus levels.

**Specific Cases:** Areas of more specific interest included tracking graduate student funds (both sources and expenditures, primarily relevant to Academic Divisions and Graduate Division); or tracking the flow of funds through recharge (relevant to many but especially so to service units in BAS, or to ITS). Graduate student funds are challenging due to the heterogeneity of channels of inflow and outflow, of time periods, and of accounting levels. Recharge is complicated to track and has additional policy complexities (both in understanding and enforcing adherence). This is outside the scope of the current project, but there might be some interest in reconsidering recharge policies.

**Timelines and Timeliness:** A lack of clarity and knowledge about timelines (e.g., Legislature, UCOP, or campus) and funding/allocation models (e.g., TAS allocation model) creates uncertainties when units are engaged in strategic planning or developing funding projections. Units sometimes feel that they are receiving information too late for effective planning of expenditures. These issues are also outside of the scope of our current initiative. Planning and Budget described a nascent project to review and streamline the method of making allocations, which would likely be greatly appreciated across the units.

**Projections and Planning:** The ability to make financial projections varies quite a lot among the divisions (some admitted to not knowing how to make projections at all), so codifying an approach and providing tools for budgetary projections would be extremely beneficial.

**Communication:** All units placed great value in retaining both open and structured communication.

This work will continue over the summer and likely throughout the 2019-2020 academic year, with increased collaboration between CPB and the Office of Planning and Budget, and likely including the explicit participation by iCP/EVC Kletzer.

### *Undergraduate Impaction*

At the suggestion of CPB, a group consisting of four Senate faculty proposed that a formal study be undertaken of the effects of impaction upon UCSC undergraduate programs. This group consisted of two members of CEP (Chair Narayan, Physics, and member Thomas, Politics) and two members of CPB (Chair Schumm, Physics, and member Helmbold, Computer Science and Engineering). With the enthusiastic

support of VCPB Delaney, the group worked with campus IRAPS (Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies) to develop and propose a set of metrics that would be used to assess the degree of impact in selected undergraduate degree programs, and identified an initial list of programs to be studied. The proposal was submitted for review by various campus leaders, including all five divisional deans, who were encouraged to share it with their faculty. The proposal was also submitted for review to a number of student leaders, who were encouraged to share it with their constituencies. The proposal was refined to incorporate feedback received during the review period, and a final set of metrics and programs to be studied were identified. Funding was obtained from the CP/EVC to support an intern to help carry out the studies; as of summer 2019, the intern (a 2019 graduate in Politics and Legal Studies) is working with the Senate group to carry out the study. The group hopes to have a draft report available for review in early fall 2019, and have a final report available as input to the review of FTE requests for the 2020-2021 hiring season. A list of programs under study is presented below.

1. Art
2. Art and Design: Games and Playable Media
3. Computer Science
4. Economics
5. Film & Digital Media
6. Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology
7. Philosophy
8. Psychology
9. Sociology
10. Technology and Information Management

Several other programs that are somewhat more challenging to evaluate methodically due to less direct association with an academic department are also proposed for study, although with a somewhat more limited set of metrics. These include Biomolecular Engineering, Cognitive Studies, Computer Game Design, Creative Writing, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, and Legal Studies. The group will attempt to include as many of these programs as possible, although the methodology will be a little more ad-hoc than that applied to the ten programs listed above.

#### *Teaching Assistant (TA) Allocations*

At the recommendation of CEP chair Narayan, CPB joined CEP and GC in an evaluation of the history of TA allocations from the CP/EVC to the divisions since the establishment of institutional targets in 2008 (see GC, CEP, CPB to CP/EVC 2/22/19). Chairs Dent (GC), Narayan (CEP) and Schumm (CPB) collaborated with the office of Planning and Budget to uncover the history of TA allocations in the intervening decade. The researched period included voluntary “give-backs” by several divisions, offered to meet mandatory budget pare-backs during the Great Recession. The period also included later “buy-backs” by these divisions that shifted some of the annual resource allocation from the EVC back into TA support and partially restored the TA allocations towards the 2018 targets. A program of offering additional TA support as incentives to increase doctoral, MFA and summer term enrollments.

The group found that, accounting for all these adjustments, allocations for the 2011-2012 academic year were very close to the targets established in 2008. It was also found that for the proposed TA funding levels for the 2019-2020 academic year, three divisions (Arts, Engineering, and Humanities) were at or above their target funding level (as defined in terms of TA positions per undergraduate FTE) but the remaining two divisions (Social Sciences and Physical and Biological Sciences) were significantly below targets. This, however, was not inconsistent with the parity achieved in 2011-2012, since these two divisions relied most heavily on give-backs to meet their required budget reductions. However, the group felt that, while



formulaically justified, it didn't necessarily make sense to hold these two divisions to the letter of the funding formula that had propagated decisions made in difficult economic times forward into the current budgetary scenario, particularly given the fungibility of funds between various divisional categories (faculty FTE, I&R support, TAS funding, etc.) that can blur the lines of accountancy. Thus, the group (after consultation with its committee membership, as well as SEC) proposed a partial restoration of TA funding for Social and PBSci to the 2008 target levels, amounting to an awarding of \$150K and \$300K of permanent funding to the Divisions of Social and of P&B Sciences, respectively. Later in the academic year, in view of the full set of resource demands facing the campus provided by the response to the CP/EVC's Resource Call, CPB reduced the recommendation to \$80,000 and \$150,000, respectively. After review of the group's position, and CPB's revised recommendation, the CP/EVC decided not to directly increase these two division's TA budgets, but instead provided funds to the Graduate Division that will mitigate the cost of converting divisional resources into TA positions by providing flexible funding to cover the benefits for such positions. This approach, at least in principle, provides equal opportunity among the divisions, but provides no direct relief for the deficits experienced by the Divisions of Social Sciences and PBSci.

### **Regular Committee Business**

#### *External Reviews*

CPB submitted specific questions to supplement the universal charge for upcoming external reviews in Art, Computational Media, Philosophy, and Psychology. The committee prepared responses to the external review reports for closure meeting discussion for Linguistics, Chemistry. CPB also reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for Digital Arts and New Media, Education, Ocean Sciences, Politics, Biomolecular Engineering, Film and Digital Media, Sociology, Feminist Studies, and Community Studies. The committee also reviewed external review deferral requests for History of Consciousness and Art.

#### *Off-Cycle FTE Requests and Waiver of Open Recruitment Requests*

CPB reviewed and made recommendations on one second hire request, two Presidential Postdoctoral hire requests, one Target of Excellence (TOE) waiver of open recruitment requests, and six Spousal/Partner waiver of open recruitment requests. In addition, CPB reviewed three requests for authorization for off-cycle recruitments for departments that had experienced losses from faculty FTE transfers. This cycle raised other issues for the committee that will continue to be taken up next year, and which are also addressed elsewhere in this report: the administration's plan to develop a policy for forward funding spousal/partner positions, which began to be put into practice this year ahead of the formal policy, as well as the issue of pre-emptive spousal/partner requests. Review of the requests also signaled to CPB the need to update policies on salary upgrades, which the committee understands will be taken up as part of the Office of Planning and Budget's review and revision of broader allocation policies, with participation and input from the Senate. CPB looks forward to following up on these issues in 2019-20.

### **Local and Systemwide Issue Review**

In addition to the issues discussed in earlier sections of the report, CPB reviewed and commented on the following issues and/or policies:

#### *Local*

- Employee Housing Program Resale Pricing Proposal (2019-20) (April 2019)
- Proposed Revisions to CAPM 416.220 (April 2019)
- Proposed Discontinuance of Bioengineering B.S. and Proposals to Establish Minors in Bioelectronics and Assistive Technology (April 2019)
- Review of University Relations External Review Materials (March 2019)
- Astronomy & Astrophysics Ph.D. Dual Degree Proposal (October 2018; February 2019)
- Proposal to Establish UCSC Genomics Institute (GI) Organized Research Unit (March 2019)

- Proposal to Consolidate Computer Engineering, Computer Science, and Electrical Engineering Graduate Programs (Chair Review: March 2019)
- Proposal to Establish Undergraduate Concentrations in Environmental Studies (Geographic Information Systems; Global Environmental Justice; Conservation Science and Policy) (January 2019)
- Draft Procedures for UCSC Implementation of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (January 2019)
- Proposal from History of Art and Visual Culture Department to Suspend the Religion and Visual Culture and Establish the Curation, Heritage, and Museums Concentration (December 2018)
- Proposed UCSC Financial Planning Guidelines for Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs) (December 2018)
- Proposal to Discontinue the Chemistry Department's Environmental Concentration (November 2018)
- Draft 2019-20 FTE and Resource Calls (November 2018)
- Revised Campus Proposed Guidelines for Improving Curricular Capacity and Capping Program Enrollment (November 2018)
- Four Faculty FTE Transfer Requests (November 2018, April 2019, June 2019)
- Review of Proposal to Reorganize Statistics and Applied Mathematics M.S./Ph.D. (October 2018)

#### *Systemwide*

- Research Grants Program Office Report (June 2019)
- UC Center Sacramento Report (June 2019)
- Proposed UC Transfer Admissions Guarantee (March 2019)

#### **Consultations**

The committee has a standing consultation with the CP/EVC at its weekly meetings, and schedules formal consultations with VCPB Peggy Delaney annually for overviews of the campus budget and budget outlook; operating budget of academic and academic support divisions, institutional support units, and auxiliary units; FTE resources, capital planning; and other topics as needed. The campus formally consults with the academic deans every fall informally, then again in winter on their division's faculty FTE requests to the CP/EVC. In 2018-19, CPB also consulted with the following administrators on issues under their respective purviews: VPAA Lee (October 2018), then-VPDGS Kletzer (October and November 2018), VPDUE Hughey and AVCEM Whittingham (November 2018), VCR Brandt (December 2018, March 2019), VCBAS Latham (May 2019), and VCIT Williams (May 2019).

#### **Continuing Issues for CPB 2019-20**

- Continue to collaborate with the Office of Planning and Budget on campus financial information sharing and management frameworks, via the work of the CPB budgetary framework subcommittee
- Campus Capital Planning Prioritization—work with the Office of Planning and Budget on an optimal process for committee participation and review
- Office of Planning and Budget review of allocation models—monitor progress and participate in review
- Silicon Valley—monitor progress of programs being developed
- Space Planning—monitor progress of task force and participate in Senate review
- Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) Implementation
- Undergraduate Impaction—continue cross committee and collaborative work with administration, and complete report.
- Monitor status of UNEX as new Dean begins their tenure.

- Engage process of potential re-organization of current University Relations division as the Chancellor re-thinks its configuration and the Vice Chancellor search gets underway.

Respectfully submitted,

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**

Zsuzsanna Abrams

Matthew Clapham

Lisbeth Haas

David Helmbold

Lindsay Hinck

Pradip Mascharak

Dard Neuman (*S*)

Nirvikar Singh

David Brundage, *ex officio*

Kimberly Lau, *ex officio*

Bruce Schumm, Chair

Katie Hellier, Graduate Representative

Prajit Saravanan, Undergraduate Representative (*W*)

August 31, 2019

**Appendix A: How CPB Functions**

CPB consists of nine regular members (one of whom serves as Chair), plus two *ex officio* members, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate. The Chair of CPB also serves, together with the Senate Chair and Vice-Chair, as a member of Senate Leadership. All members are selected by the Committee on Committees (COC) and are subject to Senate approval. CPB brings a balance of perspectives to campus issues by including members from each academic division. CPB also has places for a graduate student representative and two undergraduate student representatives to sit with the committee throughout the year. Members represent CPB on other academic and administrative committees and share the tasks of writing and editing documents. The duties of the Chair include setting meeting agendas, facilitating meetings, assigning tasks to CPB members for preparing reports and written responses, meeting commitments in terms of timely response to consultation, signing CPB documents and attending systemwide UCPB meetings. All CPB letters and reports, unless otherwise noted, represent the consensus opinion of CPB.