

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Annual Report, 2019-20

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) worked on a wide range of issues this year, including: (a) divisional faculty FTE requests; (b) review of budgetary principles in the context of COVID-19; (c) campus compensation pressures and (d) work in collaboration with other Senate committees, faculty, and/or the administration on the campus budgetary framework, undergraduate impact, and cost of attendance for graduate students. The committee continued to consult on and address capacity planning and capital issues. 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 2019-20, as well as a list of anticipated issues for 2020-21, is provided below.

Budgetary Review and Principles Statement, Impacts of COVID-19

Towards the end of the spring term, CPB delivered two perspective sheets related to the impacts of COVID-19 on the campus's budgets and operations. The first, posted May 6, 2020 to Senate Chair Lau, discussed principles related to the disbursement of \$10M of unrestricted funding released by the federal CARES act, whether a tuition rebate was justified, the protection of non-represented staff salaries, and concerns about developing a false sense of success associated with the rapid move to remote instruction. The second, posted June 9, 2020 to iCP/EVC Kletzer, advocated for tapping reserves to avoid the greatest depth of budget cuts associated with pandemic-catalyzed revenue losses and for effective joint advocacy with the Regents and Legislature to bring the dire state of the UC budget more vividly into view.

Faculty FTE Review

This year's faculty FTE Call from the iCP/EVC (December 13, 2019), initially offered an injection of 12-15 new centrally funded faculty positions (identical to last year), as well as entertaining requests to authorize vacant divisionally-held FTE positions. However, as the deans' responses were generated and Senate review got underway, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic upon campus budgets began to become a concern. Upon further consultation, then iCP/EVC Kletzer amended this offering to six or fewer central positions. Thus, CPB took a unique approach to generate its recommendations. Rather than developing a recommendation for authorizing a specific set of all requests, both divisional and new central positions, to be authorized, CPB instead developed a specific recommendation only for divisional authorizations. CPB then provided a rank-ordered list of six additional positions to be authorized pending then iCP/EVC Kletzer's decision on how many new central positions would be available for authorization.

According to the Call, requests were to be evaluated according to the extent to which they invest strategically in areas of campus strength and consistent with the deans' articulated multi-year divisional/school hiring plans and high-impact cross-divisional interdisciplinary initiatives; enhance the research and creative scholarship profile of the campus by supporting doctoral growth in existing programs or supporting new programs with high growth potential; improve the educational experience and outcomes of undergraduate students; and increase faculty diversity. 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 the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chair Onuttom Narayan and Graduate Council (GC) Chair Donald Smith. In addition, Chairs Narayan and consulted with CPB after the conclusion of the decanal consultations. While Graduate Council provided its own perspectives and recommendations directly to iCP/EVC Kletzer, CPB's thinking was advanced by the

collaboration with the CEP and GC chairs, and our resulting recommendations and perspectives were reflective of their contributions to our process. We worked with the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to define and verify a set of data, and consulted publicly available data on the campus Office of Planning and Budget website that provided essential background to the review process, including the following: a list of current searches, a list of divisional FTE already committed to forward-fund prior authorizations or to enable the hiring of a President's Postdoctoral Fellow, a list of faculty separations over the current and prior two academic years, and a list of faculty search outcomes for the current and prior two academic years. CPB also made use of publicly-available workload data compiled by the office of Institutional Research Assessment and Policy Studies (IRAPS).

Coming into a period of likely budgetary restrictions, and in light of its work with CEP in identifying impacted programs on our campus (see below), CPB gave a heightened priority to addressing curricular needs. CPB provided its recommendations to then iCP/EVC Kletzer in a memo dated May 11, 2020.

Compensation Pressures

The graduate student labor action that began in late fall raised the question of compensation for graduate student employees - Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Researchers - on our campus. At the same time, President Napolitano was expressing an intention to close the "salary gap" between the University of California and its Comparison Eight institutions, and the Unit 18 Lecturers' contract was entering re-bargaining, with the University's initial offer including a significant increase in compensation. Additionally, CPB and the Senate as a whole had begun to become more concerned about the compensation levels for non-represented staff, which according to the Campus Welfare Committee Compensation Philosophy Task Force Report (November 2018) had, overall, fallen significantly below comparator levels. Put together, it seemed to CPB that these requirements, intentions, and needs for increased compensation had the potential to place significant pressure on the UCSC budget. Thus, in collaboration with Kimberly Register of the Office of Planning and Budget, CPB developed an estimate, based on a set of stated assumptions, of the budgetary impact of these various promised or prospective increases in compensation. This estimate was presented in a report, "Compensation and Other Pressures on the UCSC Budget," to Chancellor Larive and iCP/EVC Kletzer on March 4, 2020. In particular, the report found that, under these assumptions, meeting these increases in compensation would require an addition of approximately 6.5% to the campus's core fund revenues in order to maintain the current level of effort. The inclusion of other budgetary pressures, including deferred maintenance, a mandated increase in allocation to UCRP reserves, and chronic under-funding of the Graduate Division, raised this estimate to an addition of 10% of core fund revenues required to maintain the current level of effort. However, the advent of the COVID-19 crisis in the ensuing weeks significantly muddied the report's context and results.

Student Success Task Force Report

The Division of Student Success was established in September 2015, evolving into its current form through December 2016. Former CP/EVC Marlene Tromp acknowledged in 2017, that our campus "embarked on a bold experiment" by establishing the Division of Student Success that emphasizes both "co-curricular and academic success in student well-being." In February 2019, she appointed the Student Success Task Force as a response to Vice Provost of Student Success (VPSS) Jaye Padgett's notification that he planned to leave the Student Success Division and return to the Department of Linguistics in spring 2020. As a result, the task force scrutinized the bold experiment and devised specific recommendations in its report.

CPB reviewed the report during its meetings of October 3 and October 7, and came up with three responses to the report. The first one was to concur with the report by abolishing the bold experiment and settling for a more conventional "student affairs" organization. The second was to suggest a more professional staff structure for advising and caution against the rapid incorporation of student life and dining into the new division. The third was to set and communicate a clear and compelling goal for the student affairs division.

Capital Planning

Current campus policies and culture make it extremely difficult to reassign academic space, and current utilization information is often unavailable to the administration. Although a much-needed campus-wide space survey started in fall 2018, the magnitude and difficulty of the task has made progress difficult. Some progress was made on classroom utilization, but the TA strike and pandemic seem to have pushed space allocation onto a very back burner. There is a plan to establish a review committee for space, capital, and real estate matters, but we are still awaiting the committee's charge.

The Kresge expansion plan is underway and will add a large lecture hall, new classrooms, and 400 student beds. Construction started 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 is under a regental mandate to retrofit, or remove from service, all buildings with poor seismic ratings by 2030. On our campus, this includes Kerr Hall and Thimann Laboratories, and possibly others (the inspection process is ongoing). The March Prop.13 general obligation bond was slated to provide over \$270 million in funding for renovations to Kerr Hall (~\$50 million) and a new “interdisciplinary sciences” building intended to replace Thimann. The process is complicated by the need for “decant space” to house the current occupants while a building is renovated. The old Thimann building could have provided this “decant space” after its occupants moved to the new building. Unfortunately, the hoped-for proposition failed, throwing the campus's building plans into disarray and putting our ability to meet the mandate in question.

The campus produces a Capital Financial Plan (CFP) with the advice of the Campus Planning and Stewardship Committee that ranks new construction and major renovations based on their need, desirability, and feasibility. This ranking is 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. The CFP is used to help determine where the campus will invest its planning resources. Although the planning phase for new buildings is expensive, it is essential for creating budgets and timelines, and necessary for the campus to compete for UC-wide funds. This year the retirement of Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Peggy Delaney resulted in a less active Campus Planning and Stewardship Committee (which has a CPB representative and advises on the Capital Financial Plan). CPB also did not consult on the CFP prioritization list this year. This and the previously mentioned seismic safety mandate left the Capital Financial Plan pending. A future goal is for CPB to better understand the possible projects and costs considered in the Capital Financial Plan so that the Senate can provide more meaningful input.

ODEI Reorganization

CPB reviewed the Chancellor's plan to focus and elevate the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI). There were four parts to the Chancellor's plan: (1) elevating the position of Campus Diversity Officer (CDO) for Staff and Students to Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer; (2) transitioning the reporting line so that this officer reports directly to the Chancellor, instead of to the Associate Chancellor, as in the past; (3) broadening the charge of the ODEI to serve faculty as well as staff and students; and (4) removing the Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action functions from ODEI.

CPB's response (November 4, 2019) endorsed the elevation of the CDO position to that of Associate Vice Chancellor. While registering a general concern about the proliferation of high-level administrative positions on campus, we concluded that, in this particular case, the concern was outweighed by the goal of raising the profile of diversity efforts and increasing the resources for such efforts. For similar reasons, we supported the proposed change in the reporting line (which, in fact, was simply the formalization of a change that had already occurred).

CPB was more mixed in its response to the proposed broadening of the charge of the ODEI to serve faculty. On the one hand, the shared goals of diversity programming would support bringing faculty diversity efforts into the portfolio of the new AVC/CDO, and the move would also bring UCSC into line with the organization of Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) efforts on other UC campuses. On the other hand, if they are to be successful, faculty DEI programming efforts require maximum “buy-in” from faculty and we wondered whether an active research academic (and member of the faculty) might have more success in this area than a professional staff member.

We also saw pros and cons in the proposal to remove Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action functions from ODEI. On the one hand, compliance functions are fundamentally different from programming; on the other hand, the complementary nature of the functions suggests keeping them together. In any event, CPB found it impossible to make a recommendation on this aspect of the plan given the lack of specificity in the memo about where such functions might otherwise be located.

Finally, CPB raised a possibility that had not been included in the Chancellor’s plan: making the current Office of DEI a full-fledged division. This is the situation that exists at a number of the other UC’s and while the committee did not reach consensus on this point, we did observe that if the campus were to establish such a division it would make sense (and there would be sufficient resources) to locate Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action functions within it. Such a division might also logically include Global Education initiatives.

Forward Funding Model: Faculty Partner Hires

In 2019-20, CPB twice reviewed VPAA Lee’s *Forward Funding Model for Faculty Partner Hires*. We very much supported the spirit of the proposed model—preemptively making a retention case through consideration of a partner hire, even absent an outside offer, and forward funding such a hire with central resources to address divisional financial pressures. CPB raised questions concerning its equitable application in practice.

As CPB noted in its 2018-19 Annual Report, 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. Because of the obvious costs to teaching, research, and service when faculty members must regularly go on the market in order to secure a position for their partners, CPB supports preemptive partner hires. In our 2018-19 Annual Report, we advocated that the campus adopt a clear policy regarding preemptive partner hires in order to head off the potential for both individual and divisional inequities.

VPAA Lee’s *Forward Funding Model for Faculty Partner Hires* is a clear policy and it addresses our concern about divisional inequities (specifically, that under-resourced divisions might be disadvantaged in a manner that could potentially reshape the disciplinary balance of the campus). However, the proposed policy, as presented in the fall and revised in the spring, does not alleviate CPB’s concern about individual inequities. It does not, for example, address CPB’s concern that deans hold a gatekeeper function for this new policy even to be initiated. In the interests of maximizing the chances that all faculty be treated equitably, CPB urges that the policy allow the preemptive partner hire process to be initiated whenever a faculty member requests, rather than leaving that determination with the deans. Such a process would not guarantee a partner hire—it would still need to go through all appropriate channels, including the dean’s consideration, and could be denied at any point, whether at the departmental, divisional, or Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) level—but it would ensure that the process was open to any faculty member in this situation.

Because some faculty, particularly those who are first-generation, might not know to ask for a preemptive partner hire unless the policy is widely publicized to all faculty, CPB also urged that the policy’s explicit allowance of preemptive partner hires be included in any orientation package given to new hires when they

arrive on campus, as well as posted to the Committee on Career Advancement (CCA), CAP, Senate, and Academic Personnel Office (APO) websites.

Finally, CPB was glad to hear Planning & Budget will maintain a database to track forward-funded FTE that are allocated in support of partner hires, and requested that the CPB Senate Analyst and Senate Director be given access to the database in order to pull needed forward-funded history data.

Carry-Forward Budget Management Guidelines

CPB provided feedback on draft guidelines for the management of carry-forward funds. Accurate tracking of carry-forward funds, both centrally and within individual units, is a crucial part of financial management, in order to maintain a prudent reserve, while maximizing the deployment of available funds to support ongoing activities and new initiatives. As a result, CPB strongly supported the aim of improving clarity around carry-forward balances and the guidelines for managing those balances, including the recommendation to draw down large balances by investing in one-time initiatives. While CPB felt that the high-level principles articulated in the draft were very reasonable, we also identified a few areas where greater detail or a more nuanced consideration of carry-forward funds could be useful for financial clarity and planning.

CPB noted that unit finances are an aggregate of multiple accounts. Many of these accounts have designated purposes, and some might be committed to multi-year planning. As such, CPB suggested distinguishing these committed funds from the uncommitted prudent reserve when calculating carry-forward. Likewise, if carry-forward balances vary among subunits, mandating a single number for the overarching unit may force undesirable cuts in order to meet the aggregate constraint. We also wondered how best to set the desired level of prudent reserve when units have a mixture of predictable year-to-year expenses and more variable expenses, assuming that prudent reserve funds are intended in part to cover unanticipated costs. Finally, it may be informative to understand why units have carry-forward balances greater than (or less than) the desired prudent reserve, in order to optimize funding allocations for the unit and develop a more tailored plan for managing carry-forward.

International Goals & Action Plan

CPB reviewed the Draft Internationalization Goals and Action Plan from iVPGE Richard Hughey. Despite the lack of effective leadership and vision in the document, CPB elected to recommend the following prioritization:

1. Support our international student population.
2. Incentivize international collaboration between UCSC faculty members and foreign institutions.
3. Support interdisciplinary faculty clusters in critical regions.

The draft Goals and Action Plan document was to be revised following initial Senate input; however, CPB is not aware of any updates. As with many other initiatives, the status of the internationalization effort, and resources available to support it, are now uncertain due to COVID-19.

Review of Proposed Campus SSGPDP Financial Planning Guidelines

After reviewing the initial draft of the campus Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program (SSGPDP) guidelines in 2018-2019, CPB was given the opportunity to review revised guidelines from the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs this winter. As the Senate committee most closely aligned with financial considerations, CPB looked most closely at the financial aspects of the revised guidelines. In general, CPB was appreciative of the type and nature of fiscal guidance provided to prospective proponents of SSGPDPs. CPB found that the delineation between direct and indirect costs, and the methodology and magnitude of the indirect cost estimate, was a bit unclear. CPB also reiterated its recommendation that a percentage of programs “profits” (revenues net expenditures) be directed to general campus support in recognition of the value of the UCSC “brand” that, through the program’s association with our campus, is important in establishing and maintaining its viability.

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 almost weekly with the CP/EVC, and these regular meetings highlight the positive and productive possibilities at the heart of shared governance. The committee was grateful for its opportunities to meet with then iCP/EVC Kletzer and discuss campus issues in the spirit of shared governance. During the 2020 spring quarter, many of our discussions focused on the financial effects, both known and anticipated, of the COVID-19 pandemic and how the campus will choose to make any necessary budget cuts. Given CPB's purview, the committee expects to play a central role in the overall process as we move forward. The committee is hopeful that regular conversations and consultations with the CP/EVC and other principal officers 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

Designated members of CPB continued a project to increase the clarity of financial information on campus, and to improve the sharing of that information, for internal operations as well as for broader strategic decision making. Building on work undertaken in 2018-19, which focused heavily on meeting with financial officers for a wide range of campus units, CPB members met with members of the Office of Planning and Budget (P&B) to agree on a strategy for moving forward. P&B created a campus wide "Collective Wisdom Group," which was meant to deal with a broad range of campus financial issues, including implementation of UC Path. In fall 2019, CPB members made a presentation by invitation to this group, sharing CPB's goals and findings-to-date, in order to engage with campus financial officers for the project of improving financial clarity, consistency and information-sharing.

In parallel, CPB members continued meeting with P&B representatives, with a particular focus on refining a newly-developed spreadsheet for tracking central funds. The committee also discussed ways to revive and improve the budget Bird's Eye View report, including the possibility of developing a more detailed and powerful reporting tool for internal use by financial officers and a more holistic overview for broader use across campus. Several meetings were held in fall 2019 and winter 2020 for this purpose, and a specific plan of action was discussed. Unfortunately, the pandemic and its effects on the campus put this plan on indefinite hold. A follow up meeting will occur as soon as is feasible. As just one of the bodies on this campus calling for a more transparent budget, CPB looks forward to its release before the start of AY 2020-21.

CPB was also represented on a P&B committee which was formed to analyze, rationalize and simplify a variety of formulae used on campus for allocating funds (e.g., TAS, temporary academic staffing; instruction & research) to academic units. This committee also began to consider alternative funding models, such as incentive-based funding used at some other UC campuses, that could substantially change how the academic mission is funded. Again, after several initial, but useful meetings, this committee's work

was also put on hold because of the pandemic. It is expected that this work will resume in 2020-21, and CPB looks forward to collaboration on this important work.

Undergraduate Impaction (with CEP)

In 2019-2020, in collaboration with CEP Chair Narayan and CEP Member Bonett, CPB Member Helmbold and CPB Chair Schumm completed the work begun in 2018-2019 on an analytical study of programmatic impaction. With rich support of IRAPS within the Office of Planning and Budget, a set of metrics were identified that were felt likely to be indicators of impaction - having a student-generated workload load (majors and/or lower division service workload) that stresses the resources of the hosting department. Some of these metrics were derived from the system-wide UCUES (University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey) data, and so could be used to make comparisons between sister campuses as well as between departments and divisions within UCSC. A full-length document, the “Report from the CEP/CPB Program Impaction Working Group” was released in January 2020.

The report examined 10 candidate bachelors programs for which widespread concern about workload impaction has been expressed: Art, Film and Digital Media, Games and Playable Media, Computer Science, Technology and Information Management, Philosophy, MCD Biology, Economics, Psychology and Sociology. Also included were five benchmark departments, one in each division, generally thought not to be impacted: History, Physics, Electrical Engineering, History of Art and Visual Culture, and Anthropology. The 28 metrics provided by IRAPS were combined with differing weights to form five differing “impaction indices” whose similarities could be used to develop conclusions about the degree of impaction of the various studies programs, and whose differences could be used as indicators of the confidence in those conclusions. Comparing the values of these indices, it was consistently seen that five programs were singled out by this analytical approach: Economics, MCD Biology, Technology and Information Management, Computer Science and Psychology, and of these, Computer Science was consistently, and by some measure, observed to be the most impacted. An external comparator index, composed of the subset of the metrics derived from UCUES results, again suggested that impaction in Computer Sciences at UCSC was much greater than that of its sister UC campuses. In addition, impaction in the MCD Biology and Psychology programs was observed to be significantly greater and somewhat greater, respectively, than that of sister campuses.

Cost of Attendance Working Group

Motivated by the graduate student labor action, CPB advocated for a Senate working group to estimate the cost of attendance for terminal degree (Ph.D. and MFA) students on our campus. With support from then iCP/EVC Kletzer and personal research funds of Chris Benner, director of the Institute for Social Transformation within the Social Sciences Division, a working group of six faculty and two Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) was convened. The group was led by Sociology faculty members Miriam Greenberg and Steve McKay, leading Living Wage experts on our campus, and included Andrew Fisher (Earth and Planetary Sciences) and John Bowin (Philosophy) from Graduate Council, CPB Member Singh (Economics) and CPB Chair Schumm (Physics). The GSR positions were staffed by Ph.D. candidates Veronica Hamilton (Psychology and GSA Vice-President) and Ankit Sharma (Sociology).

The group’s work began with a local survey of representatives of various demographic groups of UCSC terminal degree students, and a survey of the methodologies behind several publicly-available cost of living calculators hosted by various academic institutions. The group also obtained and analyzed granular data from the systemwide Graduate Cost of Attendance (GCOAS) survey. The local survey allowed the working group to develop a full picture of the “basket of goods” required by our graduate students to maintain an adequate standard of living and array of professional development opportunities during their studies, and how that basket varies between different demographic groups and also, to a smaller extent, among disciplines. The interplay between the subjective GCOAS data and the more objective Living Wage Calculator estimates allowed for the development of a fairly robust estimate of the cost of attendance for

our students. A complete report describing the working group's motivations and methodologies, exhibiting results, drawing conclusions, and making recommendations, is expected to be available in September 2020.

Regular Committee Business

External Reviews

CPB annually participates in department and program external reviews. During 2019-20, CPB reviewed department/program self-studies and submitted questions to supplement the universal charge for upcoming external reviews in History of Art and Visual Culture, History of Consciousness, Languages and Applied Linguistics, Mathematics, and Theater Arts. CPB also prepared responses to department/program external review reports in preparation for closure meetings for Art, Computational Media, Philosophy, and Psychology. The committee reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for Astronomy & Astrophysics, Earth & Planetary Sciences, History, and Music. CPB reviewed an external review deferral request for Anthropology.

Off-Cycle FTE Requests and Waiver of Open Recruitment Requests

CPB reviewed and made recommendations on four additional hires (second hires and second/third hires) requests (BSOE and PBSci) and six requests for authorization for other off-cycle recruitments (BSOE, PBSci, Social Sciences), four Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows Program Hire requests (Humanities, PBSci, Social Sciences), one Target of Excellence (TOE) waiver of open recruitment request (PBSci), and four Spousal/Partner waiver of open recruitment requests (Arts/PBSci, PBSci, Humanities).

During 2018-19, CPB suggested the need to update policies on salary upgrades, and expected this to be taken up this year as part of a broader review and revision of allocation policies (led by the Office of Planning and Budget with participation and input from the Senate). A group began meeting this year, with a CPB representative, but it did not continue its work. CPB anticipates that review of allocation policies will be taken up in 2020-21, with CPB participation and input.

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

- CCI Proposed Changes to GSI Appointment Criteria for Undergraduate Courses (June 2020)
- Proposal to Establish Biotechnology B.A. (May 2020)
- Proposal to Establish Contemporary Practices Concentration in Music (April 2020)
- Proposal to Establish Black Studies Minor (from CRES faculty) (March 2020)
- Proposal to Suspend the Technology and Information Management (TIM) B.S. and Minor (March 2020)
- Revised UCSC Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP) Process Guidelines (February 2020)
- UCSC Pathways to Retirement Proposal (February 2020)
- Proposal for a Designated Emphasis in Data Science (January 2020)
- Chair Response (with CEP and GC Chairs): Teaching Assistants in Graduate Courses (December 2019)
- Arts Games & Playable Media: Three Year Interim Report (December 2019)
- Proposal to Establish Education, Democracy, and Justice B.A. (November 2019)
- Review of Draft Changes to Academic Programs and Units: Policy and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment, and Change (APU) (November 2019)
- Proposal to Establish Agroecology B.A. (November 2019)
- Proposal to Establish Applied Mathematics B.S. (October 2019)

- Mathematics Undergraduate Proposals (B.S. degree in Mathematics; B.A. in Mathematics Education; B.S. in Computational Mathematics—intended to replace current concentrations) (October 2019)
- Proposal to Establish Concentrations in Music (Global Musics; Western Art Music) (October 2019)
- Two Faculty FTE Transfer Requests (November 2019)
- Chairs Response (with CEP Chair): Funding for Academic Literacy Curriculum (September 2019)

Systemwide

- Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) Report (March 2020)
- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Recommendation to Eliminate the ACT/SAT Essay Requirement (March 2020)
- UC Washington Center Review (February 2020)
- Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 240, 246 (January 2020)

Consultations

The committee has a standing consultation with the CP/EVC at its weekly meetings, and schedules formal consultations with the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget 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 committee 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 2019-20, CPB also consulted with the following administrators on issues under their respective purviews: Acting Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Williams (November 2019), Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Hughey and Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Whittingham (November 2019), Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Williams (February 2020). CPB also consulted with Sociology Professors Miriam Greenberg and Steve McKay about housing costs and impacts in Santa Cruz County (February 2020).

Continuing Issues for CPB 2020-21

- Continue to collaborate with the Office of Planning and Budget on 1) campus financial information sharing and management frameworks, via the work of the CPB budgetary framework subcommittee; 2) optimal process for review of campus capital planning prioritization
- Monitor the Office of Planning and Budget review of allocation models and participate in review (this process was begun this year, expected to continue in 2020-21)
- Participate in and monitor the work of the Administrative Organization Taskforce, on the Office of Planning & Budget restructuring scheduled to launch in 2020-21
- Campus Space Planning—monitor progress of task force and participate in Senate review
- Engage the new leadership in University Extension and University Relations in consultations
- Monitor and engage the work of the Joint Working Group on Graduate Education and the Cost of Attendance Working Group

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Matthew Clapham
Deborah Gould
David Helmbold
Minghui Hu
Dard Neuman
Nirvikar Singh
Marilyn Walker (*W, S*)

James Sirigotis, Graduate Representative (*S*)

Fitnat Yildiz
David Brundage, *ex officio*
Kimberly Lau, *ex officio*
Bruce Schumm, Chair

August 31, 2020

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 UCPB meetings. All CPB letters and reports, unless otherwise noted, represent the consensus opinion of CPB.