

## COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET Annual Report, 2021-22

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

### Overview

In the midst of multiple global crises, this past year also brought systemic changes to three revenue streams that benefit UC Santa Cruz and might fundamentally shift our campus approach to planning: increases in the state budget; increases in undergraduate tuition at cohort levels; and adjustments to the UC rebenching model, which determines how state monies flow to UC campuses. Additionally, UC achieved historically unprecedented gains through its investment portfolios. In the fall of 2020, however, UCSC was bracing for a rather different future: in addition to preparing for a full year of remote work, the campus was deliberating how to react to a permanent cut in the state budget, and was planning for scenarios of additional permanent cuts of five, ten, and fifteen percent. These new and anticipated budget cuts came after more than a decade of austerity measures. And yet, while the world suffered through the COVID-19 pandemic, the state of California experienced two consecutive years of tax returns at historically high levels: in 2020-21, California state tax returns were close to \$14.5 billion above the June budget act level; and 2021-22 tax returns were closer to an extraordinary \$97 billion above the June budget act level.<sup>1</sup> As a consequence, the state budget included two consecutive years of five-percent base increases in ongoing UC General Fund resources, as well as other significant permanent and one-time funds.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the governor agreed to “five-year compacts”, which provide annual five percent increases in operating budgets each year over five years. Regarding systemwide tuition, the state and UCOP agreed to undergraduate cohort tuition increases for each incoming freshmen and transfer class, keeping those rates flat for each cohort for six years. Regarding rebenching, UCOP applied what it calls the “95% guardrails”, whereby new state funds are to be redistributed so that no campus falls below 95% of the average systemwide unweighted per-student funding. These guardrails increase state revenue flows to UCSC since it previously was at a disadvantage with no medical center and smaller numbers of doctoral students compared to most other UC campuses. Finally, the UC Office of the Chief Investment Officer (CIO) announced in August 2021 the largest one-year gain in investment assets ever, a 29 percent increase to \$168 billion.<sup>3</sup> The March 2022 Chief Investment Officer report to the regents stated that UC investments had already gained \$22.1 billion over the prior year.<sup>4</sup>

And yet, the COVID-19 pandemic continues, as do other geopolitical and climate events and corresponding economic shifts: supply chain issues, inflation, rises in interest rates, and a recession threat into 2023. With even Silicon Valley and other tech sector companies in the state of California freezing spending and/or laying off employees, it is difficult to anticipate conditions for

---

<sup>1</sup> These numbers were provided by UCOP representatives during their monthly briefs to systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). As the tax return updates were ongoing, the numbers are not final.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2022-23/pdf/Enacted/BudgetSummary/HigherEducation.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> [www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-assets-grow-38-billion-2021-168-billion-endowment-returning-337-percent-and-pension#:~:text=The%20University's%20investment%20portfolios%20contain,end%20of%20the%20fiscal%20year](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-assets-grow-38-billion-2021-168-billion-endowment-returning-337-percent-and-pension#:~:text=The%20University's%20investment%20portfolios%20contain,end%20of%20the%20fiscal%20year)

<sup>4</sup> <https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar22/i1.pdf>

budgetary stability let alone sustained growth. All that said, CPB approached the past year (and approaches the coming year) with a sense that these systemic revenue shifts ought to change our campus approaches to planning: from year-to-year decision-making to multi-year planning; from austerity measures (e.g. cuts) and considerations (e.g. “zero sum” logic) to enhancement measures (to stabilize and strengthen programs and units); and from incentives and decisions to “chase growth” to strategies for “shaped growth.” Campus leadership has established initiatives that will shape our planning: the 10-year “faculty 100” plan, with the goal of a net increase of 100 Senate faculty and a corresponding decrease in student-to-faculty ratios to UC norms; a budget initiative to develop tools and a calendar for multi-year planning; and the regularization of resource calls, which render transparent the many campus needs beyond Senate faculty recruitments. While fully appreciative of these rationalizing moves, all intended to increase transparency and regularize planning and budgeting, CPB nevertheless flags **housing** (for students, staff, and faculty), **space** (classroom, lab, and office space), and **capital planning** as ongoing and largely deferred matters that require urgent attention.

CPB reaffirmed pre-existing committee principles by which it would deliberate and decide upon issues (see CPB’s annual report for 2020-21), whether in response to crises, new initiatives, or annual/routine business. At all turns, CPB emphasized diversifying, stabilizing, and strengthening programs, units, and the educational experiences of students; advocating for shaped growth where appropriate; minimizing the damage of cuts where possible; and being vigilant and responsive to the ways in which circumstances, planning, and/or policy might impact the campus community differentially and asymmetrically. In these ways, CPB committed to critically imagining what is possible beyond the pressures of austerity, and to avoid, wherever possible, recommendations to decisions that would leave long term negative impacts to campus programs and community welfare.

This report is organized by the following sections:

- Shared Governance and Consultation Process
- Faculty FTE Review
- Space and Capital Planning
- Online Undergraduate Degree Statement
- VPDUE Proposals
- Regular Committee Business
- Local and Systemwide Issue Review
- Continuing Issues for CPB in 2022-23

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

The UC structure of shared governance clearly delineates CPB as an advisory committee. Our committee’s robust consultation schedule, however, creates an active process of engagement and accountability between the faculty and administration. Our conversations allow CPB to address our differences in vision and strategy, while also affirming our many shared values and goals. Our consultation process involves both structured and unstructured contexts. Unstructured conversations provide both CPB members and administrators opportunities to share their concerns and to clarify their priorities.

The committee typically has a standing consultation with the CP/EVC at its weekly meetings, and this year consulted with CP/EVC Kletzer during fifteen of these meetings. CPB also schedules

formal consultations with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning (AVCBAP) annually for overviews of the campus budget and budget outlook, and other topics as needed (this year, an overview of the planned campus Academic Resource Model [now Fresh AIR] and campus carryforward and deficit balances). Over the summer, the CPB Chair and Analyst will plan to work with AVC Register to make any necessary changes to the consultation calendar for 2022-23 in order to support CPB engagement in key issues of budget and planning, and to efficiently support areas of collaboration between CPB and Office of Budget and Planning BAP). AVC Register also regularly attended the CP/EVC standing consultations.

CPB consults with the academic deans every fall informally, then again in winter on their division's faculty FTE requests to the CP/EVC. Graduate Council (GC) and Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) Chairs are also annually consulted in winter on the faculty FTE requests. In 2021-22, CPB also consulted twice with iVCBAS Kamaleswaran (May, June 2022) on issues related to capital planning, space, housing, and other areas of shared interest and collaboration.

In 2021-22 CPB continued to examine consultation processes to ensure transparency and collaboration. We discussed creating clearer guidelines about consultation materials needed for timely and effective decision-making. We often found, when reviewing requests, that we simply didn't have enough information (either from a division or a department) to make an informed recommendation. CPB has emphasized that attention to its guidelines for information required prior to personnel consultations will prevent delays in these time-sensitive processes

CPB members were also involved with two newly established groups. The Implementation Task Force for Inclusive Excellence in Graduate Education (ITF) was convened in the fall of 2021 to implement the recommendations of the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG). Chair Neuman served as co-Chair of the Steering Committee and Budget Committee; Analyst Bañuelos and member Angelo served on the Student Success and Welfare Subcommittee; and Members Monroe, and Venturi served on the funding sub-committee. The campus also established the University Space Committee, on which CPB member Venturi serves ex officio.

### **Faculty FTE Review**

This year's review involved two changes which will likely carry forward in subsequent years. One, CP/EVC Kletzer shifted the timeline so the entire faculty FTE review process begins and ends earlier in the academic year, with the hopes of getting offers to candidates earlier. Two, both the on-cycle and off-cycle proposals included requests for the center to cover start up packages, anticipating the yet-to-come academic resource model.

CPB received the FTE requests on January 11, 2022 and reviewed the submissions over most of the winter quarter. CPB restructured historical data to analyze longitudinal trends of hiring, separations, central vs divisional positions, and faculty and student growth/contraction by department and division. CPB established teams that were assigned to analyze and present the proposals of specific divisions: the analysis involved reviews of the historical data in relation to divisional proposals, and facilitated discussion of each division's submissions. After each presentation and discussion, CPB spent two additional sessions discussing each FTE request in the context of its home division and each division's case for central position(s). CPB also received and restructured datasets to look at faculty and student growth over a sixteen-year period (from 2003-04 to 2019-20) as well as student-to-faculty ratios from a variety of angles: looking at faculty

FTE as budgeted, payroll and Senate FTE; and looking at students as total student FTE, undergraduate, majors, masters and doctoral. We examined each variable and the different combinations of workload ratios by department and division, comparing departments to their division and then to the campus average. This data was provided by the Office of Budget and Planning and was restructured to present comparative analysis both over time and within a single year.

CPB first examined and ranked the positions within a division and then examined the case each division made for central position(s). CPB's deliberations about the FTE requests were guided by the principles outlined in the FTE call letter, as well as by priorities established by CPB; namely, how the proposed FTE positions would: a) stabilize and strengthen existing undergraduate and graduate programs; and b) support established campus initiatives. In ranking FTE requests, CPB also reinforced the fundamental principle that the University of California's educational mission as a research university is to provide a UC quality education, defined broadly as the opportunity for students to work with world-class researchers and to therefore gain "closely mentored" research experience in an intellectual and campus environment committed to diversity, equity and inclusion. With this principle in mind, the specific factors CPB prioritized when evaluating each FTE request were (in unranked order): a) improving undergraduate success and experience by addressing impaction and high student-to-faculty ratios; b) supporting programs that are challenged to mount their undergraduate and/or graduate curriculum; c) increasing disciplinary and demographic diversity; d) strengthening graduate education; e) and, where disciplinarily relevant, recognizing positions that might support graduate education through extramural support.

In addition, at a high level, CPB's approach to the 2022-2023 FTE requests review was to recommend a proactive and aggressive hiring stance given both the favorable financial climate and the Faculty 100 announcement made in fall 2021. In regards to the financial climate, CPB believes that UCSC has seen the ill effects of the decision to pause faculty hiring in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and notes that student-to-faculty ratios are still higher overall at UCSC than at any other UC campus. CPB agrees that it is critical to continue an aggressive hiring path to meet departments' current needs and new ones that will arise from future student growth. In terms of the Faculty 100, CPB made FTE recommendations with this initiative in mind, and strove to articulate and model principles that could be used to inform those hiring decisions. Specifically, we hope that as the campus moves into the Faculty 100, this hiring initiative will be used to:

- **Strengthen and stabilize existing departments**, ensuring that each department and program achieves the critical mass required to mount its curriculum and allow each faculty member sufficient time for the various mentoring and teaching activities, administrative and service responsibilities, and research and sabbatical leaves that are required for advancement.
- **Engage in proactive, longer-term strategic thinking** about the size and shape of the university as an ecosystem. Indeed, CPB hopes to see the campus shift paradigms from "chasing growth" to "shaping growth," and expects such change in the planning process to result in a coherent and cross-divisional strategy for expanding the faculty while considering other factors such as the size and health of individual departments. We see this as an opportunity for faculty at the department level to have a voice in multi-year planning and vision, and for the campus to develop a clear long-term vision for department sizes, student population, program sizes and degrees, and space.

- **Make creative use of FTE positions.** CPB strongly supported several dean requests in this year’s FTE planning that were innovative, cross-divisional, and/or supported campus-wide goals that did not fit neatly into departmental hiring plans. Though CPB was not able to recommend all of these positions within the current year funding envelope, CPB welcomes and encourages such innovative thinking among departments and divisions as we set forth on the FTE 100 goal.

CPB also noted two ongoing, interrelated challenges that are critical issues for future hiring and retention, especially with the additional Faculty 100 goal: **housing** and **space constraints**. Needless to say, attracting and adding competitive faculty presumes the existence of affordable housing and dedicated, adequate office, lab, and classroom space. The campus is well aware of housing challenges, both in terms of current limitations and the prohibitive cost of new construction. Space also remains a critical issue; while CPB was unable to get a systematic detailing of the number of faculty being hired without offices and labs, it did note that all 15 of BSOE’s requests had the office and lab space marked as TBD. CPB flagged in its FTE recommendations, and underscores now, the urgency of the need to address both of these space-related matters in order to secure and retain faculty.

### **Space and Capital Planning**

Space has been a critical resource at UCSC. This is particularly true as the State of California continues to limit financial resources for capital improvements. In 1995 the CP/EVC established, at the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for Facilities (ACF), a list of space management principles and processes to provide a comprehensive framework for the assignment of space in order to facilitate effective management of space resources. The ACF recommended amendments of such principles in 2002, and Chancellor Blumenthal implemented the final policy, which is current, in November 2011. The key takeaways from this policy (written in 2011) are:

- “The campus does not have sufficient space (both in terms of quantity and programmatic sustainability) to meet the needs for all academic programs, student services, and administrative services.”
- “With the planning process, space is considered as much a campus resource as faculty, staff, or support dollars. Accordingly, campus space resources should be used in the best possible manner, keeping in mind that the campus, in approving a campus program, pledges itself to commit resources to sustaining that campus program.”

Since 2011, no broadly effective action has been undertaken on space and capital planning, mostly because of lack of financial resources and litigation. This, together with a Systemwide mandate to increase undergraduate enrollment, and therefore faculty FTEs and staff, has led to a significant worsening of the space situation, igniting a chain reaction of undesirable consequences. For instance:

- Regular lecture time was reduced to accommodate one extra teaching slot each day, thus impacting the syllabus and total instructional hours.
- The campus is challenged to approve or support innovative new programs and sometimes even new courses due to classroom space constraints.

- Faculty FTE recruitment is now constrained by space shortage, including laboratory space and, more recently, office space. This shortage, in conjunction with increasing undergraduate enrollment, is causing significant strain on faculty and students.

To address some of these issues, in the spring of 2022, CP/EVC Kletzer established the University Space Committee (USC). The committee is charged to provide strategic advice to the Chancellor on the allocation of campus space resources and capital planning. CPB has one representative sitting on the USC as ex-officio with voting rights, and looks forward to engaging with the USC to address the space issues on campus.

### **Online Undergraduate Degree Statement**

Beginning in 2020-21, CPB has been responding to both systemwide and campus-specific reports on the challenges and opportunities in developing and launching an online degree program. Catalyzed by a proposal for an online degree program from the Division of the Arts and by investigation into the subject at the systemwide level, the campus opted to examine the issue of online degree programs in general before turning to the specific proposal under consideration. The campus established several undergraduate online degree working groups on which CPB members participated. These groups worked, first, to surface questions about such programs, and then to examine specific requisites and boundaries (e.g., regarding student experience, curricular integrity, budget, and so on). CPB's responses to reports of these working groups can be summarized as consistently having heeded the following maxim: Any online degree program must be a UC-quality program, and investments in this new approach must be sufficient—indeed must be *robust*—to meet UC-level expectations for educational and research aims. Consequently, CPB asserted that any online degree program should not:

- be considered a cost-effective way of scaling enrollment;
- be viewed as a solution to the campus challenges of housing shortages and expenses;

but rather should:

- be seen as a value-added investment in the array of programs already offered by the campus;
- be funded independently of the resources of existing programs, many of which have been resource-starved in the last two decades.

In AY 2021-22, CPB reviewed and supported one proposal that met these criteria: the Arts Division's Creative Technologies program. As one of two inaugural proposals for online degree programs that underwent review at systemwide Senate and administrative levels this year, this program, if approved, will set a standard for subsequent online program proposals that will be approved at the level of the separate campuses, and thus must clearly establish its contribution to UC education. The proposal satisfies these principles. First, the campus has committed to investing substantial resources, including additional Senate faculty and visiting artists; office spaces; TAs; a faculty program director; multiple staff FTE; and substantial funds for initial course development costs. Second, while this program shows great potential to recruit a strong and diverse student pool, it was not built with revenue growth as a driving aim. CPB urges that this combination of factors (significant investment in resources and a focus on programmatic quality rather than revenue neutrality) should be adopted broadly in proposals for future online programs. Additionally, CPB found the most promising element of the Creative Technologies

proposal to be tied to its educational and research mission: namely, that *the online modality is native to the program's pedagogical, research and community-building aims*. CPB thinks it is worth considering whether programs that leverage the added value of teaching and conducting research in digital environments should be prioritized in future planning efforts.

### **Proposed Faculty Salary Equity Program**

CPB was not actively involved in the design of the 2022 Faculty Salary Equity Program nor was it given access to key data such as the average salary of UCSC Senate faculty for each rank and step as of October 1, 2021. Such data seemed very important to assess the salary equity program proposed in May 2022 from a planning and budget viewpoint. Having the Senate (Committee on Faculty Welfare and CPB) involved in the design of the program can yield stimulating discussions, strengthen the program, and make it more equitable. CPB looks forward to engaging with the Administration in developing the program further in the upcoming years.

Designing a fair salary equity program is not an easy task. For instance, there are different positions depending on whether we consider greater-than-normal career advancement purely a consequence of merit, or also a consequence of other, non-merit, factors. On the one hand, Senate faculty who were awarded greater-than-normal career advancements for their outstanding performance in research, teaching, and service may not be benefiting from a salary equity program. From this perspective, a salary equity program might seem inequitable towards faculty who were rewarded because of their merit, therefore undercutting the salary practices we have been using on our campus. On the other hand, faculty hired in different divisions are sometimes hired at salaries that reflect factors other than merit, strictly speaking. These factors include market pressures, stronger advocacy by home departments/deans, etc. From this perspective, a salary equity program seems equitable towards faculty who had a disproportionately lower starting salary.

Further, the salary program that was proposed in May 2022 had six salary bands (three for regular scale faculty and three for BEE faculty) instead of just three, which seems to go against the principle of an equity mandate. It raises the more fundamental question of what “equity” means in the context of varying salary scales and suggests other possible routes to achieving it than disbursement of one-time funds. CPB hopes that such questions can be considered in the future, and hopes to be part of such discussions.

### **VPDUE Proposals**

Two proposals emerged from the office of the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE). The first, a pre-proposal, suggested changes to the campus undergraduate academic integrity policy and outlined a plan for an Academic Integrity Office. As the policy itself is more a matter for CEP than CPB, CPB limited its comments to the latter, a new office meant to disentangle academic from disciplinary conduct issues, establish greater consistency in decisions about academic integrity cases, and reduce related workload among faculty, staff, and administrators.

Because of the preliminary status of the proposal, CPB could not provide its customary evaluation of the budgetary impacts and trade-offs that would be involved in creating the office. The committee found itself asking basic questions about the number, type, and role of proposed staff and faculty director; the amount of space the center would require; the budget for the center and

its source(s). However, CPB did opine firmly against the proposition that the center be (partially) funded by fees assessed of students accused of academic integrity violations.

CPB also responded to the final report of the Summer Campus Initiative. CPB appreciated the work and imagination of the working group, which outlined strategies for promoting, strengthening, and growing summer programs as a means of supporting campus priority goals.

CPB found the administrative and procedural recommendations (labeled OP1-OP4 in the report) to be relatively well considered. Still, the committee noted that the sequencing and priority of these activities were unclear, as were the amount of additional resources required to support them. We recommend that a clearly prioritized plan with resource implications be developed for implementing these recommendations.

CPB was more critical of a second group of recommendations (labeled BR1-BR4). These raised significant questions around planning and governance. The committee found that, if implemented, they would call for changes to the orientation of the campus as a whole. These recommendations appeared to consider the summer program in isolation from the regular business of the campus, and in so doing, reenacted the problem that the report seeks to solve. Of particular concern was the suggestion to recruit “summer only” Teaching Professors, a proposal that raised questions around hiring processes, shared governance, and faculty working conditions. Indeed, the recommendation to create “combined full year appointments” as part of an initiative to “Standardize summer as a significant aspect of faculty and curricular planning” would involve a major renegotiation of faculty working conditions and campus processes. Such change, if contemplated, should emerge from high level strategic planning driven by campus goals rather than by a Summer Campus Initiative (the tail should not wag the dog).

CPB expects that any change to summer session would provide opportunities and would incentivize (rather than create pressure for) faculty and graduate student participation. Thus, CPB urged serious reconsideration of the second group of recommendations, with input from CPB, GC, CEP, faculty, and other stakeholders.

## **Regular Committee Business**

### *External Reviews*

CPB annually participates in department and program external reviews. During 2021-22, CPB reviewed department/program self-studies and submitted questions to supplement the universal charge for upcoming reviews for Colleges, Digital Arts and New Media (DANM), Feminist Studies, Latin American and Latino Studies, Literature, MCD Biology, and Physics. CPB also prepared responses to department/program external review reports in preparation for closure meetings for Anthropology, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Environmental Studies, Science Communication (closure meeting delayed to 2022-23), Theater Arts (now Performance, Play, and Design), and the Writing Program. Anticipated but not received/reviewed were the self-study for Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and report for Art & Design: Games and Playable Media. The committee reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for Art, Computational Media, Languages and Applied Linguistics, Philosophy, and Psychology. CPB reviewed external review deferral requests for Film and Digital Media.

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



CPB reviewed and made recommendations on six additional hire requests (second hires and second/third hires) from the following divisions: BSOE (one), Humanities (two), PBSci (two), Social Sciences (one). CPB also reviewed five requests for authorization for other off-cycle recruitments from BSOE (three-including one request for two hires and one request for four hires), Social Sciences (one), and jointly from Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (one). CPB reviewed requests for six Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows and Chancellor's Fellows Program Hire requests (one in Arts, one in BSOE, three in Humanities, one in Social Sciences), three Target of Excellence (TOE) waiver of open recruitment requests (one in BSOE, two in PBSci), and nine Spousal/Partner waiver of open recruitment requests (one in Arts, one in BSOE, three in Humanities, one in Social Sciences, and three in PBSci).

As in recent years, CPB noted the need to update policies on salary upgrades, and noted the number of exceptions to policy for start-up expenses. CPB looks forward to continued campus review of allocation policies and the broader FRESH AIR model, begun last year as the Academic Resource Model, 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*

- Education/LALS Combined Major Pathway Proposal (October 2021)
- Materials Science & Engineering M.S., Ph.D. Proposal (October 2021)
- Microbiology B.S. Proposal (October 2021, April 2022)
- 2022-23 Faculty FTE Draft Call (October 2021)
- UC Santa Cruz Pilot Support Structures for Free Speech and Protest (November 2021)
- Statistics Department Internal Viability Report (November 2021)
- Applied Mathematics Department Internal Viability Report (November 2021)
- Community Studies Administrative Home Change (November 2021)
- Faculty FTE Transfer Requests & Joint Appointment Requests (n=4) (November 2021, December 2021, June 2022)
- BSOE Proposal Direct Admissions and Conferral of Degrees (January 2022, June 2022)
- Environmental Sciences B.S. Updated Charter and Bylaws (January 2022)
- Administrative Planning for WASC/WSCUC Reaccreditation (January 2022)
- Film and Digital Media Critical Studies Concentration Discontinuance Proposal (January 2022)
- Proposed Revisions to CAPM 407.690; 803.620; 600.311; 602.330 (January 2022)
- Geographic Information Systems, Spatial Technologies, Applications and Research (GISTAR) M.S. and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Proposals (January 2022)
- Global and Community Health B.A. and B.S. Proposals (February 2022)
- History of Consciousness Minor Reinstatement Proposal (February 2022)
- Five-Year Perspectives List 2022-23 to 2026-27 (February 2022)
- UC Santa Cruz International Center Proposal (March 2022)
- Proposal to Redesign the Undergraduate Chemistry Curriculum (March 2022)
- Proposal to Establish Undergraduate Concentration in Computational Physics (March 2022)

- Environmental Sciences B.S. Interim (Three-Year) Report (April 2022)
- Creative Technologies B.A. Proposal (April 2022)
- Proposed Revision to CAPM 101.000: Waivers of Open Recruitment for Senate Faculty Positions (April 2022)
- Proposed Revisions to CAPM 300.240; 304.241 (April 2022)
- UC Santa Cruz Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning Advisory Committee Draft Charge (May 2022)
- Dance M.F.A. Revised Proposal (May 2022)
- Proposed Revisions to CAPM 512.280 (May 2022)
- UC Santa Cruz 2022-23 Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendations (May 2022)
- Technology and Information Management Interim Report (June 2022)
- Art + Design: Games and Playable Media B.A. Revised Charter and Bylaws (June 2022)
- Coastal Science and Policy MS. Interim (Three-Year) Report (June 2022)
- WASC/WSCUC Request for Themes (June 2022)
- Patent Royalty Research Share Income Disposition Proposed Policy (June 2022)
- SEA Change Bronze Award Narrative and Action Plan Draft (June 2022)
- Proposed Update to College Provost Housing Stipend, CAPM 306.240 (June 2022)

*Systemwide*

- Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices (December 2021)
- Draft Presidential Policy: Supplement to Military Pay (April 2022)
- Negotiated Salary Trial Phase 2 Report (June 2022)
- Recommendations for Department Political Statements (reviewed but did not respond)

**Continuing Issues for CPB in 2022-23**

As indicated above, there are several matters of continuing and emerging importance that will require CPB engagement and attention.

CPB will continue to collaborate with:

- the Office of Budget and Planning, including on enhancing CPB review of budgetary frameworks and budgetary data;
- the Division of Finance, Operations, and Administration (FOA) (formerly Business and Administrative Services—BAS) on committee participation and review of capital planning issues, continue monitoring and engaging in issues of space planning (including through CPB representation on University Space Committee)
- the disciplinary deans and CP/EVC on faculty FTE at planning and review stages.

Initiatives that CPB hopes to engage in a consultative process include: the new campus academic budget resource model (Fresh AIR), the budget resource call, and campus planning towards the faculty 100 goals.

CPB will continue its participation in, and will monitor and review the work of, the Implementation Task Force for Inclusive Excellence in Graduate Education (ITF).

CPB plans to re-engage CP/EVC Kletzer, VPDUE Hughey, and VPDGS Biehl on undergraduate and graduate enrollment planning.

Respectfully submitted,

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**

Hillary Angelo

David Cuthbert (*F, S*)

Raphe Kudela (*W*)

Andrew Mathews

Matt McCarthy

J. Cameron Monroe

Sriram Shastry

Don Smith (*F*)

Daniele Venturi

David Brundage, *ex officio*

Patty Gallagher, *ex officio*

Elizabeth Abrams, *Vice Chair*

Dard Neuman, Chair

Daniel Halpern-DeVries, SUA Rep.

Margaret McDevitt-Irwin, GSA Rep. (*F*)

Rachel Pausch, GSA Rep. (*W, S*)

August 31, 2022

## **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.