

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
Annual Report 2020-21

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The 2020-21 academic year was marked by globally unprecedented events: the CZU Lightning Complex fire that started in August 2020 and the continuation of the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to a full year of remote instruction. The challenges of the current year built on top of local and national events from the previous academic year: the PG&E power outages in fall 2019 that caused class cancellations; the onset of COVID-19 with the statewide stay-at-home order in March 2020, and the abrupt shift to remote learning in April 2020. Additionally, two events brought about profound states of reckoning at the local and national levels: the graduate student wildcat strike in the winter and spring quarters of 2020; and the protests, statements, and conversations around racial justice in the aftermath of the murder of George Floyd in May 2020. The University of California therefore entered the current academic year in deep reflection about its mission in the context of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and great uncertainty about the budget implications of the pandemic on state revenue and enrollment-based tuition. At the most fundamental level, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) sought continually to ask how decisions would impact UCSC's research and teaching mission more broadly, and the lives and wellbeing of UCSC's students, staff, and faculty more specifically. CPB therefore started the year by discussing the principles by which it would deliberate and decide upon issues, whether in response to crises, new initiatives, or annual/routine business. At all turns, CPB emphasized: (a) diversifying, stabilizing, and strengthening its programs, units, and the educational experiences of students; and to do so in part by (b) ameliorating as far as possible the negative effects of COVID by strategizing and arguing against layoffs and permanent cuts. In these ways, CPB committed to deliberations, statements, and solutions that critically imagined what was possible beyond the pressures of austerity, and to avoid, wherever possible, long term negative impacts to programs and community welfare. This report organizes the range of issues CPB worked on under three broad categories. These are responses to:

- I. global/national/local **events**:
 - A. review of campus budget cut targets and principles
 - B. graduate education and graduate student welfare
 1. Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG)
 2. cost of graduate attendance
 3. Masters Incentive Program (MIP)
 - C. university and campus policing
- II. campus **initiatives** including work in collaboration with other Senate committees, faculty, and/or the administration on:
 - A. online education initiatives
 - B. the campus budgetary framework
 - C. the restructuring of the Office of Planning and Budget¹
 - D. planning for a Campus Diversity Officer
 - E. planning for future employee housing
- III. annual and **routine business**:
 - A. divisional faculty FTE requests
 - B. non-degree program proposals
 - C. participation in external reviews of departments

¹ Throughout this report, we refer to the campus Office of Planning and Budget (P&B). P&B has been renamed Budget Analysis and Planning (BAP), and this change will be reflected in future reports.

D. review of Off-Cycle and Waiver of Open Recruitment FTE requests.

A detailed summary of CPB’s work in 2020-21, as well as a list of anticipated issues for 2021-22, is provided below.

I. Response to Global/National/Local Events

Ia. Review of Budget Cut Targets and Principles for Review

During fall 2020, CPB reviewed CP/EVC Kletzer’s request for Senate consultation on the planned “approach to the FY21 \$20M permanent reduction in state funding for UC Santa Cruz.” The document provided three decision-points for consideration: 1) one-time instead of permanent cuts; 2) a 60/40 split of the cuts between the center and the divisions; 3) different ways of thinking about the target amounts of cuts relative to each division’s permanent budget and carryforward revenues; specifically 3a) how permanent budgets and carryforwards might be weighted differently to arrive at target amounts; and 3b) how those weights might differ in disciplinary divisions (Arts, Baskin School of Engineering, Humanities, Physical and Biological Science, and Social Sciences), as compared to other divisions and units (e.g., Undergraduate Education, the Graduate Division, Office of Research, Business and Administrative Services, University Relations, etc.). CPB met on four separate occasions (10/29, 11/5, 11/12 and 11/19) to discuss the proposed approach, and benefited from two discussions with CP/EVC Kletzer and Associate Vice Chancellor (AVP) Register. In addition, CPB reviewed the responses from other reviewing Senate committees, including: Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Educational Policy (CEP), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Information Technology (CIT), and Teaching (COT). In conducting its review, CPB was guided by the following principles for budget cuts (building on CPB principles articulated in correspondence to then iCP/EVC Kletzer dated 6/9/20). These principles were that UCSC should strive to:

- minimize layoffs;
- preserve the research and educational mission of UCSC by advocating against permanent cuts to departments, programs, and divisions, and advocating for undergraduate and graduate student success, minimizing impact, and supporting the ability of all programs to mount their curriculum;
- support and advance disciplinary and demographic diversity;
- advocate for a stronger public compact with higher education, such as a return to the Master Plan for Higher Education (1960);
- delay permanent cuts until otherwise unavoidable (for example, with use of central carryforward balances or advocating borrowing on the part of UCOP).

With those principles in mind, CPB strongly supported the use of one-time funds to address budget cuts and to ensure that cuts do not “have a disproportionate impact on low-income students, students from underrepresented minority groups, and other disadvantaged students.” However, CPB argued that the overall approach focused **too much on target amounts and too little on guiding principles and potential impacts of proposed cuts**. For these reasons, CPB recommended that the center, units/divisions, and Senate engage in an **impact assessment** of the one-time cuts taken. **This process could surface which and how carryforwards are committed or otherwise budgeted, so as to assess the potential impacts of each cut against campus principles and priorities**. This process could additionally prepare the campus to address future potential cuts strategically and not just reactively. **CPB also questioned why the details of divisional carryforwards were not accompanied by a corresponding set of details about the center’s carryforward**. As the budget cuts were among the most consequential sets of decisions the campus faced, CPB details its response below (see CPB to CP/EVC 11/20/20).

1. CPB strongly supported the strategy of utilizing one-time, instead of permanent cuts, to address this year's funding reductions due to cuts in the state budget for the University of California (UC)

and its campuses. Such an approach, CPB argued, would allow UCSC to strategically prepare for multiple scenarios, ranging from the ominous (with increased cuts in core funds over the next few years on top of minimal revenues in the auxiliaries), to the more optimistic (with increased relief due to a possible vaccine, potential stimulus packages, a different approach to the state budget with a new state legislature, etc). As UCOP Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Nathan Brostrom stated to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) during the fall quarter meetings, the fundamentals of the University of California are strong and so the economic implications of the current pandemic crisis might not resemble those of the previous economic recession.

2. However, **without information about the center’s carryforward balances and how both the center and the units planned to use their carryforward balances, CPB could not ascertain how that 60/40 distribution was arrived at, nor if that split was the appropriate distribution.** Relatedly, CPB also asked why more central funds were not offered to support the one-time cuts, thereby better protecting UCSC’s research and teaching mission. The question is critical because UCSC has not yet recovered from the previous round of permanent cuts, has the highest student to faculty ratio among the UCs, and must do everything in its power to protect its research and education mission.

CPB understands that part of the reasoning for asking all units to take one-time cuts is that there are “rainy day” funds that have accrued over the years, and that the present pandemic crisis is precisely the moment to draw on those rainy day funds. Additionally, CPB appreciates that some one-time funds are used for expenses that have not and will not take place during the COVID pandemic: travel, events, etc. It seems reasonable and appropriate for units to share in this sacrifice by identifying those monies that will have less damaging impacts, especially since these cuts can push off the far more damaging permanent cuts.

Yet this approach to arrive at target cuts did not have an accompanying process to surface and evaluate committed vs uncommitted monies, and therefore no way to identify cuts that are more “neutral” (monies that would not have been spent) from cuts that are potentially more damaging. Nor could CPB ascertain if any cuts would contravene foundational campus values, priorities, or requirements (to not have a disproportionate impact on low income, underrepresented minority (URM) or other disadvantaged students). It is conceivable, for example, that problematic and damaging cuts might emerge with an impact assessment, and could even be avoided if a different split between the center and units were established. Indeed, some CPB members argued for a **feasibility analysis of a third option with the center absorbing most, if not all of the cuts**, an option that could have proven to be most reasonable given the center’s substantial carryforward and the likelihood that such a choice would improve faculty and staff morale as we moved through a very difficult period.

3. CPB agreed that for the disciplinary divisions, permanent budgets should be recalculated by removing the faculty turnover savings (TOS). This approach would more accurately reflect the permanent budget of the disciplinary divisions. However, that reduction in the proportional amount of cuts would be passed to the non-disciplinary divisions, many of which took substantial cuts in staff during the budget cuts following the recession in 2007-8. **CPB therefore asked if those adjustments might be better absorbed by the center than by the non-disciplinary divisions.**
4. Though it was not discussed in the budget-cut approach document, **CPB also strongly supported the approach to minimize layoffs through a redeployment program for UCSC employees**

whose job status was precarious due to the pandemic. CPB discussed this program in the context of these one-time cuts and our expressed principle to minimize layoffs.

5. CPB strongly supported the requirement, imposed by this year's state Budget Act and consistent with our campus values, that **proposed cuts “not have a disproportionate impact on low-income students, students from underrepresented minority groups, and other disadvantaged students”** and our budgets should not be adjusted “in a manner that disproportionately impacts the enrollment of, and services provided to, those students.” As mentioned above, however, CPB was concerned that there was no explicit process to assess adherence to this requirement. Were units putting forward target numbers from specific accounts, or was there an accompanying description of what is being lost with the proposed cuts?
6. The proposal put forward two weighted averages to establish target cuts for the divisions: one where 75% of the target cut is determined by each division's permanent budget and 25% by their carryforward balances; a second with a 50%/50% weight between permanent budget and carryforward balances. CPB found that both had defensible rationales **but they revealed deeper philosophical issues about financial planning, vetting, reporting, and assessment:** does the absence of significant carryforwards represent an optimal relationship between permanent budget and operational needs? Alternatively, does the presence of significant carryforwards represent careful and prudent planning, or does it represent unneeded and therefore unspent funds? Of course the answer is contextual and complicated by two factors: 1) the funding source often determines how and when certain moneys can be spent (e.g., it is required that state funds be spent the year they are distributed; return to aid must be spent on student support; extramural funds have a range of restrictions; tuition funds have more flexibility. 2) The UC system and UCSC have been in a process of “adapting” to a fundamental shift in the state compact with higher education, with the state providing less per student dollars to the University since the onset of the great recession and the corresponding budget crises in 2007-8. **Where once the presence of significant “unspent” money (carryforward) might indicate that a unit did not need as much money as it was provided, it can now also mean a unit is saving working capital reserves for key initiatives and investments that are no longer being provided by state funding.** Yet, there is no way to differentiate and therefore assess carryforwards with their corresponding commitments.

Returning to the proposed approach for budget cuts, in elevating the contribution of carryforwards towards the target cut amount, the 50/50 approach gives greater weight to just that set of funds (carryforward balances) that can be used to take one-time instead of permanent cuts. By contrast, a 75/25 weight acknowledges and values past and present fiscal prudence, arguing that “it seems unwise to penalize units that are exercising care in hiring during this period of fiscal uncertainty” and that “calculating the full contribution from FY20 carryforward is a disincentive for future fiscal prudence.”² As can be expected, the 50/50 and 75/25 weights impact divisions quite differently, with Social Sciences (SocSci) and Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE) representing two contrasting cases in the disciplinary divisions. Where both divisions have relatively similar permanent budgets of ~\$26m (less turnover savingsTOS), BSOE has the largest carryforward amounts (\$2.46m) whereas SocSci has the smallest (\$186,590). The 75/25 split would therefore unfavorably impact SocSci, with it having to pay \$190,446 more than with the 50/50 weighting scheme (\$757k vs \$567K). Conversely, the 50/50 weighting scheme would unfavorably impact BSOE, with it having to pay \$374,884 more than with the 75/25 scheme (\$1.7m vs \$1.3m). The

² CPB also noted that divisional carryforward balances include Gift and Endowment Income that is often under the control of individual PIs or faculty members rather than the divisional administration, and suggested that such funds might be excluded from the computation of the divisional carryforwards.

raw numbers provide no sense of the cost of those cuts, and whether they might damage existing programs that support campus priorities.

These two approaches to weighting permanent budgets and carryforwards reveal questions that go straight to matters of campus **planning**: when do carryforwards represent careful planning and when do they represent an amassing of revenue that could/should be spent? **How might UCSC better organize its systems and processes so that the center, divisions, departments, and programs can transparently and efficiently communicate their plans in a commensurate and comparable framework, and have those plans assessed and their implementations accounted for?** This issue of carryforwards in relation to assessment and planning will return in this report on two more occasions: with the preliminary assessment of the **Masters Incentive Program (MIP)**; and with CPB's ongoing discussion with P&B about **the center's carryforward**.

Ib. Graduate Education/Graduate Student Welfare

CPB also engaged in and reviewed a number of initiatives that directly and indirectly addressed graduate education and graduate student welfare. These initiatives included: the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG) initiated by the Graduate Council (GC) and charged by the Chancellor and CP/EVC in academic year 2019-20 (four CPB members served on this group); the Cost of Attendance/Cost of Living report conducted by a committee initiated by CPB in the spring of 2020; the Masters Incentive Program (MIP) Working Group comprised of members from CPB, GC, and the Graduate Division; and the systemwide review of the proposed Presidential Fee Policy for Graduate Students *In Absentia* Registration. In all these, CPB drew on the four principles developed by the JWG: to 1) strengthen the graduate enterprise; 2) cultivate research excellence and professional development; 3) advance disciplinary, faculty, and student diversity; and 4) provide an environment for student success and welfare. Additionally, there were three reviews for UC wide and campus specific safety/policing plans, developed in response to national issues of racial justice, protest, and policing, but for which the UC campus experience with policing during the graduate student wildcat strike was also formative to CPB's response: the Gold Book review; the Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan; and the Critical Response Program Proposal.

Ib1. Review: Cost of Attendance/Cost of Living Report

As noted in our 2019-20 report, last year's CPB, motivated by the graduate student labor action, began discussions about whether it could play a constructive role in helping to resolve the turmoil then engulfing the campus. Given the central role that high costs of attendance and living in Santa Cruz played in discussions generated by the strike, the committee was interested in whether it could help bring some clarity to an understanding of actual costs experienced by graduate students. Aware of the important research conducted by Sociology professors Miriam Greenberg and Steve McKay on urban housing and poverty issues, CPB invited Professors Greenberg and McKay to discuss the formulation of a research project that culminated in the "Report from the Graduate Student Cost of Attendance and Living Calculator," released in September 2020.

Because this document was not itself an Academic Senate report, Senate Leadership determined that CPB should undertake an initial analysis of the report and make recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee. In its analysis (see CPB to Senate Chair 3/8/21), CPB agreed that UCSC should develop an accurate and annually updated cost-of-attendance (COA) estimate and noted that, while there remain outstanding questions about an agreed upon COA estimate and how much the University is obliged to meet a doctoral/MFA student's COA needs, there is still a significant gap between the current combined salary and housing fellowship and graduate student COA needs. **Asserting that there was an urgent moral imperative to resolve these matters, CPB recommended that UCSC immediately work to further**

bridge the gap between current salary and housing stipends and doctoral/MFA student COA to improve graduate student welfare while the campus resolves other outstanding questions.

More specifically, CPB recommended that SEC should discuss and recommend the constitution of a “Senate Assessment Committee” that would address outstanding issues with the COA/COL report to arrive at an agreed upon campus COA estimate; that any COA calculator should use a range instead of midpoints for the cost estimates; that it should call for a subsequent “standing committee” that would annually update COA estimates and make those publicly available for prospective graduate students and UCSC stakeholders; and that this standing committee address how to support “non-traditional” students and/or students with greater financial need. CPB will continue to work with SEC and the administration on an implementation plan for these recommendations next year.

Ib2. Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy – Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration

During spring 2021, CPB reviewed the Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy – Fee Policy for Graduate Student *In Absentia* Registration. The current policy calls for students who are doing approved coursework and/or research outside of California to pay 15% of Tuition and Student Services Fees in order to register and maintain access to “certain University programs and services such as health insurance.” At present, students who do approved coursework and/or research inside California are not eligible to register *In Absentia* unless they request and are granted exceptions. Presumably these “special cases” are granted with some regularity by graduate deans or professional school deans. Therefore, this proposal is to give campuses the authority to determine whether these exceptions can be campus norms: in effect, each campus could determine if it wants a policy to grant *In Absentia* registration eligibility to all graduate students doing approved work away from their home campus but still within California. CPB, in its response dated 6/29/21, agreed that this proposed change “will allow UC to be more explicit about the conditions under which *In Absentia* registration is granted, so that the policy can be well advertised and more equitably applied.” CPB therefore supported this proposed change but **raised several issues about the *In Absentia* policy as it impacts graduate education and graduate student welfare.** In particular, CPB members wondered if the *In Absentia* policy could go even further to ameliorate financial burdens for **graduate students research needs and decrease time-to-degree by: lowering the 15% even further, and perhaps even eliminating it; and eliminating the “local area” provision.**

CPB found that the language of the original policy raised questions about the purposes of the *In Absentia* policy. **The documents expressed a tension between two views of graduate education: as intrinsic to an R1 public university; and as an enterprise that provides revenue to the University.** This tension has important implications on how the policy impacts graduate students. On the one hand, the rationale given for the policy is expressed in terms of support for graduate students and their graduate education: to help graduate students “make continued progress towards their degree while maintaining access to certain University programs and services such as health insurance.” On the other hand, the language also establishes the policy as a mechanism to keep students in a tuition-tethered structure so as not to lose revenue. The latter is expressed in a response to a FAQ concerning what is meant by special cases: “Deans are expected to be very judicious in granting exceptions, since granting exceptions has fiscal ramifications: students who normally would pay full tuition and fees will bring in less revenue for the University when they pay only 15 percent of Tuition and Student Services Fee.”

CPB considers the two sides of this tension to be largely incompatible, and recommends that the policy be treated primarily or only as a means of enabling students to finish their degrees. *In Absentia* is typically granted when graduate students have completed their coursework and are working towards their thesis research and writing: *In Absentia* is a period when students are not employed as Academic Student Employees (ASE), so it is also a period when students might have to self-fund (if not supported by

departments, with fellowships, GSRships or external funding). For students who fall in that category, the *In Absentia* policy might very well be prohibitive, **with a main impact of extending their time-to-degree, because they have to self-fund or because they decide to go on leave of absence and therefore lose connections with their advisors, the university community, and university resources.** From the campus *In Absentia* form³, CPB calculates that a graduate student would have to pay \$2,599.85 per quarter or \$7,799.55 per year (this amount includes the quarterly cost of tuition and fees (\$953) and the UC SHIP health insurance (\$1,646). That is a substantial sum for a graduate student to pay while also covering expenses for their research and cost of living. CPB suggested it is time to rethink the purpose, percentage of, or even the need for *In Absentia* fees beyond UC GSHIP in order to be enrolled. Indeed, with regard to doctoral students, CPB believes that once they have passed all required coursework and qualifying exams, and are solely focused on completing their dissertations, UC’s administrative structures should be organized only to facilitate this outcome, at the most optimal pace and lowest cost to students that is possible. In this way, UC can address how it can better live up to its research mission as a public university by limiting the revenue collected from graduate students concluding their study and providing more support for their research and writing.

CPB also questions how the new language that defines the Local Campus Region: namely, as an area “defined by the graduate dean beyond which students could not easily access campus resources.” Students who have completed all their research and need an exclusive focus on publications/dissertation to finish might have “easy access” to campus resources, but their best path to degree completion might include rarely or never coming to campus or utilizing campus resources. With that scenario in mind, CPB questioned whether a graduate student’s exact geographical location or proximity to campus should even be relevant. CPB also recommended revisiting and clarifying the language on “easy” access to campus resources: Accessibility is not a universal category--what is easily accessible for one student may not be for another, even if they are living in the same geographic area. **In sum, CPB suggested that thinking about *In Absentia* in terms of graduate student educational needs first, rather than in terms of revenue provided by students, might lead to other policy changes that could strengthen graduate education at UC.**

Ib3. The Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education

CPB had four members (including the Senate Chair) represented on the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (JWG). As the report is already public (March 2021), CPB will limit its report to questions concerning financial data at UCSC.

As written in the narrative appendix of the JWG’s final report, a significant proportion of the JWG’s effort was spent on conducting a comprehensive revenue analysis of how UCSC supports graduate students. One of the key findings is that prior to JWG’s efforts there was no means to readily assemble the data necessary for a comprehensive revenue analysis of how graduate students are supported at UCSC. **This circumstance has likely affected, if not precluded, a comprehensive analysis that should serve as a basis for major decision making.** For example, even fundamental answers to questions such as “what percentage of doctoral students have received at least 5 years of funding in the past, and how does that number vary by division and department?”, and “how are graduate students supported over the course of their graduate career, and what proportion of students have gone without any form of institutional support (i.e., self-funded) at some point in their graduate career?”, had been elusive.

CPB flags these efforts as the Senate has long called for better transparency and clarity of campus finances and budget. What is clear is that the challenge for transparency also resides with the way data is stored in

³ <https://graddiv.ucsc.edu/current-students/pdfs/absentia.pdf>

multiple “data universes” and in ways that makes data integration and analysis challenging. JWG therefore gathered and integrated into an analyzable dataset revenue data from multiple sources.⁴ As each of these pools of data were obtained in disaggregated form (i.e., multiple spreadsheets with multiple worksheets per spreadsheet), the JWG developed a data management and analyses framework that integrated the revenues generated by and spent on graduate students. This data framework allowed for analysis across datasets that previously had been difficult to achieve. JWG then worked with Planning and Budget to develop a programmed workflow to automate the generation of integrated datasets for subsequent years moving forward, so as to facilitate the reporting process of this information.

The JWG was also interested in understanding how actual students were supported over the course of their graduate career, and the proportion of students that may have gone without any form of institutional support (i.e., self- or outside fellowship-funded) at some point in their graduate career to specifically determine: what percentage of graduate students got full, partial, or no institutional funding, by degree type (doctoral and master's), and by division and department; actual time-to-degree by degree type, division and department; and correlational analysis of the relationship between funding, funding-type and time-to-degree. **The revenue data from Planning and Budget are based on graduate student FTE, and not individual students per se, and was not amenable to address these questions.** Therefore, the JWG obtained data from the Graduate Division that included: a ten-year longitudinal dataset (from 2010-2019), with data per student including anonymous ID, division, department, and degree type (PhD, DMA, MFA, MA, MS), year and quarter enrolled, enrollment status (full time, part time, *In Absentia*, on leave), support level (full, partial, none), and type of support (Teaching Assistant [TA], Graduate Student Instructor [GSI], Graduate Student Researcher [GSR], fellowship). The JWG worked with Planning and Budget to restructure these data into a single analyzable dataset, and to create a programmed workflow to make analysis semi-automated for the Graduate Division moving forward.

We delineate these activities to underscore the fragmented information structure on campus and therefore the challenges to obtaining regular (and usable) information flow. CPB will continue working with P&B, the Graduate Council, and the Graduate Division to develop an implementation plan on the JWG's recommendations including the regularization of gathering and reporting these data.

Ib4. Subcommittee and/or Cross-Committee Reports

Master's Incentive Program (MIP) Working Group

The Chancellor's 2 and 5 year guarantee for MFA and doctoral students left unresolved the role of masters programs and masters students in the graduate education ecosystem. If the campus is prioritizing funding for MFA and doctoral students, what are the implications on masters students and programs, especially for non-professional fields? CPB, GC, and the Graduate Division therefore continued its collaboration as a MIP Working Group to explore the role of masters programs and masters students in the graduate

⁴ These sources include: the UCSC budget website; Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies (IRAPS); Office of Research (OR); University Relations (UR); Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE); Graduate Division (GD); and Office of Planning and Budget (P&B). The UCSC budget website provided the total campus expenditure by fund type, providing the total universe under which graduate support sits. IRAPS provided graduate student enrollment by student bodies (as opposed to student FTE). OR and BSOE provided data from UR: OR provided year-over-year corporate contracts, gifts and grants; BSOE provided a more detailed dataset on extramural contracts secured by corporate gifts. GD provided data on year-over-year graduate enrollments broken out by degree level (doctoral, MFA, MA/MS) and year in program status; the number of doctoral/MFA students eligible for the 5/2 year guaranteed financial support for doctoral/MFA students announced by the Chancellor in winter quarter, 2020; fellowship distribution by academic division (block, Chancellors, Cota-Robles, other). P&B provided Master's Incentive Program (MIP) allocation by division and department; data on funds spent to support graduate students as academic student employees (ASEs) and graduate student researchers (GSRs) etc., broken down by source category (core state enrollment and tuition, extramural, and “other” fund types, the latter of which includes sales and service, indirect cost recovery, and student fees). Each of these categories of funds supporting graduate students was analyzed both in terms of support type (ASE, GSR, fellowship, etc.) and fund source (e.g., extramural funds from extramural contracts, grants, endowments, or gifts, etc.).

education ecosystem more broadly and to assess the impact of the MIP more specifically. By way of background, UCSC established the Masters' Programs Incentive funding model in January 2014 to “promote graduate student enrollment growth and doctoral program development.”⁵ The MIP program was meant to incentivize academic divisions and departments/programs to grow masters programs through a revenue sharing model. The revenues generated were to be used flexibly to grow “doctoral enrollment” by supporting “instructional capacity, enriching graduate curriculum, and enhancing UCSC's relevance to regional industry by increasing masters enrollments and degrees granted.”⁶

The MIP Working Group asked whether the MIP program has shown evidence of accomplishing those goals. To accomplish its task, the working group made requests to all departments, programs, and divisions for information on: MIP allocation, balance and carryforward, as well as how divisions/programs use MIP funds. While analysis is still ongoing and will continue through the upcoming academic year, it is clear that **many programs and divisions are carrying forward substantial funds**. Over a three year period from 2018-19 to 2020-21, the campus allocated approximately \$2M a year to divisions, departments, and programs. **However, the total carryforward across all divisions, departments, and programs was \$6.4M.**

As with CPB’s analysis of the budget cut proposal, the working group’s analysis revealed **a disjuncture between carryforward money that is committed and a process to regularly mark, assess, and report on those commitments**. This disjuncture is made clear when one looks at the MIP carryforwards in relation to the budget cut proposal: clearly the 60/40 center/divisions division of one time cuts is related to the fact that, on paper, some divisions and departments are carrying forward significant sums of money: the \$6.4M of MIP carryforwards represents nearly a third of the required permanent cuts for the current year. **And yet, there is little to no understanding of how those carryforwards are committed vs. not committed, and by what process those commitments can be regularly communicated and assessed.** The findings and implications of this working group are still in process, and the MIP Working Group will continue in the 2021-22 academic year.

Ic. University Policing Policies

CPB was provided the opportunity to read and evaluate a number of documents outlining new initiatives related to university-wide and campus specific safety and policing practices. These include revisions to the UC “Gold Book,” the document containing university-wide police policies and administrative procedures, as well as the “Presidential Campus Safety Plan Draft.” Additionally, UCSC presented a Critical Response Program (CRP) plan draft proposal. All appear to have been necessitated by conflicts that unfolded during the graduate student strikes of 2020, as well as from the unfolding national conversation regarding police brutality more generally. While CPB read the Gold Book revisions as deficient in many regards (see below and CPB to Senate Chair 4/6/21), members were more encouraged by the Presidential Campus Safety Plan Draft (CPB to Senate Chair 6/14/21) and UCSC’s CRP plan (CPB to Senate Chair 4/27/21), which takes community-driven safety, transparency, and accountability more seriously. With all three, however, CPB pushed the University and campus to go much further in making a serious space for the range of viewpoints including “**defunding or abolishing**” police departments; to not institute reforms that internalize functions even further to the campus police; and to more deeply limit use of force.

CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the **Gold Book** (CPB to Senate Chair 4/6/21). This included an updated “Use of Force” policy, and new policy documents regarding “Body Worn Audio/Video Systems,” a “Systemwide Response Team,” and “Carry Concealed Weapons” for retired officers. CPB members were

⁵ https://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/allocations-and-models/masters_incentive.html

⁶ *ibid.*

encouraged that the UC is taking active steps to define and limit the conditions under which officers may use force within our campus communities, and are taking steps to instill a culture of police accountability across the system. While these changes are welcome, members felt that the proposed changes were decontextualized and relatively tone deaf to the unfolding national conversation about police violence. Members opined that the proposed policies did not go far enough in rethinking the fundamental nature of policing on our campus, and provided top-down solutions to problems needing greater community engagement.

Subsequently, CPB reviewed the **Presidential Campus Safety Plan Draft** (CPB to Senate Chair 6/14/21), a plan that is represented as the beginning of a larger plan to “re-envision safety at the University of California.” This re-envisioning was more responsive to national events and subsequent conversations about rethinking the role of police and policing in the larger system of public safety. As such, this plan “starts by acknowledging” that “the same systems charged with providing protection have become a source of great distrust and fear.” CPB supported the spirit of the shift in thinking as well as with the four overarching guidelines: community-driven safety; inclusive tiered responses; transparency; and accountability. CPB offered the following suggestions:

- Regarding a University of California (UC) safety structure at a high level, there are still national and local conversations as to whether universities and colleges more broadly, and the UC more specifically, should even have campus police. Thus, CPB asserted that it is crucial that this process truly make space for the range of viewpoints including “**defunding or abolishing**” police departments, and that these viewpoints be seriously considered by campus leadership. Moreover, if this revision of campus safety protocols is to be taken up rigorously with a “variety of views”, CPB also recommended inviting those who have worked to produce, and are deeply involved in, abolitionist thinking.
- Regarding a UC safety structure that might include police and policing: CPB identified three broad concerns that should guide any approach to transform campus safety: 1) The holistic approach should not have the effect of internalizing more functions to the campus police; 2) police accountability boards should be fully independent and have control, rather than just serve an advisory role; 3) Police accountability boards should operate in a constructive and not just a reactive manner. CPB argues that for a board to be consequential and helpful, it should be in a position to generate conditions for enforcement, and not limited to handling investigations and complaints.

CPB was also concerned that this document is silent on discussions of weapons, guns, and use of force, especially given that the system wide review on the University Policing Policies (Gold Book) included a “use of force” policy that was, in CPB’s judgement, inadequately reformed and unresponsive to national conversations on police violence. Relatedly, CPB found it problematic that the document states that campuses will merely “reinforce and communicate” existing “University and campus guidance on protest response, role of police, observers or monitors, and use of mutual aid.” That statement suggests an unwillingness on the part of UC to critically examine the way police (including non-UC police) have been used in protests, including issues of actual police violence, as well as the way armed uniformed police acting as “observers” served to intimidate protesters and others coming to campus.

Relatedly, CPB reviewed UCSC’s **Critical Response Program (CRP)** plan draft proposal put forth by interim Vice Chancellor Baszile and Vice Chancellor Latham (CPB to Senate Chair 4/27/221). CPB appreciated the Senate being involved at this early stage and further appreciated the direction this program is moving, specifically in its attempts to move away from a police-only model for engagement with students experiencing mental health crises beyond the regular business hours of Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) or requiring engagement/intervention outside of its offices. For students in the midst of a

mental health crisis, some of whom come from communities or personal experiences characterized by troubled interactions with uniformed police, this is clearly a step in the right direction. **Still, CPB argued that the campus should commit to further separating the role of the University of California Police Department (UCPD) from the CRP before establishing a new structure for a critical response program.**

The CRP proposal does draw attention to the fact that students (and campus community members more broadly) from marginalized backgrounds are more likely to feel unsafe with the police-only structure of campus responses to mental health crises outside of the CAPS offices and business hours. The CRP proposal recommends a Crisis Response Team that pairs a police officer with a licensed mental health professional, both of whom are trained in matters of diversity, equity, and inclusion and who might be hired from FTE positions vacated by UCPDs. But any response structure that, as the report states, relies “on people trained for an entirely different set of engagements” calls for rethinking. The CRP refers to alternative models that do not rely on police for mental health emergencies but argues that they are prohibitive given the relative volume of cases on campus.

CPB suggests that before rejecting other models, that the CRP proposal include more information about them: what other models exist? How are they structured? How do they address potential safety concerns for the response team? What are their resource requirements in terms of budget, personnel, and facilities? How do those requirements compare to the current proposal? It seems especially critical that the campus have a transparent and involved conversation about the range of options before setting a foundational structure since: 1) the Crisis Response Team would be tasked with developing protocols and conducting outreach concerning crisis responses services and programs; and 2) the resources for the Crisis Response Team might draw, in part, from vacated UCPD positions: if only half of those positions are dedicated to hiring non-police officer specialists for mental health emergencies, the campus will already be embarking on a reallocation pathway that could be more limited than it needs to be.

II. Campus Initiatives

Online Education Initiatives

Over the course of a year in which all UC campuses offered remote instruction of *courses* almost exclusively, CPB engaged with the concept of online undergraduate degree *programs* several times, both at university-wide and campus levels.

In fall 2020, CPB responded to the report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force created by the Academic Council in AY 2019-20 (11/13/20). The task force, with representatives from each of the UC campuses, was convened in response to the first systemwide proposal for a fully remote undergraduate degree program. The report offered three policy options for governing online degree programs, each of which had supporters among members of the task force. In its response, CPB firmly supported one, the UC-Quality Remote Degree option. This option described fully remote degrees that would meet the high expectations for UC degrees--including that they be taught by regular faculty and provide a full education, including out-of-the-classroom opportunities, equivalent to that of a traditional on-campus education, a determination that rests in the hands of the Senate.

In winter 2021, CPB representatives participated in the development of a campus charter for exploring the possibility of online degree programs at UC Santa Cruz. This was one of four initiatives, all proposed in the summer by campus leadership, that went through the charter process. It gained additional impetus from an Arts Division proposal for the first online degree program at UCSC. Though delaying the review of the Arts proposal, the charter process provided a framework for why the campus might consider online

programs, and a detailed collection of questions, grouped by topic, that would need to be addressed before launching even one such program--a principled approach. CPB reviewed and provided feedback on draft and final versions of the charter (see CPB to Senate Chair 4/6/21).

In spring 2021, with the charter having been approved for further exploration by Chancellor Larive and Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Kletzer, five separate work groups were created, each to examine in greater detail one cluster of questions raised in the charter process. CPB members participated in two of these work groups, the first on finance and budget, and the second on student experience in online programs.

Budgetary Review Items

CPB and the Office of Planning and Budget continued its collaboration to make the campus budget more transparent and legible. **One recurring issue, already encountered above with the budget cut approach document and the analysis of the MIP program, is the presence and appropriateness of the level of carryforwards.** A multi-year initiative undertaken between CPB and P&B has been refining tool(s) for reporting central fund balances and projections. In 2019-20 P&B shared with CPB a newly developed spreadsheet that provided a four year (from 2016-17 to 2019-20) overview of central funds (permanent and one-time), including central carryforwards and a “what if” tool to explore multi-year planning scenarios for investments in FTE faculty and “resource calls” for other needs. This sheet showed substantial **central carryforwards**, which generated much discussion from the time of its presentation to the present, ranging from:

- the technical: recommending how the sheet can be improved;
- the philosophical: given the broad belief the campus is under-resourced, could or should those resources be used for ongoing support of the research and education mission. For example, could the center have reduced the student to faculty ratio by using recurring temporary funding to allocate more faculty FTE to divisions?;
- the evaluative: reviewing whether all those funds are unspent and unbudgeted vs committed;
- to the ethical: the imperative of making the center’s carryforward information public so as to enter it into a larger campus conversation about campus investments and planning more broadly and emergency use more specifically.

Regarding technical improvements, last year’s CPB recommended the sheet include the background data that informed the summary tables. Regarding the ethics of emergency use, CPB issued a statement in the spring of 2020 to use those reserves to hold at bay any permanent cuts that might (and did) arrive due to COVID19.⁷ Regarding the ethics of disclosure, CPB entered the current academic year with a shared sense of urgency to have the information about central carryforwards made public to the university, beginning with the fall Senate Forum on 2020-21 budget (held on October 14, 2020) and in subsequent meetings with the CP/EVC and P&B. On Feb 11, 2021 AVP Register presented a detailed set of documents that provided more context and updated information about central funds and carryforwards: **The UCSC center entered 2020-21 with \$121M of prior year carryforward (down from a highpoint of \$160M in 2018-19 and 2019/20) and a new budget of \$34.8M for a \$156M total “budget.”** With allocations and adjustments of approximately \$60M, UCSC started the year with a ~\$95.5M “current balance”, **of which \$71M was committed to campus costs such as the benefit pool**, leaving a projected central balance of \$24M.

The sizable sum of committed central carryforward money returns CPB to the issue of how carryforwards campus-wide ought to be tracked, communicated, reviewed, and assessed. CPB looks

⁷ Specifically, CPB wrote in its 2019-20 report that it “advocated for tapping reserves to avoid the greatest depth of budget cuts associated with pandemic-catalyzed revenue losses.” <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cpb-committee-on-planning-and-budget/reports/cpb-annual-reports/1982-cpb-annual-report-2019-20.pdf>

forward to working with P&B, principal officers and the CP/EVC to better understand present commitments from the center, divisions, and departments/programs, and to use that information to clarify guidelines and processes for how to do multi-year planning moving forward. How do we as a campus distinguish carryforwards from prudent reserves? Within carryforwards, how do we mark annual as opposed to multi-year commitments, including the need to accumulate savings for substantially higher one-time investments?

As an improvement to the static PDF deficit report, AVP Register provided a robust carryforward and deficits sheet, which included supporting data (per CPB's request), and a pivot table to explore financial information by unit (e.g., Chancellor/CPEVC units, Academic Units, Colleges, BAS, etc.). The pivot table also included a filter to "slice" the data by core vs. non-core funds, UCSC fund type (state general, student fees, tuition, sales and service, etc.), function group (academic support, auxiliary enterprises, etc.), org levels (3, 4, & 5), and whether the moneys are startup or not, and whether a unit had carryforward or not. CPB found this to be a very powerful tool and recommended that it also include a year over year view that the original "what if" model provided, as well as definitions of technical terms.

Another initiative undertaken between P&B and CPB over the last three years was to improve and replace the existing "Bird's Eye View" document that provides the annual campus budget summary. CPB reviewed P&B's proposed dashboard, which provides a more detailed and holistic overview of the campus financial activities, with an interactive multi-year view. CPB agreed this was a vast improvement and can be found on the Campus Resource Summary site.⁸

CPB representatives also met regularly with P&B and the assistant deans from each disciplinary division in the late summer and fall of 2020 to discuss the Academic Resource Model (ARM). The ARM was presented by P&B as a new metrics-driven model to replace UCSC's antiquated financial models; to expedite budget allocations and facilitate multi-year planning; to incentivize decisions towards UC and campus priorities; to provide clarity, transparency, and a shared understanding of how money is allocated from the center to different units, and to facilitate FTE hires by removing the need for disciplinary divisions to accumulate funds from open provisions to finance start up packages and salary augmentations for new hires. While CPB and all principal officers agreed that UCSC needs to fundamentally change its approach to campus budgeting and how it allocates resources, we also raised many issues: ought the model be based on campus values and principles rather than start with formulae?; how can the campus develop a common framework that nevertheless is responsive to the unique disciplinary needs of different divisions and departments?; how can deans drive initiatives when a core source of discretionary budget (open provisions) is rightly redirected back to faculty hires? Due to the complexity of working out those questions and the convergence with budget cut discussions and federal Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund (HEERF) funding cycles, this project was put on hold and will resume in the summer/fall of 2021.

Restructuring of Office of Planning and Budget

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed Chancellor Larive's plan to restructure units within the Office of Planning and Budget (P&B) (CPB to Senate Chair 11/13/20). The plan would disband P&B from its current structure, and not replace the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) position. Instead, the current campus Budget Director would be elevated to AVC of Budget and Resource Management. Capital Planning and Space Management (CPSM) would report to Physical Planning Development and Operations (PPDO), under the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS), which reports to the Chancellor. The other units, Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies (IRAPS); Budget and Resource Management (BRM); and Data Management Services (DMS) would all have direct reporting to the CP/EVC with indirect secondary reporting to the Chancellor.

⁸ https://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/reports-overviews/ucsc_campus_resources_summary.html

CPB had the following observations:

- **Operational Efficiencies:** the proposed plan cites operational efficiencies and effectiveness as a driver for the restructuring plan. Over the short term, the restructuring plan seems to build some stability into the reporting structure. Over the medium and long term, however, CPB wondered if P&B would benefit from an open search for a VCPB or a CFO position.
- **CPSM Consultation:** Under the proposed plan, Capital Planning and Space Management (CPSM) would move under PPDO, which may offer efficiencies over the current reporting structure. CPB did not have a strong opinion on where CPSM ultimately resides, but members did point out one issue that is of significant importance: over the last few years, CPB has noted the shifts in the nature and quality of consultation on capital planning issues (one example is CPB input into the Capital Financial Plan, which as we understand it, has at least in part, had to do with shifting annual UCOP deadlines, which impact timing of campus review). CPB members agreed that wherever CPSM ultimately resides, it is critical to build stronger consultative relationships in this area, and looks forward to beginning that work in the year ahead.

CPB is developing a plan to work with VCBAS Latham on a new approach to Capital Planning consultation in the next academic year.

CDO Reorganization

CPB reviewed Chancellor Larive's request for review of plans to reimagine the role of the UCSC Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) (CPB to Senate Chair 6/2/21). CPB concurred that this position should be elevated to Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and appreciated the campus's deepening commitment to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

CPB recommended that filling a position at this level should be conducted through an open, national search. CPB noted that a senior position with a large portfolio would require staff support beyond what already exists in the Office for DEI. CPB requested more information about support staff and the financial implications of such an office. The majority of CPB members felt that the successful candidate should have faculty experience and research expertise. Several members suggested looking for candidates with research expertise in emerging practices that focus on belonging, dignity, and justice, and who are grounded in research-based practices such as Critical Race Theory. Finally, CPB members opined that if the candidate is a faculty member, that person should have a faculty home, as do deans.

Employee Housing Work Group

CPB provided a representative to the Employee Housing Work Group (EHWG), an advisory group led by Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (VCBAS) Sarah Latham with expert staff and representation from the Staff Advisory Board, the deans, relevant Senate committees, and faculty at large. The work group regularly starting in late fall 2020. Following analysis of a survey on housing demand conducted by the EHWG in 2019-20, the group's work in 2020-21 initially focused on two main goals: (1) identifying and narrowing possible constellations of housing options in developing Ranch View Terrace, phase 2 (RVT2); and conceptualizing possible next steps for development of employee housing beyond RVT2. An overarching third goal developed out of discussions: identifying the multiple purposes and audiences employee housing projects could serve, and clarifying how different housing configurations and policy approaches could meet those different purposes. For example, should employee housing options be designed to help the campus meet its diversity goals? Its efforts to recruit faculty? To retain them? To retain staff? To determine which purposes and audiences were important to consider for future employee housing, the EHWG conducted several focus group interviews with Senate committee, staff, and administration groups. Discussion followed of housing configurations that could meet those purposes and shifts in policy that might thus be considered.

For academic year 21-22, the EHWG will either invite faculty with research expertise on local housing to join the committee or to present to it, and will also invite CAAD to provide a representative.

III. Response to Annual and Routine Business

Faculty FTE Review

In the fall of 2020, CP/EVC Kletzer circulated the faculty recruitment request for 2021-22. In preparing its recommendations, CPB drew on the faculty recruitment call to the academic divisions (dated January 7, 2021), the requests for faculty recruitment submitted by the divisions, and in addition, consulted with each of the divisional deans, all of whom received a set of questions in advance. CPB invited the chairs of Graduate Council (GC) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to attend each of the dean consultations. CPB also consulted with the GC and CEP chairs on their perspectives, as chairs of their committees, related to implications for graduate and undergraduate education respectively. CPB received the FTE requests on March 2, 2021. CPB reviewed the submissions over eight meetings, consulting with each divisional dean and the CEP and GC chairs. CPB assigned a team to review and facilitate discussion of each division's submissions. After each team presented and the committee discussed, CPB spent two additional sessions to discuss each FTE request in the context of its home division and each division's case for central position(s). CPB utilized a matrix to examine each FTE request through factors elaborated below. CPB reviewed and structured in a comparable format data on faculty FTE by department, undergraduate and graduate student-to-faculty workload, undergraduate major by faculty FTE, and department support of graduate students through extramural funding. These data were provided by the Office of Planning and Budget and the Joint Senate-Administration Working Group on Graduate Education (2021).

CPB's approach to the review of the FTE requests was first to examine and rank the positions within a division, and then to examine the case each division made for central position(s) (see CPB's recommendations to CP/EVC Kletzer dated 5/10/21). 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. The priorities CPB developed were responsive to a year in which the COVID-19 pandemic placed the University of California system in a state of deep budget uncertainty, and to profound questions raised by the graduate student wildcat strike, pre-COVID, about the levels of support provided to graduate programs and graduate students. As such, CPB did not focus on how FTE provisions would drive growth per se (e.g., "by supporting significant doctoral growth," or departments with "high growth potential," or new interdisciplinary initiatives), as had been prioritized by CPB in previous years (specifically 2014-15 to 2018-19). Instead, CPB focused on how the proposed FTE positions would **stabilize and strengthen** existing undergraduate and graduate programs as well as established campus initiatives. However, in focusing on stabilizing and strengthening rather than growing, CPB did not take a conservative approach by recommending the lower number in a range of new FTEs provided in the FTE call. Given that the California Governor proposed a full restoration of the UC budget, CPB made its recommendation based on the maximum number of new FTEs provided in the FTE call: eight rather than six or seven, and made recommendations should the CP/EVC decide to go with even more, which she ultimately did.

At a high level, CPB 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 the principles of a UC quality education in mind, as well as the principles of stabilizing and strengthening existing programs and initiatives, the specific factors CPB prioritized when evaluating each FTE request were: 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.

The factors CPB considered for recommending the allocation of new central positions were: first, to support programs that have experienced substantial student population growth relative to faculty growth, so as to help stabilize and strengthen those programs; and second, to support programs that engage with existing campus initiatives.

Regarding student growth, CPB notes that from 2010 to 2018, BSOE has seen an expansion in majors and student FTE by 252% and 103% respectively, but has only seen its ladder and payroll faculty grow by 23% and 46% respectively (see figure 1 below, developed by CPB from data provided by IRAPs). CPB therefore recommended that the majority of available central positions be allocated to BSOE (5 of the 8 allocated central positions). CPB did not view this as just a market-based argument. Rather, the campus ought to support each program in its mission to mount a UC quality undergraduate and graduate education: having student-to-faculty ratios at the levels found in BSOE, most especially in Computer Science and Engineering (CSE), goes against that principle.

Though BSOE has driven student enrollment growth at UCSC, CPB also underscored that undergraduate student-to-faculty ratios are higher *overall* at UCSC than at any other UC campus. This burden is shared across the campus: UCSC has 20 departments with an undergraduate student-to-faculty ratio of 21 or higher (21 being the campus average), with 5 departments from the Arts; 3 from BSOE, 4 from HUM; 4 from PSci; and 4 from SocSci. These numbers do not include the divisional programs, such as Arts, Games and Playable Media (AGPM) in the Arts Division, and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES) in the Humanities Division, which also have some of the highest undergraduate student-to-faculty workloads on campus.

CPB was encouraged that many divisional and departmental requests were committed to promoting inclusion, equity, and diversity within their FTE proposals: some deans focused on demographic diversity while others emphasized how curricular and intellectual diversity can serve as drivers for equity, inclusion, and demographic diversity. CPB considers all to be important, with demographic diversity helping students see themselves in their professors, and curricular and intellectual diversity helping to keep UCSC's research and teaching vital.

Shared Governance and Consultation Process

CPB invites deans, vice provosts, and vice chancellors to meet in both structured and unstructured contexts. Unstructured meetings provide opportunities for administrators to share their ideas and concerns with CPB, and for CPB to understand the vision and priorities for various divisions. 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.

The UC structure of shared governance has clearly delimited purviews. While respecting and upholding those purviews, CPB sought to think of shared governance as both constantly addressing differences and identifying shared goals, and shared values. We have reviewed our decision making and our consultation processes with an eye towards increasing levels of transparency and collaboration. Given that 2020-21 has presented both the faculty and the administration with unthinkably difficult problems, CPB feels that its partnership demands candor, criticism (when needed), collaboration, and an insistence on the university's stated values.

Regular Committee Business

External Reviews

CPB annually participates in department and program external reviews. During 2020-21, CPB reviewed department/program self-studies and submitted questions to supplement the universal charge for upcoming

reviews in Arts: Games & Playable Media, Anthropology, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Environmental Studies, Science Communication, and Writing. CPB also prepared responses to departments/program external review reports in preparation for closure meetings for History of Art and Visual Culture, History of Consciousness, Languages and Applied Linguistics, Mathematics. The committee reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for Chemistry and Biochemistry, and Linguistics. CPB reviewed several external review deferral requests for Environmental Studies, Community Studies, Applied Mathematics, Biomolecular Engineering, and Computer Science and Engineering.

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 (four), PBSci (one), Social Sciences (one). CPB also reviewed one request for authorization for other off-cycle recruitments (Humanities). CPB reviewed five Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows Program Hire requests (one in BSOE, four in Social Sciences), two Target of Excellence (TOE) Waiver of Open Recruitment requests (BSOE, PBSci), and four Spousal/Partner Waiver of Open Recruitment requests (two in Humanities, one in Social Sciences, and one in PBSci).

| # of Off-Cycle Requests | Arts | BSOE | Hum | PBSci | SocSci | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Second/Third Hires | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Off-cycle open recruitment | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| PPFP hire requests | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| TOE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Spousal/Partner waiver requests | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Total | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 17 |

During this year’s reviews CPB once again noted the need to update policies on salary upgrades, and also noted the number of exceptions to policy for startup expenses included in the proposals. CPB looks forward to continued review of allocation policies and the broader Academic Resource Model, begun this year and expected to continue in the next academic year, with continued CPB participation and input.

Local and Systemwide Issue Review

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

Local

- Languages and Applied Linguistics (LAAL) Spanish Minor Proposal (October 2020)
- Associate Provost Position Description: Office of CP/EVC (November 2020)
- Proposed Interim COVID-Related Caregiver Modified Duties Program (November 2020)
- Senate Committee on Career Advising Proposal to Assess Faculty Climate in External Reviews (November 2020)
- Documented Discussions Proposal for Addressing “Less Serious” Faculty Conduct (December 2020)
- Bay Tree Bookstore Operations and Model Review (December 2020)
- Film and Digital Media Production Concentration Proposal (December 2020)
- Revised Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity and Capping Program Enrollment Process

(January 2021)

- Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Committee on Courses of Instruction Request for Consultation on Classroom Space Issues (February 2021)
- Earth and Planetary Sciences (EPS) Geophysics Concentration Proposal (February 2021)
- Proposal to Modify and Discontinue Computer Engineering Programs and Governance (February 2021)
- Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL) External Review and Funding Renewal Proposal (February 2021)
- Administrative White Paper Response to Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) Barrier Reduction: Team Teaching Report (March 2021)
- Proposal to Suspend the Italian Studies B.A. (April 2021)
- Administrative Home Change Proposal: Technology and Information Management Undergraduate Programs (May 2021)
- Faculty FTE Transfer Requests & Joint Appointment Requests (n=11) (May 2021, June 2021)
- Proposal to Establish Critical Race and Ethnic Studies Department (June 2021)
- 2021-22 Employee Housing Re-Pricing Program Recommendations Review (June 2021)
- Arts: Games & Playable Media Administrative Home Change and Theater Arts Department Simple Name Change Bundled Proposal (June 2021)

Systemwide

- Proposed Curtailment Program (October 2020)
- Academic Planning Council's Faculty Salary Scales Task Force Report and Recommendations (February 2021)
- Proposed Presidential Policy, Business, and Finance Bulletin, IS-12 IT Recovery (February 2021)
- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Report and Recommendations for the Future (February 2021)
- Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-43 (March 2021)
- Proposed Presidential Policy SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program (May 2021)

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 (this year with the now interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget) annually for overviews of the UC and campus budget and budget outlook; capital planning; and other topics as needed (this year, an overview of the Central Resources summary, campus carryforward and deficit balances, and a presentation of the public facing Financial Dashboard project). CPB typically receives an overview from Planning and Budget on the operating budget of academic and academic support divisions, institutional support units, and auxiliary units. This will resume in the next academic year.

The committee consults with the academic deans every fall, then again during winter quarter specifically on their division's faculty FTE requests to the CP/EVC. In 2020-21, CPB also consulted with the following administrators on issues under their respective purviews: Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Latham (December 2020), Interim Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies Williams (January 2021), Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education Hughey and Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Whittingham (January 2021). CPB also consulted with the Graduate Council and Committee on Educational Policy chairs (April 2021).

Continuing Issues for CPB 2021-22

- Continue to collaborate with the Office of Planning and Budget on campus financial information sharing and management frameworks; enhance CPB review of budgetary frameworks

- Collaborate with VCBAS on optimal process for review of capital planning issues post-restructuring of the Office of Planning and Budget, and implement pilot year of review and consultation
- Collaborate with P&B to identify causes of, and solutions to improving, UCSC's student to faculty ratio
- Participate in review of campus budgetary model (Academic Resources Model)
- Monitor and participate in faculty FTE at planning and review stages
- Campus Space Planning—monitor progress and participate in Senate review
- Monitor progress of, and participate in, campus Math summit planned for 2021-22
- Monitor and engage the work and implementation of the Joint Working Group on Graduate Education and the Cost of Attendance Working Group
- Continue work with Graduate Council and VPDGS on Master's Incentive Program analysis and recommendations
- Monitor UC and campus initiatives on policing
- Monitor progress on hiring of Campus Diversity Officer
- Monitor and collaborate with the Committee on Faculty Welfare on review of Employee Housing Re-Pricing recommendations

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Elizabeth Abrams

David Cuthbert

Gina Dent

Cormac Flanagan

Debbie Gould

Raphe Kudela (F)

Matt McCarthy (W, S)

J. Cameron Monroe

Sriram Shastry

David Brundage, *ex officio*

Patty Gallagher, *ex officio*

Dard Neuman, Chair

Margaret McDevitt-Irwin, Grad Representative (W, S)

Edith Trautwein, UG Representative

Jake Washeka, UG Representative

August 31, 2021

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.