

COUNCIL ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
ANNUAL REPORT: 2005-2006

To the Faculty Legislature:

The Council on Planning and Budget held 20 regularly-scheduled two-hour meetings during the 2005-2006 academic year to consider a broad range of educational, academic planning and budgetary issues.

As a committee of Academic Senate that advises the Executive Vice Chancellor on a wide range of campus planning, CPB discusses issues in the context of the needs of the whole campus including, but not limited to, campus budget, capital planning, instruction – both graduate and undergraduate, research, space issues, matters of diversity, and development initiatives.

Thus, council members have to be both specialists in matters of planning and budget, while retaining a broad sense of the campus as a whole, a requirement that demands considerable self-education and allocation of time on the part of the members. This past year Council members worked exceptionally hard as we met with key campus officers such as Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas, Todd Lee, Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning, Martie Levy, Director of Capital Development in the Office of Budget and Planning, and Marc Fisher, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management, so that we could provide informed comments on budgetary and enrollment issues, the redrafted Academic Plan, the marked growth in capital projects on the campus, as well as working with newly instituted procedures for FTE allocation and approval, and the substantial numbers of requests for EORs from across the campus. CPB welcomes the commitment to transparency of process on the part of the administration and is pleased to have been a part of this move towards greater transparency over the past few years.

A plethora of other topics also come before the Council including requests for:

- advice on possible name change of units,
- guidance on amending educational policies,
- comments on departmental reviews including meetings for the Chair and Vice-Chair with the members of the visiting External Review Committees as well as requests for suggestions on the one and three year follow-up reviews, and reviews of research units.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DRAFT ACADEMIC PLAN (discussed in April 2006) 2006 - 2026

CPB members greatly appreciated the thought that had gone into developing the Academic Plan since its last draft. The Council still felt, however, that a detailed explication of resource implications was needed as well as explicit attention to the departmental and divisional 15 year long-range plans. Council also sought reassurance that imbalances amongst divisions and departments on teaching, research support and physical space needs would not be exacerbated due to the projected growth proposed in the Academic Plan, and, indeed, hoped such inequities might be reduced as a result of the growth. Other issues commented on by the Council were the urgent need for affordable housing for faculty and staff as well as how interdisciplinarity could be furthered albeit not at the expense of those areas for whom such interdisciplinarity was not appropriate.

EOR POLICY

The request by divisional Deans for FTE as exceptions to open recruitment (EOR) has not declined in the past few years and this year we dealt with eleven such requests. In February 2006, the Council concurred with EVC Lucas' policy on EORs, a policy developed from discussions on The Council in the past two years.

THE CAPITAL PLANNING PROCESS

CPB supported the extensive work of its standing Committee on Capital and Space Planning by requesting that all capital projects which involved new buildings also have a renovation element in their proposals. The Council notes that it appears that a strategy close to this one is being implemented as capital projects work their way through the Campus Planning Committee.

CPB also offered comments on a Preliminary Project Proposal to site a Campus Guesthouse, probably near the Faculty Club, to be run by a third party. Members of Council had a number of concerns regarding such a venture. We request that the Academic Senate remain actively informed on this proposal as it moves through the planning process, so that CPB input is integral to all future deliberations.

FTE APPROVED TO FILL

As in previous years, much of the Spring 2006 quarter was spent considering the Divisional and College requests for approval to fill FTE in 2006-07. In this past year, the preliminary discussions with the Deans in Winter 2006, combined with a relatively recent policy to allocate temporary sub zero funds directly to the Divisions – rather than have the EVC hold such funds in that office – meant that the Council discussed the Deans' current requests alongside the requests of the departments in their Division/College. Further, in assessing the requests submitted for approval to fill FTE, Council took into account the number of "carry forward" (allocated but yet unfilled) FTE in the Division/College

THE DETAILED REPORT

EOR POLICY

The past few years have demonstrated that when considering EORs, there has not been an adequate policy in place which systematically included the planning perspective of Senate. Formal Senate assessment of such requests always includes an assessment from the Committee on Academic Personnel which examines the qualifications of individual candidates. Clearly, CAP is not the appropriate committee to comment on the departmental, divisional, college or campus impact of such an appointment. In the past few years, EVC Lucas has been consulting with The Council on EOR requests, but no policy was in place that included CPB as a formal advisory body for such deliberations. In February 2006 CPB concurred with a set of suggestions offered by EVC Lucas to regularize such requests in the spirit of joint planning between the Senate and the Administration. The Affirmative Action Policies (Section V, Paragraph VIII: Exceptions to Open Recruitment for Senate Faculty) in the Red Binder were amended to reflect this.

However, to regularize a set of procedures for EOR can also mean that such requests become routine, rather than the exception, as seen in the past few years when it was thought there would be a dearth of new FTE allocated to Colleges and Divisions. This past year Council dealt with eleven such requests, none of which were for presidential Post-Doctoral Fellows, and although often sympathetic to the individual urgent needs of the divisions, felt that such requests do not fulfill the spirit of a public university that appoints its faculty in open searches. While EORs may be used to diversify a faculty, it is also the case that research needs to be done to see if EOR appointments have increased the diversity of the campus over the past decade.

THE CAPITAL PLANNING PROCESS

Martie Levy, Director of Capital Development, Office of Budget and Planning, came to talk to the Council twice during the year about the state of state funded capital projects at UCSB. She described how projects enter the planning process at UCSB, and shared with The Council that costs of construction are outrunning the estimates submitted for such costs. CPB was perturbed by the significant mismatch/gap between the estimated costs of building and the actual bids submitted for the cost of building once the project is approved by UCOP. Members of The Council felt that a solution to this mismatch/gap must be sought as matter of urgency.

Joel Michaelsen, Chair of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Faculty and Staff Housing also came to CPB to discuss the development of housing for faculty and staff. Many times during the year members of The Council urged the provision of decent and affordable housing for faculty, staff and students noting that this remains a key element in ensuring that the campus continues to thrive.

Space sub-committee

In November 2005 the space sub-committee of CPB met with recently retired David Gonzales, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Facilities Management, asking for information on the needs for building renewal on campus, defined as a collection of deferred maintenance items. He brought a list of over twenty buildings needing significant renewal. This list was prioritized by his office, and reflected urgency for Bio II and Music among others. The need for space renewal is seen in some cases as safety issues as with Bio II and Engineering I. In others such as Music, the needs threaten academic programs by potentially inhibiting the retention and recruitment of new faculty and graduate students.

CPB also noted that much of the renovation in recent years has been ad-hoc and connected with start up for new faculty and requested that other funding models for building renovation be investigated. CPB is pleased to note that in recent meetings of the Campus Planning Committee the issue of renovations has been placed on the agenda alongside the discussions of construction of new buildings.

PROGRAM REVIEWS

CPB is routinely asked to comment on departmental self-assessments in the form of questions directed to the External Review Committee (ERC) for a unit. Later in the process, the Chair or Vice-Chair of CPB meets with the External Review Committee when it is on campus. Following that, CPB receives the ERC report as well as the departmental response to that report and offers further comments, always with an eye to The Council's planning and budgetary role.

In 2005-06 CPB reviewed the external reviews of the departments of Chicana/o Studies Dramatic Art, History of Art and Architecture, Latin American and Iberian Studies Program, Mechanical and Electrical Engineering, and Spanish and Portuguese. CPB also discussed the review of the Center for Chicana/o Studies.

One issue that demands the attention of the Senate is how we might best tackle the issue of departments/units "in trouble". If Senate and the Administration notice such units, CPB suggested that such situations be attended to as early as possible in order to avoid a major set of repercussions for individuals and departments. Involvement of the Academic Senate at an early stage – for advice or other guidance – might help to limit the deepening of such "trouble".

DRAFT ACADEMIC PLAN April 2006

While the Council recognized the draft as an excellent document for a very broad set of parameters, there were concerns that the Plan does not adequately address many of the implications of the growth scenario that directly relate to the quality of the UCSB campus.

For example, members of The Council stressed that the draft Plan is not yet adequate as a document that could be used for detailed internal campus planning. Thus, The Council suggested that an internal planning document be drafted alongside this more widely distributed academic plan, and that this internal document could address specific resource issues in the context of UCSB campus needs. This internal planning document could start its planning by drawing on the UCSB departments', divisional and college fifteen year plans. CPB also voiced some concerns regarding the proposed campus-projected-growth over the coming two decades, particularly in terms of how such growth might differentially impact divisions, departments and colleges. Concern was also expressed that such differential growth would affect faculty workload and could lead to further impoverishment of programs with high teaching loads. In addition, members of The Council were concerned as to the fate of departments that are not likely to grow yet are integral to the scholarly mission of a research university.

The Council also discussed the question of how interdisciplinarity will be furthered on campus as a result of this Academic Plan. Will interdisciplinarity be implemented in all areas of campus, or in some areas but not others? How will the decision be made regarding which areas are to be furthered in this way? While The Council welcomed the deliberations on interdisciplinarity for the campus as integral to the draft Academic Plan, The Council also noted that the redrafted Academic Plan itself did not simultaneously emphasize the importance of continuing to invest in core disciplines.

The Council agreed that the success of the campus Academic Plan also depends upon how the LRDP addresses future changes in staffing, land use, instructional and research space, housing, and infrastructure to accommodate the projected enrolment and associated growth for the campus. In addition, The Council emphasized that affordable housing for staff, faculty and students is not only the "single greatest tactical challenge the campus faces" but may be the central most significant challenge, independent of any and all plans for growth.

As the campus grows, staffing issues will clearly continue to be critical, and The Council would have welcomed seeing more specific information about the projected increase in staffing levels at the campus. Further, The Council wondered about how resources will be allocated to other functions central to the workings of a world-class university, including the Library.

FTE PLANNING

In Spring 2006 The Council considered the requests for approval to fill FTE by the Divisional Deans with a view to offering advice to EVC Lucas on such requests. Following last year's debacle in which the Deans' reports were only available to The Council during the summer months, effectively preventing any thorough-going commentary on such reports/requests, CPB received most of the Deans' reports in late Winter/early Spring 2006. Given the change in the way in which FTE are now handled in the Administration (that is, Divisional Deans hold the budget for all permanent and unfilled FTE allocated to them) The Council focused on the relationship between the Deans' request and the needs voiced by individual departments within their division. Thus, The Council looked at every departmental request alongside the Deans' recommendations as to which departments were most in need of FTE at the present time. Further, The Council took into account not only the most recent PRP on a department/unit, but also noted the number of separations, current and future rankings and prospective rankings for departments, and faculty workload. CPB discussions were further informed by previously allocated FTE which were still unfilled ("carry-forward" FTE) and the possible number of searches a department or division might feasibly conduct in the coming year. CPB also took account of EORs allocated to a department and division/college. Finally, CPB offered suggestions for FTE in the years beyond 2006-07.

Memberships and Consultations. In Fall 2005 there were a number of consultative meetings with key campus officers to bring new Council members up to speed with respect to campus planning and budget. These included Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas, Todd Lee, Budget Director in the Office of

Budget and Planning, Martie Levy, Director of Capital Development in the Office of Budget and Planning, and Joel Michaelsen in his capacity as Chair of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Faculty and Staff Housing. Walter Yuen, Chair of the Divisional Senate also consulted with The Council a number of times.

Later in the year, The Council consulted with Deans Marshall, Moskovits, Tirrell, Melack, Tiffney and Oliver. The Consultations with the Deans provided an opportunity for The Council to discuss how the allocations of the temporary sub-zero funds to the Deans was working as well as to better understand the needs of Division/College. In addition, Chair Bhavnani and Vice-Chair Bohn met with each of the Deans before the Dean's visit to CPB.

Council Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani served on the Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy as well as on the Campus Planning Committee, the Campus Design Review Committee, the Classroom Utilization Committee, the Academic Senate's Executive Council and as Trustee of the UCSB Foundation and its subcommittee on finance. She also met with UCOP personnel at campus meetings to discuss how to improve diversity within the UC, and met with Rory Hume and others from UCOP on the state of graduate education within the University of California. She also attended a public meeting of the Senior Women's Council which discussed the status of women faculty and their career prospects at this campus.

Vice Chair Henning Bohn represented UCSB on University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Messrs. Bhavnani and Bohn reported regularly to the Council on issues before the systemwide and campus committees and were, variously, consulted by the search committees for a number of senior administrative officers. The Chair or the Vice Chair participated in the external review committee interviews in the PRP process and conveyed the Council's concerns about the units being reviewed to the ERC members. Ms. Bhavnani served on the Library Building Committee and made reports to the full Council on progress in that area. Michael Gerber served as Chair of the Council's Committee on Development and Community Relations and also served on the Board of the UCSB Foundation. Bruce Luyendyk served as the Chair of the Committee on Capital and Space Planning for the Fall quarter but, due to his appointment as an Associate Dean was succeeded in Winter by Stephanie Le Menager; Divy Agrawal chaired the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation for the Fall quarter and was succeeded by Stanley Awramik in the Winter. This latter Committee reported to the full Council on a number of different issues including the 2006-2025 Draft Academic Plan, the Council on Research and Instructional Resources Survey, and the Summary of the Environmental Issues Task Force Report.

Policies and Procedures

The Committee reviewed a draft policy for the Transfer, Consolidation or Continuance of a Graduate or Undergraduate Program, as well as a draft policy to Transfer, Consolidate or Disestablish and Academic Unit. These reviews were undertaken for a policy workgroup that was formed in 2002 to discuss and revise certain outdated UCSB policies and procedures.

University Council on Planning and Budget

The Council was regularly briefed by the UCPB Representative, Henning Bohn, about systemwide Planning & Budget issues. Key issues were:

- senior management compensation and overall UC compensation and salary competitiveness, including comments on the Mercer report and various audit reports;
- the UC budget, the state budget situation, and the financial status of the UC pension plan;
- the UCRP report on Current UC Budget Trends, which describes alternative budget scenarios for the University and their implications;
- proposals to increase graduate student funding and to limit fees and NRT;
- concerns about the new relationship between University and the Los Alamos National Security LLC, which were fueled by an apparent reluctance of administrators to provide information;
- proposals on the Strategic Sourcing Initiative;
- discussion of funding and structure of EAP;

- comments on pending reviews of MRUs and on the review process of Cal. ISIs.

15-Year Reviews

The Council was asked for its input on a 15-year review of the University Committee on Latino Research.

Council on Research and Instructional Resources Survey

Professor Awramik led The Council's discussion on this survey, offering a detailed and helpful set of insights into the issues raised. The Council sent a detailed reply in which we focused especially on budget and planning aspects. The general issues raised were with regard to the role of graduate students in the instructional process, support for new faculty (especially Assistant Professors) on the campus, and increased support for graduate students on the campus. The Council strongly suggested that the campus budgets be designed with the above in mind. Finally, CPB strongly supported the recommendation for budget transparency in the allocation of instructional resources across the campus.

Name Changes. The Council reviewed and endorsed name changes for the following units: Center for Black Studies (to Center for Black Studies Research), Film Studies (to Film and Media Studies) and Francisco Torres Dormitory (to Santa Catalina).

The Chair wishes to express her appreciation to the members of the council for their willingness to expend substantial time and energy on the business of the council, which was, at times, extremely demanding. The good humour, candour and willingness to listen on the part of all members at times of intense discussion were very welcome. The Chair also wants to thank Henning Bohn for his extremely able work as Vice Chair.

Within the Academic Senate Office, the Chair particularly wishes to thank Ellen Friedkin who serves as staff Analyst to the Council. Ellen kept The Council on track and ensured we dealt with issues in a timely manner. Further, her wide ranging knowledge about campus matters and by-laws, her ability to quickly unearth previous policies and reports, some from close to two decades ago, and her advice on a wide range of matters ensured we were able to do our job. We simply could not have done our work without her.

Divyakant Agrawal (Fall)
 Stanley Awramik (Winter and Spring)
 Robyn Bell
 Hening Bohn (Vice-Chair)
 Claudio Campagnari
 James Childress
 David Clarke (Winter and Spring)
 Michael Gerber
 Sreenivas Jammalamadaka
 Stephanie Le Menager
 Bruce Luyendyk (Fall)
 Laurie Oaks
 Alice O'Connor
 Stanley Parsons
 David Rock
 Cynthia Skenazi
 Robert York

Kum Kum Bhavnani (Chair)

