Purpose of the Council: To initiate, coordinate and implement academic planning that promotes the quality and diversity of the academic experience; provide advice on the campus budget, capital planning and allocations of resources and space.

Highlights:

- Council considered the FTE plans for each college, school, division, and department in order to advise the Executive Vice Chancellor regarding priorities for filling FTE.
- Council started several initiatives to gain a better understanding of the Campus budget, which will continue into the next term.
- Council engaged in several rounds of consultation about Station Q.
- Council reviewed proposals for new academic buildings and identified as top priorities Music followed by Physics.
- Council considered several systemwide proposals for changes to the faculty salary system.

Follow this link to see the full report →
The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) met for twenty-one regularly scheduled sessions during the 2006-07 term.

I. Agenda

CPB’s agendas typically include the following items, in addition to any campus or systemwide issues and/or consultations with the administration:

Exception to Open Recruitment

In accordance with UCSB’s Campus Policies and Procedures on Academic Personnel, CPB reviews all requests for exception to open recruitment (EOR). Departments may request an exception to open recruitment for two reasons, in the absence of an approved FTE or an open search: 1) the hire or retention of a Senate faculty member involves a hire for a spouse or domestic partner; or 2) an unanticipated opportunity for a ladder faculty appointment of an individual whose unique qualifications and outstanding promise or accomplishment which will make an extraordinary contribution to the campus’ goals of excellence and diversity. CPB endorsed seven of the eleven EOR requests in the 2006-07 term.

Review of Existing Programs

CPB participated in the Academic Program Review of the following departments and programs in 2006-07:

Physics
Political Science
English
Geography
Chicana/o Studies

When asked to provide recommendations for the 2008-09 Academic Program Reviews, Council voiced concern that approximately twelve departments have not been reviewed in eight, nine, or ten years. According to the Academic Program Review Procedures, six departments are reviewed each academic year, allowing a complete campus review to be accomplished within an eight-year cycle. CPB recommended nine departments/programs for review rather than the typical six, to ensure that no more than eight years elapse between reviews. Council noted in their reply that the structure of the program review process may need to be reconsidered to accommodate additional reviews, especially as new programs are established and interdisciplinary units are included in the PRP process.

CPB also participated in the reviews of Military Science and Writing, which were carried out by the respective academic deans, and commented on the review of the Marine Science Institute.

Endorsement of New Programs

CPB reviewed and provided comments on the Proposal for an M.A./Ph.D. in Feminist Studies at UCSB, which were forwarded to the Graduate Council for consideration. The proposal was endorsed by the Graduate Council and approved by the Faculty Legislature in the spring, and is now under consideration by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs at the systemwide Academic Senate.
CPB also reviewed and endorsed the Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering and a Bachelor of Science Degree in Computer Engineering Within the College of Creative Studies. The proposal is now under consideration by the Undergraduate Council.

Review of Endowed Chairs

In accordance with UCSB’s Policy on Endowed Chairs, CPB is consulted regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject area and its conformity with the academic mission of our campus. CPB received five endowed chair proposals, in addition to a proposal for the Academic Initiative Professorships, a cluster of four endowed chairs designed to “support new academic program initiatives or ongoing programs of unusual importance.” The Committee on Development and Community Relations (CDCR) reviewed each proposal and drafted a response for discussion at the next CPB meeting. Council submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

Name Changes

Council commented on the proposed name change of the Department of Dramatic Art and Dance to the Department of Theater and Dance. The undergraduate and graduate degree programs were also changed to reflect the new name of the department.

II. Issues and Outcomes

The Council on Planning and Budget discussed the following campus issues during the 2006-07 term:

FTE Planning

The Council considered the College, School, Divisional and FTE Departmental Plans received from the College of Letters and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Creative Studies, the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education. Each year, the Executive Vice Chancellor consults with CPB regarding priorities for filling FTE. Council reviewed each departmental request alongside the Deans’ recommendations as to which departments were most in need of FTE at the present time. CPB also considered information such as the number of separations, unfilled or “carry-forward” FTE, and EORs allocated to the department/college/school. Council recommended a set of strongly-supported FTE for 2007-08, as well as a set of FTE recommended for pre-approved searches beyond 2007-08.

Budget Analysis

Motivated by the presumption that sensible Campus planning requires a good understanding of the Campus budget, Council started several initiatives to gain a better understanding in this area. While CPB has traditionally focused on planning, the budget is part of its responsibility. In notable contrast to other UC campuses, UCSB is lacking a dedicated budget committee that would ensure shared governance with regard to the budget. While the latter is a shortcoming, the breadth of CPB’s mission is also an opportunity because planning and budget benefit from integration: planning is unrealistic unless funded; budgeting too easily reduces to book-keeping unless guided by a planning vision.

In September 2006, CPB asked the EVC for the sub-0 budgets of colleges, schools, and divisions. This request was passed on to the Deans as part of the FTE call. The responses were mixed, ranging from informative financial plans from some Deans to no response from others. Separately, the CPB chair and vice chair participated in a sequence of meetings with Assistant
Chancellor Todd Lee, with the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, and with former CPB chair Chris Newfield to develop a database covering the sub-0 budget. A data set covering five years of sub-0 expenditures was constructed and provided to Council. The CPB chair also performed his own analysis of the annual Planning Data Books and presented the results to Council. Council prepared a set of questions arising from this analysis that were distributed for comment to the administration.

Council considers this year’s budget initiatives modest first steps in the direction of greater transparency and more effective shared governance in this area, to be pursued further in the coming years.

Station Q

CPB was consulted regarding a proposal to affiliate members of Station-Q, a Microsoft-sponsored research center, with the UCSB faculty. Station-Q presents an opportunity for UCSB to collaborate with Microsoft in the area of quantum computing. The proposal includes an agreement by which Station-Q members, who are distinguished academics on leave from other universities, would be considered for tenure track positions at UCSB, should Station-Q come to an end. Council corresponded with the Executive Vice Chancellor numerous times throughout the year to voice concerns, ask questions, and generally attempt to come to an understanding regarding Station-Q. A final policy with regard to Station-Q has yet to be established.

CPC Review of New Building Proposals

The Campus Planning Committee (CPC) began discussions in the spring regarding available funding for two buildings that would begin the planning process at the end of the current five-year capital plan, and construction in the years to follow. The four building proposals presented for selection were Physics, Music, and the colleges of Creative Studies and Engineering. CPB was asked to make recommendations to the Divisional Chair. Council’s Committee on Capital and Space Planning (C&SP) reviewed the four proposals, and met with the Director of Capital Development in the Office of Budget and Planning and with other interested parties. The Committee reviewed numerous documents, such as CPC presentations, and staff analyses of space needs. They also relied on a C&SP building study from April 2005, when the Committee spent several months examining buildings in disrepair (including site visits) and reviewing building proposals. C&SP presented their findings to Council, who discussed that the four departments are all in need of new space, although to a different degrees.

The Committee agreed that the top two criteria were first, safety and liability, particularly regarding earthquakes, and second, strengthening the intellectual quality of the campus. After weighing the arguments for the four different proposals, CPB ranked the proposed building for the Department of Music first and the building for the Department of Physics second. This is not to diminish the merits of the Engineering and CCS proposals, but because the space needs of Music and Physics appear more critical at this time. The Music building is decrepit and unsafe, reportedly leaks and has a poor seismic rating, which implies potential liability. It is the campus’ ethical responsibility to insure the safety of its students, staff, and faculty, and it is a disgrace to allow structures with poor seismic ratings to persist as teaching facilities on the campus. Physics clearly has an urgent need of office space, and immediate and future needs for laboratory space that is ample enough to accommodate faculty research and built up-to standard for current research methods (vibration-free, etc.). CPB expects that CPC will make a decision sometime this fall.

The Council on Planning and Budget discussed the following systemwide issues during the 2006-07 term:
Proposed Revisions to APM 620

In November 2006, President Dynes formed a workgroup to address the faculty salary scales. The UC’s aim is to attract and retain faculty using a competitive and effective system of compensation while maintaining a rigorous and effective post tenure review. The workgroup presented several amendments to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 620, which were approved by the Academic Council for systemwide review. The amendments to APM 620 would remove language indicating that off-scale salaries are exception to policy; and change language defining off-scale so that the new scales may include the range between the scales as “on-scale” salaries. CPB noted that re-defining off-scale to include faculty with off-scale salaries greater than the next step will reduce the number of faculty that are off-scale; however, unless the dollar amounts pegged to steps in the salary scale are adjusted upward significantly to reflect salaries at or greater than the Comparison Eight institutions, the percentage of faculty with off-scale salaries will swell again rapidly. A package of changes that restores a more realistic (higher) salary scale would help alleviate suspicions that the proposed change is mainly about “scandal-proofing” the APM. The divisional responses to the subject proposal are currently under consideration by the Academic Council.

With regard to the salary scales, CPB expressed concern that UCOP is moving too quickly towards implementing significant changes without sufficient Senate consultation.

Proposed Amendments to APM 220-18

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) proposed amendments to the criteria for advancement to Step VI and Above Scale (APM 200-18.b(4)), which were adopted by the Academic Council in late March. CPB was asked to review and comment on the proposed amendments. The criteria for advancement to Step VI includes three categories: 1) scholarship or creative achievement, 2) University teaching, and 3) service. Currently, evidence of sustained excellence is required in all three categories, whereas the proposed language requires great academic distinction, recognized nationally or internationally, in at least one of the three categories. Council raised a concern about the possibility of excellence in one area being used to compensate for less than stellar performance in another. Also, CPB was concerned with limiting advancement to Above Scale to those who have achieved international recognition. There may be fields within disciplines that may not be well recognized or regarded outside of the United States, and it would be difficult to achieve the necessary international recognition. CPB’s response to the proposed amendments was included in the Divisional response now under consideration by the Academic Council.

UCAP Recommendations and Proposed Changes to Academic Personnel Policies

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) was asked to review the University’s salary scale system amid growing concerns that the majority of UC faculty are not being compensated according to the published system. UCAP found that the use of “off-scale” salaries has sharply increased since the mid-1990s, as the current system does not allow UC to adjust salaries to either the Comparison Eight averages or to market-based salaries by discipline. UCAP drafted a report on principles and policy recommendations for UC faculty compensation, which was submitted to the Academic Council for consideration and then to the divisions for review and comment. CPB recognizes the need for change in the UC compensation system, although there are differences of opinion on how this should be accomplished. In their response, Council noted the need for an extremely compelling argument for increases in salary, even more so in light of the recent controversies about UC executive compensation.

The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) submitted a joint proposal to the Academic Council that discusses the
appropriate degree of the use of graduate students in university instruction. At present, the policies and procedures with regard to the use of graduate students in instruction vary from campus to campus. CPB was asked to comment on the proposal, which defines titles and conditions of employment for graduate student instructors, and discusses the applicability of academic freedom and the Faculty Code of Conduct. In their response, Council questioned the need for new policy when perhaps the problems discussed in the proposal could be solved by increased diligence in enforcing the current policies. Council also voiced concern that the document does not contain a clear statement on the full range of problems that it is trying to address and the limitations of the current policy/regulations in solving these problems. Council also pointed out that the proposal does not include a discussion of the significant resource issues that the proposed changes will undoubtedly create and the implications of the proposal for collective bargaining agreements. CPB’s concerns were included in the Divisional response to the Academic Council. Council expects that CCGA and UCEP will take each Division’s comments into consideration and circulate a revised draft for review in 2007-08.

III. Committees

The Council’s standing committees (Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Capital and Space Planning, and Development and Community Relations) do business primarily by e-mail. Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met several times to discuss Station-Q and the campus budget. Capital and Space Planning met several times to prepare draft recommendations on New Building Proposals.

IV. Council Representation

The Council Chair served as vice chair of the Campus Planning Committee. Both the CPB chair and the chair of the Committee on Development and Community Relations serve as Trustees of the UCSB foundation.

V. CPB Relationship with UCPB

The Council Chair served as UCSB representative on UCPB, regularly reported on UCPB business, and solicited comments from council members on pending UCPB issues.

VI. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning and Budget met with several members of the Administration during the 2006-07 term, including the Executive Vice Chancellor, Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development, the Deans of the College of Letters and Science, Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, Associate Dean of the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, Dean of the College of Creative Studies, Dean of the College of Engineering, the Divisional Chair of the Academic Senate, and the Director of Capital Development in the Office of Budget and Planning.

The Council Chair and Vice Chair had separate, usually bi-weekly consultations with EVC Gene Lucas. These meetings are an efficient way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

As noted, the Council Chair and Vice Chair also participated in a sequence of meetings on the sub-0 budget with Assistant Chancellor Todd Lee, the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, and former CPB chair Chris Newfield.

VII. Carry-Over Issues

An important continuing issue is the campus budget. In its final 2006-07 meeting, CPB drafted a detailed list of questions about the campus budget that were sent to selected administrators. We
hope to build on the answers and on this year’s analysis to improve CPB’s understanding of the budget.
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