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 participated in the academic program review of eight units (seven departments and one program)
- Council reviewed several systemwide proposals, including the BOARS proposal for freshmen eligibility reform
- Council considered ten requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EOR)
- Council leadership (as well as other Senate leadership) participated in ongoing budget discussions and dialogue with the University administration (Executive Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget & Planning, etc.)
To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

I. Overview

Meetings

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) met for twenty regularly scheduled sessions during the 2007-08 term (6 in fall, 6 in winter, and 8 in spring).

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:

- Academic program reviews
- Exceptions to open recruitment (EORs)
- Endowed chair proposals
- Review of campus issues (policies, procedures, reports, etc.)
- Review of systemwide issues (reports, proposals, etc.)
- Consultations with University officials
- Review of departmental and divisional FTE plans

Council Membership:

Robert York, Chair
Bjorn Birnir, Vice Chair, Chair of Committee on Development & Community Relations
Denise Bielby
Ted Frech
Bob Koegel
Bill Freudenburg
Shirley Geok-lin Lim
Michael Glassow
Stephen McLean
Carlos Levi
Jane Mulfinger
John (Doug) Moore (out W08), Chair of Committee on Capital & Space Planning
Stanley Parsons (out F07), Chair of Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation
Jeanette Favrot Peterson (out W08)
Chuck Samuel
Matthew Turk
Jesse Bernal, Graduate Student Association (GSA) Representative

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of the following departments and programs in 2007-08:

- Department of Chemical Engineering
- Department of Communication
- Department of Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology
- Department of English
- Department of Exercise & Sport Studies
- Department of History
- Department of Statistics & Applied Probability
- Writing Program
When asked to provide recommendations for the 2009-10 Academic Program Reviews, Council voiced concern that many departments had not been reviewed in eight, nine, or even ten years. According to the Academic Program Review Procedures, six departments are to be 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 Exercise and Sport Studies and the Writing Program, which were carried out by the respective academic deans (and not the Program Review Panel), and commented on the external review of the Institute for Quantum and Complex Dynamics (IQCD).

Reviews of these units were first given to one of four ad hoc area subcommittees (Engineering/MATP; Social Sciences/Global Studies/Education; Humanities & Fine Arts/College of Creative Studies; and Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences/Bren), which then forwarded its comments and recommendations to the full council.

III. Exceptions to Open Recruitment

In accordance with UCSB’s Campus Policies and Procedures on Academic Personnel, CPB received ten requests for exceptions to open recruitment (EORs).

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 ten EOR requests in the 2007-08 term, withheld its support for one, and two are Station Q-related and are pending guidelines before Council moves forward.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

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 the following six endowed chair proposals:

1. Ahlers Endowed Chair in Experimental Physics
2. Veeco Chair in Engineering and the Sciences
3. Sarah Miller McCune SAGE Dean of Social Sciences Endowed Chair
4. Walter J. Mead Endowed Chair in Economics
5. Anton Vonk Chair in International Security
6. Fred and Linda R. Wudl Chair in Materials Science

The Committee on Development and Community Relations (CDCR) reviewed each proposal and drafted a response for discussion at the following CPB meeting. Council submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

The Committee on Development and Community Relations also formulated a recommendation of how to amplify UCSB’s fundraising effort based on Council’s previous discussions. This recommendation was then discussed and approved by the Council and sent to the EVC and other administrators in charge of fundraising.

V. Review of Campus Issues
The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2007-08 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 2008-09, as well as a set of FTE recommended for pre-approved searches for 2009-10.

Council reviewed a search request from the College of Engineering to replace open FTE left by the separation of Vikram Deshpande. CPB offered its conditional approval for this out-of-cycle search request, noting that the search for a replacement would involve little or no additional resources only if the department makes a similar junior-level hire and offers a similar start-up package. Council felt strongly that resource-neutrality should in fact be an important requirement for any out-of-cycle search request, and therefore agreed to offer its support for a replacement search at the same level, salary range, and startup costs as the original hire.

Council was asked to comment on an FTE transfer request from the Department of Physics for Matthew Fisher from KITP to Station Q. Council is awaiting administration guidelines regarding Station Q before finishing its review of this request.

**Endorsement of New Programs**

CPB reviewed and endorsed the Proposal to Establish a 5-Year BS/MS Program in Chemistry and Materials, noting that the additional one or two students per year will require minimal additional resources.

**Name Changes**

Council endorsed the proposed name change of the Center for Chicano Studies to the Institute for Chicano Studies.

CPB also reviewed and provided comments on the joint proposal for the departmentalization of the Women’s Studies Program and a name change to the Department of Feminist Studies, which was then approved by the Faculty Legislature at its June meeting.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Proposal**

Council discussed the Proposal on ADA Issues at UCSB, a report written by an informal group of faculty who are concerned with current problems in the implementation of ADA policies at UCSB. CPB was concerned that many vague assertions were made in the documentation, but few specific problems were explicitly described. Council noted that a great deal of the requested resources were for additional staffing, and wondered if a more appropriate use of resources would be to dedicate additional funds to infrastructure (e.g., safer walkways, vans, etc.) that would eliminate barriers to people with disabilities. In addition, Council felt there existed a disconnection between the asserted problem and the committee’s recommendations.

**Proposal to Establish a Center for Collaborative Engineering Research and Education**
Council reviewed the proposal to establish a Center for Collaborative Engineering Research and Education. Council was not opposed to the proposed collaboration in principle but felt that there were many points in need of further elaboration or clarification. First, the proposal lacked a letter of support from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and CPB felt that this was a major omission. Council did not perceive a clear educational rational for the proposed center. The proposal discussed the educational benefits to both institutions and expanding educational efforts after the Center is established. UCSB has BS and MS programs, and it is unclear what the specific educational need or opportunity would be for our campus. The proposed staffing (administrative assistant) did not seem to be enough if the Center administers grants, payroll and purchasing, and recharges for use of specialized Center instrumentation. Finally, Council was concerned about the effect of export-control regulations and laws on graduate students participating in research through the proposed center.

Proposal to Establish an Institute for Energy Efficiency

Council reviewed the proposal to establish an Institute for Energy Efficiency. Overall, Council enthusiastically supported this proposal, noting the proposed institute’s potential to be a transformational initiative for UCSB, and especially for the College of Engineering, as well as its potential to attract research funding, generating significant financial support. Council questioned whether it would be more appropriate to establish a Center instead of an Institute, and noted that UC Davis already has an Energy Efficiency Center (http://eec.ucdavis.edu/). CPB also offered the suggestion to make greater use of UCSB’s existing strengths outside of engineering, specifically including faculty from the social sciences and even humanities who could contribute to the proposed Institute’s intended focus on energy efficiency. Council noted the proposal made no mention of staff to administer grants, payroll, purchasing, and recharges for use of specialized Institute instrumentation, and questioned who would perform these tasks.

Proposal to Establish a Center for Stem Cell Biology and Engineering

Council reviewed the proposed Center for Stem Cell Biology and Engineering, and expressed enthusiasm for the proposed center, noting that UCSB is positioned to make headway in this field given our inter-disciplinary resources and our ability to conduct research through this center across fields and disciplines. Council expressed its understanding that funding for the proposed center would come from extramural grants, and that the primary resource required from the University would be through possible allocations of space for the center.

Review of Policies and Procedures on Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuation, and Disestablishment (TCDD)

CPB reviewed proposed changes to the policies and procedures on Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuation, and Disestablishment (TCDD) of academic programs and units. Council noted the weight and importance of such procedures, and found no objections to the document as written. After incorporating feedback from CPB, the Undergraduate Council, and the Graduate Council, the proposed policies and procedures were included as a discussion item at the June Faculty Legislature meeting and will be voted on in fall 2008.

Proposal for a new Department of Teaching, Curriculum, & Professional Development (TCPD)

CPB reviewed the revised proposal for the creation of a Department of Teaching, Curriculum, & Professional Development (TCPD) in the fall quarter and then again in spring. Council felt the rationale of coupling academic faculty engaging in educational research with the Teacher Education Program seemed logical, and a close working relationship between academia and classroom teachers and those training them is likely to be mutually beneficial. Council questioned
the rationale of having two departments awarding the same degree (TCPD and the Department of Education), but deferred to the Graduate Council to address this concern.

Proposed Recommended Guidelines for Departmental Instructional Workload Policies

Council reviewed the proposed Recommended Guidelines for Departmental Instructional Workload Policies, which were drafted by the Executive Vice Chancellor’s office. The development of these proposed guidelines were a result of a multi-year history of events, including a report of the Bureau of State Audit and a subsequent directive by President Richard Atkinson asking the Chancellors to implement an increase in undergraduate courses and support UCOP’s reexamination of faculty instructional workload. Council agreed there is merit in having a written policy regarding instructional workload, but believed that it should be a statement of principles and expectations, not a rigidly enforced set of rules, so as to retain flexibility. Council noted that there is not a direct correlation between the number of courses taught and the number of students taught, and that reporting of instruction in terms of numbers of classes or students does not account for the quality of said educational activities. Additional comments were made by CPB regarding ambiguities in specific sections of the proposed guidelines.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2007-08 term:

APM 710, 711, and 080

CPB reviewed the proposed amendments to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) 710, and the proposal for new APMs 711 and 080 (dealing with Paid Sick Leave, Reasonable Accommodation, Medical Separation, and Constructive Resignation). CPB chose not to opine. CAPRA reviewed the proposed amendments and had no comment. During Council discussion, it was noted that the issue of “constructive resignation”, which was included in a previous review of these amendments, has since been dropped from the proposed revisions. It was further noted that the inclusion of “domestic partners” in the language of the proposed amendments could be good for recruiting and/or retaining faculty members.

UCEP/CCGA report, The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction

The Council on Planning & Budget discussed the UCEP/CCGA report, The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction, and the proposed changes to SR 750.B and APM 410 4a and 4b. In general the Council supported the proposed changes, but made note of some particular concerns. CPB was concerned that the proposed changes, coupled with declining budgets, may tend to encourage the utilization of graduate students in place of lecturers. This could have a further unintended consequence of increasing the faculty’s workload with additional supervisory responsibilities. Council agreed with the strong encouragement for faculty oversight of graduate student instructors, and felt that graduate students teaching fellow graduate students should be rare and involve clear faculty supervision. While Council agreed that the instruction to apply these policies equally to the summer term is important, there was a question about whether that recommendation in the report would indeed be followed without a formal adoption into policy.

BOARS Proposal on Freshman Eligibility Reform

Council reviewed a Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy developed by the UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) first in the fall quarter and then a revised version again in spring. In its initial review, CPB questioned the financial impact of the estimated 50% increase in the number of applications to review (under the new “Entitled to Review” category) and whether additional revenue from the fee (raised from $60 to $65 per campus application) would be a realistic amount to fully offset the increase. In its subsequent
Council continued to have concerns with the potential fiscal risks in changing the eligibility requirements, specifically with regard to the inherent uncertainty in the application volume and the estimated number of students who will be "entitled to review" under the new proposal. Council suggested that implementation of the new proposal might be best done gradually, allowing for small, real-time administrative adjustments that could be phased in slowly and adaptively. In addition, Council felt strongly that a greater portion of each application fee should be provided to the campus directly to cover the full cost of a review.

Ad Hoc Committee Report on International Education

Council reviewed the System-wide Ad Hoc Committee Report on International Education, including the Minority Report by Gayle Binion, the response of Michael O'Connell, Interim University wide Director of EAP, and the fiscal review of EAP by consultant Jerry Kessler. Council generally agreed with the goals that were set forward in the report, but was not confident that the proposed budgetary steps would provide a secure foundation for the EAP program going forward. Council agreed that increasing the rate of student participation in international education programs should be a priority, but also noted the basic fiscal imbalances that have and will continue to make it difficult for EAP to increase its enrollments. Council was disappointed with the lack of any meaningful evaluation of the academic programs run by EAP, and how these programs could realistically double their enrollment without significant structural changes. CPB noted the lack of critical evaluation of the role of UC Study Centers, despite the importance of immersion programs in the EAP program.

Proposed Regulations Governing Conduct of Non-Affiliates

Council was given an opportunity to participate in the systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Regulations Governing Conduct of Non-Affiliates, but chose not to opine, as it appeared to lie beyond the purview of CPB.

UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) report, "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure"

CPB reviewed the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) report, "Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure" and supported the recommendations therein. However, Council expressed concerns and offered comments regarding specific aspects of the recommendations. First, it was noted that the committee that prepared the report did not include representatives from the medical schools or national labs except for one (Jonathan Showstack, Assistant Vice Chancellor and Co-CIO, UCSF). Regarding the recommendation to develop IT infrastructure, tools and services to support collaboration within the UC community, Council felt that critical evaluation of current and proposed new modalities should be undertaken before upgrade of existing equipment or establishment of new modalities is undertaken. Council advised care with regard to the recommendation to develop a UC grid research cyberinfrastructure by building on the current UC Grid prototype, to ensure that expenses and costs are equitably shared and no attempt is made to offload them onto research grants unfairly. Finally, Council expressed serious concerns with Recommendation 8 (create the capacity to manage our digital assets), regarding its tone that suggests UC owns scholarly work by its employees.

VII. Committees

The Council’s standing committees (Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Capital and Space Planning, and Development and Community Relations) conducted business primarily by e-mail. Issues were delegated to the appropriate committees for prior review, and recommendations were then forwarded to the full Council for deliberation.

VIII. Council Representation
The Council Chair served as member 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. The Chair of the Committee on Capital & Space Planning also attended meetings of the Campus Planning Committee and the Design Review Committee.

IX. CPB Relationship with UCPB

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

X. 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 regular consultations with EVC Gene Lucas. These meetings are an efficient way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

Budget Analysis

Regular meetings were held this term between Senate leadership and the administration to discuss various aspects of the University budget. Attendance at these meetings included the Academic Senate Chair and Vice Chair, CPB Chair and Vice Chair, Senate Executive Director and CPB Analyst, Executive Vice Chancellor, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget, Vice Chancellor for Research, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for IT/ CIO.

Topics of discussion included:
- Sub 0 annual shortfall
- Revenue generation/ Income accounts
- Gifts and endowments/ Gift assessments
- Faculty recruitment/ Faculty merit increases
- Research support/ Indirect cost (IDC) recovery
- Expenditures
- Purchased utilities
- Deferred maintenance
- Technology Investments
- Campus assessments/ tax to auxiliary services

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Unresolved issues remain surrounding Station Q, and the associated implications with regard to FTEs, personnel, and Academic Senate membership. In consultation with the Academic Senate Chair and staff, the Executive Vice Chancellor is currently in the process of developing guidelines to address these issues.