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 seven units (six departments and one program)
- Council reviewed several systemwide proposals, including President Yudof’s salary reduction plan and the BOARS proposal for freshmen eligibility reform
- Council reviewed several campus-specific proposals, including the WASC proposal for institutional accreditation
- Council considered two requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EOR)
- Council reviewed three proposals to establish endowed chairs
- Council leadership (as well as other Senate leadership) continued with budget discussions and dialogue as part of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Budget Strategy
I. Overview

Meetings

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) met for twenty regularly scheduled sessions during the 2008-09 term (7 in fall, 6 in winter, and 7 in spring).

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:
- Academic program reviews
- 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
- Exceptions to open recruitment (EORs)
- Endowed chair proposals

Council Membership:
Bjorn Birnir; Mathematics (CPB Chair)
Jane Mulfinger; Art (CPB Vice-Chair and Chair of Committee on Development & Community Relations)
Denise Bielby; Sociology
Collie Conoley; Counseling, Clinical, School Psychology
Ted Frech; Economics
Deborah Fygenson; Physics (Chair of Committee on Capital & Space Planning)
Michael Glassow; Anthropology
Bob Koegel; Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology (Chair of Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation)
Gary Leal; Chemical Engineering
Carlos Levi; Materials
Stephen McLean; Mechanical Engineering
John (Doug) Moore; Mathematics
Linda Putnam; Communication
Charles Samuel; Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biology
Matthew Turk; Computer Science/ MATP
Filiberto Nolasco; Graduate Student Association Rep

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of the following departments and programs in 2008-09:
- Department of Economics
- Department of Exercise & Sport Studies (coordinated by Dean of Social Sciences)
When asked to provide recommendations for the Program Review Panel (PRP) reviews for 2010-11, Council voiced concern that many departments had not been reviewed in nine or 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 submitted the following prioritized list for program reviews:

- Chemistry & Biochemistry
- Computer Science
- Computer Engineering Program
- Sociology
- Music
- Art
- Film & Media Studies
- East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies
- Feminist Studies

Council recommended the deferral of the review of the Department of Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology, noting that it is a relatively new unit and was included in the most recent review of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education.

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 two 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 one of the two requests for the 2008-09 academic year.
IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s *Policy on Endowed Chairs*, CPB was consulted regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject area and its conformity with the academic mission of our campus. CPB received three endowed chair proposals:

1. Doluca Endowed Chair in Electrical & Computer Engineering,
2. Veeco Chair in Engineering and the Sciences
3. Gurley Endowed Chair in Theoretical Physics and Biology

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.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2008-09 academic year:

**FTE Planning**

Because of the budget crisis, planning for academic appointments was considerably different this year. It was confirmed after consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate Joel Michaelsen and Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas that the Council on Planning and Budget advises the EVC on FTE plans also in times of crises and/or a hiring freeze. In previous years, the Executive Vice Chancellor asked each dean to submit a plan requesting new faculty FTEs to be filled in future years. This year, however, the EVC requested the deans to submit a plan to distribute the existing previously-approved FTEs over a three-year period (2008-2011). No new FTEs would be allocated. The EVC then consulted with CPB regarding priorities for filling FTE. The Council considered the revised FTE plans from the divisions of the College of Letters and Science, the College of Creative Studies, the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and the College of Engineering. CPB conducted its review in context of its recommendations made last year for the two-year cycle 2008-2010. CPB had previously recommended 24 new searches plus 1 discretionary FTE (MLPS), amounting to 24.5 FTE. Of the 24 new searches that CPB recommended, 20 were considered by the Council to be *strong* recommendations.

Since only the 2008-2009 FTEs were approved last year, the spread of allocated positions over three years created an imbalance. Many departments that had been recommended to receive a position in the 2009-2010 cycle would not get any positions for three years simply because they had successfully recruited before the 2008-2009 recommendations and happened to get a position in the second year for this particular cycle. Thus the reason and logic in the allocation of the 2009-10 positions is lost by this particular cut-off. It was also noted that last year’s recommendations from CPB were not completely followed. HFA received more positions than recommended at the expense of MLPS, which received fewer than was recommended by CPB for the 2008-2009 cycle. This
year’s recommendation accounted for these factors.

In his call to the deans, the EVC indicated that there were six new FTE to be allocated. CPB recommended they be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FTE Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>1 discretionary FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC SCI</td>
<td>2 discretionary FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPS</td>
<td>2 discretionary FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>1 discretionary FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>No FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGSE</td>
<td>No FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREN</td>
<td>No FTEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTE Transfer Requests

CPB reviewed two requests to transfer FTEs from the discontinued Law & Society Program to other academic units (the Department of Religious Studies and the Global & International Studies Program). Council supported both of these requests.

Technology Management Program Proposals

CPB reviewed a tripartite proposal from the Technology Management Program, calling for: the establishment of a new academic unit within the College of Engineering (Technology Management Program); the establishment of a new instructional program (minor in Technology Management); and the establishment of a graduate certificate (and re-naming of the current Graduate Program in Management Practice to a Graduate Certificate in Technology Management). CPB endorsed the latter two proposals, but it did not endorse the establishment of a new academic unit.

Proposed Major in Economics & Accounting

The Council on Planning & Budget endorsed an Economics Department proposal for a new major in Economics and Accounting. Council noted that there were no stated requests for additional resources; the assessment of student interest suggested that students will appreciate the change; and the proposed new major appeared to be replacing an existing major with another approximately equivalent major that has been more carefully thought out (is more appropriately named, and has a more appropriate curriculum).
CPB called attention to a few concerns: the effects of increasing the minimum GPA requirement (from 2.85 to 3.0); the heavy reliance on lecturers; the resource requirements of the new major, especially if it is popular; and the impact that the proposed major will have on other majors that work in concert with Economics.

Proposed Major in *Linguistics, Culture, and Society*

Council endorsed the Linguistics Department proposal for a new major in *Linguistics, Culture, and Society*. CPB noted that minimal new resources were requested. Nonetheless, in light of a climate in which existing resources are diminishing, the expectation of even minimal new resources might be unrealistic. CPB noted the proposal lacked a plan for discontinuation of department’s existing Linguistics Sociocultural emphasis. There was considerable concern among Council members regarding the diffusion of efforts in a small department that does not have very many students. Council suggested including a definite plan to discontinue the current emphasis and to phase it out in such a way that would not over-extend the resources of the department. Council also expressed its concern regarding the impact that this proposed major would have on other departments.

Proposed *Center for Latina/o Health, Education and Research*

Council reviewed the proposal to establish a *Center for Latina/o Health, Education and Research*, within the Chicano Studies Institute, an ORU. Council endorsed this proposal, noting that it relates to ongoing local and national priorities and provides ample opportunities to attract funding resources. Council also offered several suggestions for improving the proposed program.

Proposed *Center for Computing Education and Diversity*

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the proposal for the *Center for Computing Education and Diversity*, a non-ORU center. Council strongly supported the intent of the proposed center and agreed that it would address an area of great need. Nonetheless, CPB expressed significant concerns that the proposed center would require new resources at a time when resources are scarce.

Council was disappointed that the proposal lacked a complete budget, without which CPB was unable to thoroughly evaluate the proposal. CPB requested that the proposal be resubmitted with a detailed budget and letters stating that the resources necessary for the budget will be provided by the College of Engineering.

Proposed Procedures on International Agreements

The Council on Planning & Budget supported the draft proposal for campus procedures on international agreements. However, Council suggested further clarity in defining the process for expanding an international agreement beyond UCSB, to allow for the
Education Abroad Program involvement, and the participation of other campuses to be added later.

Proposed *Instructional Technology Enhancement Initiative*

The Council on Planning & Budget endorsed the proposal for the College of Letters and Science *Instructional Technology Enhancement Initiative*.

CPB agreed that the proposal was timely and appropriate, and had the following additional comments and questions:

1. CPB wonders if the fee of $2.50 per unit is too low.
2. Will other colleges and divisions develop instructional technology fees?
3. Will the salary expenses include CMS support staff and cover benefits?
4. CPB felt that L&S should take advantage of the models developed at UCLA and to avoid re-inventing the wheel.

Proposed Memoranda of Understanding

Council reviewed two proposed Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between UCSB and international entities: the Royal Education Council of Bhutan and the Queensland Institute of Technology. Council supported both of the proposals, noting that there were no new resources required.

Proposed Name Change: *Institute for Quantum & Complex Dynamics*

Council reviewed the proposal to change the name of an Organized Research Unit, from the Institute for Quantum & Complex Dynamics (IQCD) to the Institute for Terahertz Science & Technology (ITST). CPB did not approve the name change request at this time. Council noted that there are currently two centers that exist under the auspices of the institute: the Center for Terahertz Science & Technology (CTST) and the Center for Complex & Nonlinear Sciences (CCNS). Council felt that it was missing explicit input from the existing faculty in both centers regarding the proposed name change. Is the name change supported by all (or a majority) of the faculty? Furthermore, the proposed name change appeared to subsume all of the scope of the ORU under the umbrella of one of its centers, from which it would get its new name (“terahertz science and technology”). Exactly what will this name change mean for the other center (Center for Complex & Nonlinear Sciences)?

Proposed *Silicon Photonics Center*

The Council on Planning & Budget endorsed the proposal to establish the *Silicon Photonics Center*, noting that there were no stated requests for additional resources and staff would be paid through grants and space already in hand.

Council also noted its surprise that all of the faculty members associated with the proposed center are from the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering. Council
wondered if there might be room for involvement or collaboration from faculty in other departments on campus, such as Chemical Engineering or Physics.

WASC Reaccreditation Proposal

Council participated in two rounds of review related to UCSB’s proposal for reaccreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

CPB first reviewed the proposed themes for WASC reaccreditation in October. Council feels the rationale behind the four themes (research, sustainability, internationalization, and assessment) seemed reasonably appropriate. All four themes spotlighted a need to organize the opportunities, resources and responsibilities in these various areas and most point out the need for some sort of umbrella agency to accomplish that. CPB was concerned about the current budget crisis and its implications for this process, and noted that given the current budget problems we may need to be careful about proposing unfunded mandates to departments with respect to any of the four themes.

Council supported the themes of undergraduate research, sustainability, and internationalization, with assessment serving as an overarching backdrop of the reaccreditation process. Council concurred with the suggestion in the cover memo to use assessment “not as a full-fledged theme but as a method for highlighting the measurement of student learning outcomes that is practiced within one or more of the other themes.”

CPB then reviewed the draft WASC institutional proposal in April, and had no objections to the revised themes or the proposal as written. Council particularly supported the theme of enhancing undergraduate education through research, noting that this is an area in which UCSB has much to highlight, while at the same time allowing an opportunity to set new goals for the future. CPB would also favored keeping the themes as broad as possible.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2008-09 term:

President Yudof’s Proposals on Furlough/ Salary Reduction Options

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in two rounds of review on proposals put forth by UC President Mark Yudof regarding salary reduction options (furloughs/ pay cuts).

CPB first reviewed the proposal to amend Regents Standing Order 100.4 in May. The proposal would not only expand the President’s authority to declare an emergency, but would allow for the implementation of furloughs and/or pay cuts during such a period of declared emergency. CPB conducted a thorough yet expedited review.
Council expressed a great number of concerns regarding its review of the amended Regents Standing Order, including the following:

- The rushed deadline for comment did not allow for thorough review
- The definition of “emergency” powers of the President versus an “extreme financial circumstance”
- Overly broad extension of power to the President
- The duration of a declared “emergency” and the process for restoring the non-emergency status were unclear
- The need for two separate and distinct Standing Orders: one for declared “emergencies” and another for implementation of furloughs/salary reductions
- The need for further research on state and federal fair employment practices
- The use of furloughs and/or salary reductions should be a last resort

CPB then reviewed a proposal by President Yudof containing three implementation options in June. It was also another “expedited” review, with a very quick turn-around time. Council noted that either of the options (salary cuts or furloughs) would threaten the core quality of the faculty and staff and should only be undertaken as an absolute last resort, only to be considered after all possible strategic cuts have been made. CPB was adamant that cuts should not apply to salaries on soft money (research grants or contracts). Of the options presented, CPB favored furloughs over pay cuts (Option II), believing it would be easier to reinstate full salary after the furlough period has ended. Council also felt that furloughs should be visible and taken on current work days with a corresponding reduction in work and services offered. CPB called for an analysis of the effect of the plans on retirement benefits. Council urged the Board of Regents to take actions to preserve retirement benefits.

Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan

The Council on Planning & Budget endorsed the proposal for the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan. However, CPB expressed its disappointment in the short turn-around time it was given to review this proposal. Furthermore, Council noted that the brief (4-page) document was not comprehensive and was lacking in clarity. Council encouraged more clarity in the document before it is made available publically.

BOARS Proposal on Non-Resident Enrollment

CPB reviewed the Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools’ (BOARS’) document proposing principles for non-resident enrollment. Council was in agreement regarding the need for a UC guiding policy on this issue. CPB concurred with several of the principles set forth in the memo, in particular principles 1 through 5. Council agreed that educational quality, diversity, and accessibility and affordability for California residents are all important goals, and decisions regarding non-resident enrollment should not be made to the detriment of these. Nonetheless, Council felt that revenue-generating opportunities of enrolling non-resident students should not be ignored, as they can provide wide-ranging benefits to the university, including its resident students.
Council strongly agreed that UCOP should continue to advocate for sufficient enrollment funding from the state, and to not allow the current funding gap to become an embedded assumption. CPB advocated raising the percentage of non-resident undergraduates at UCSB to approximately 10% – not only for the financial benefits, but for the overall health of the university.

Council did not agree with principles 6 and 7, regarding the use of student revenues. CPB argued that earmarking revenues from resident or non-resident students is not sound fiscal policy, and puts unnecessary constraints on the university’s ability to perform its mission.

UC Accountability Framework (Revisions)

The Chair of the Council of Planning and Budget reviewed President Yudof’s revised UC Accountability Framework; the short deadline made it impossible for the full Council to review the revisions. In his memo, the Chair stated that such a short turnaround time runs counter to the principle of shared governance and should only be exercised in exceptional cases. However, he was pleased to see that some of the recommendations of the Council had been followed; percentages of dollar amounts were being used instead of hard to gauge absolute dollar numbers for external support, and the data from the different campuses in a way that was fairer to the smaller campuses.

Other recommendations were not followed. The methodology behind the ratings was not sufficiently explained and data on the success rate of bringing high school graduates up to speed in science and engineering were not included.

EAP Business Plan

Council reviewed EAP’s proposed Business Plan and the accompanying proposed budget. The Council rejected the premises underlying the plan; nor did it think that the accounting practices of EAP expenses were transparent enough to make a sound judgment of the premises. Although the general thrust of the Business Plan would probably put EAP on a sounder financial basis in the future, the short implementation time-span and a couple of fundamental errors in funding appropriations threaten to undermined the academic mission of EAP if the plan were to be implemented unchanged. Council urged that three steps be taken so as to ensure that the academic mission of EAP is preserved and EAP will be placed in a position to respond to an increasing demand for participation of UC’s student body in international programs, both at the undergraduate and the graduate level:

1. The switching of General Funds and Student Fees with general funds going to the campuses and the Fees to the UOEAP office instead of the other way around, as is currently the case, should be implemented in five instead of three years.
2. The campuses should, with their increased (General) funds, cover the instructional cost of the foreign reciprocity students, including the cost of an increasing number of reciprocity students in the future.

3. The salaries of an increased number of EAP campus advisors, which in the past have been paid by UOEAP, should be covered by the campuses from their increased funds. In other words UCOP should mandate that the campuses pay the salaries of these advisors. “Return-to-aid” collected from fees of EAP students should also go to aid prospective EAP students that otherwise might not be able to afford EAP.

Report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the Report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate, of the UC Task Force on Planning for Doctoral & Professional Education. CPB noted that UC has an extensive history and experience in developing and awarding the Ph.D., and concurred that in keeping with California’s Master Plan for Higher Education it should continue to retain the sole authority to award this degree within California public higher education.

Regarding the second key recommendation (to review the granting of professional degrees on a title-by-title basis), Council felt that the University ought to take a strong stance in favor of retaining the authority to grant doctoral degrees for all fields of study, including professional titles. The University’s existing research infrastructure as well as experience in professional schools such as Medicine and Law demonstrates that UC should retain the sole authority to grant the new professional doctorates as well.

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 Chair served as UCSB representative on UCPB, regularly reported on UCPB business, and solicited comments from council members on pending UCPB issues. The Council Vice Chair also attended some UCPB meetings as an alternate.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning and Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2008-09 term, including the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning; Director of Capital Development; Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement; Associate Vice Chancellor for Development; Vice Chancellor for Research; the Deans of the College of Letters and Science; Dean of the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; Dean of the College of Creative Studies; and Dean of the College of Engineering.

The Council Chair and Vice Chair had regular (bi-monthly) consultations with EVC Gene Lucas. These meetings were an efficient way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

Budget Analysis

The Chancellor’s Committee on Budget Strategy resumed its work this year. Composition of the committee included University administrators as well as Academic Senate leadership, including the Chair of CPB.

Capital Planning

This was the first year that UC campuses have been asked to submit a 10-year Capital Plan. The intention was to give the campuses more flexibility in how they executed their Capital Plans, however more detailed and longer term plans were required with detailed justifications of the use of and the need for the buildings, based on careful academic analysis. Previously, the campus’s 5-year Capital Plan was reviewed by CPB every two years and updated with recent academic information and construction history. The 10-year plans are then submitted to the Board of Regents and once approved the campuses have more flexibility in executing the 10-year plan once sufficient funding has been secured.

Chair of the Academic Senate Joel Michaelsen and Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas were consulted on the procedure and subsequently Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas issued a call to all the academic divisions of UCSB to submit their Capital Plans for the 10-year period and these were received and reviewed by the Council. The Council then made recommendation based on the data provided by the deans of the various divisions, the history of the academic departments and construction history of existing buildings.
Prior to the CPB meeting where the 10-year Capital Plans were discussed, the chair of the Committee on Capital and Space Planning and CPB’s Chair met with Martie Levy, Director of Capital Development in the Office of Budget and Planning, and Michael Witherell, Vice Chancellor for Research, to discuss the financing of buildings by Garamendi funds. Garamendi funds are the overhead of the Federal Grants that will pay for the loans assumed by the Campus to construct the buildings. CPB’s concern was that first the overhead funds would not suffice and that the campus would reach its debt ceiling and not be able fund short term projects. The percentage of buildings funded by Garamendi funds is higher at UCSB than any other UC campus. CPB’s Committee on Capital and Space Planning concluded that the overhead funds generated by the research in the proposed building would suffice to finance the capital loans. In addition, new research generated in this building would help to raise the campus debt ceiling. Thus the financing of short term projects should not suffer. The Council agreed.

Some members of Council noted the great disparity in the details provided by the various Deans to support their 10 Year Capital Plans, and after discussion it was decided to delay a final report from Council until further discussion and more information could be gathered over the summer. However, under the pressure of time, recommendations from the Capital Space and Planning subcommittee were drafted over the summer by the CPB Chair with consultation from some committee members but not from the whole council. The recommendations were sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor in August.

**XI. Carry-Over Issues**

Since this was the first year that UC campuses have been asked to submit a 10-year Capital Plan, UCSB’s plan is still in process and is expected to go to the Regents in fall. Thus the 2008-2009 recommendations will need to be revisited by the Council. It also remains to be decided how often the Council should review the 10-year Capital Plans.