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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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 participated in the academic program review of five academic units.
- Council studied FTE plans from each department and college / division, met with the Deans about their unit’s FTE needs, and made recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor about new FTE allocations.
- Council reviewed several campus-specific proposals, including proposals to establish new centers and new degree programs.
- Council considered nine requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EOR).
- Council reviewed five proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) met for twenty-one regularly scheduled sessions (seven in fall, eight in winter, and nine in spring).

CPB’s agendas typically included the following items:
- Academic program reviews
- Review of campus issues (proposed centers, policies, procedures, reports, etc.)
- Review of systemwide issues (reports, proposals, etc.)
- Review of departmental and college / division FTE plans
- Consultations with Deans and other University administrators
- Exceptions to open recruitment (EORs)
- Endowed chair proposals

II. Academic Program Reviews

CPB participated in the academic program review of five academic units:

1. Department of Anthropology
2. Computer Engineering Program
3. Environmental Studies Program
4. Department of Film & Media Studies
5. Department of Sociology

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by its respective area subcommittee: Engineering (Computer Engineering); Humanities & Fine Arts (Film & Media Studies); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences (Anthropology and Environmental Studies); and Social Sciences (Sociology). As per the review procedures, in fall quarter CPB reviewed the departments’ data notebooks and submitted a list of suggested questions to the Program Review Panel (PRP), for consideration by the respective External Review Committee (ERC). In spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the ERC’s reports and department responses and provided further comments.

When asked to provide recommendations for the PRP reviews for 2013-14, Council reiterated its concern that several programs have not been reviewed for 10 or more years. CPB noted that the Academic Review Procedures, as established by the Program Review Panel, call for reviews to occur on a “cycle of approximately eight years”. Over the past few years, it appears that this cycle has lengthened, and there are now some units that have not been reviewed for 12 years, or even longer. CPB strongly urged that the pace of reviews be increased to allow the 8 year cycle to be realized.

CPB recommended the following units for review (in priority order):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Materials (graduate program)</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feminist Studies</td>
<td>2001-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bren School of Environmental Science &amp;</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marine Science (interdepartmental graduate</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower on CPB’s priority list were the Biomolecular Science & Engineering Program (interdepartmental graduate program) and the Department of Religious Studies.

Response: The Executive Vice Chancellor selected the following academic units for review for the 2013-14 cycle:
1. Bren
2. Feminist Studies
3. Materials
4. Classics*

*Religious Studies was initially chosen for review, but then was deferred until 2014-15 and replaced with Classics.

III. Exceptions to Open Recruitment

In accordance with UCSB’s Campus Policies and Procedures on Academic Personnel (section VII-1 of the “Red Binder”), departments may request an exception to open recruitment (EOR) for two reasons, in the absence of an approved FTE or an open search: 1) the hire or retention of a Senate faculty member involving 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 will make an extraordinary contribution to the campus’ goals of excellence and diversity.

CPB reviewed nine requests for exceptions to open recruitment (an additional request was received by Council, but then withdrawn before it was reviewed). Council opposed two of these requests (which were both later denied by the Executive Vice Chancellor) and offered a varying degree of support to the rest (which were all ultimately approved by the EVC).

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. The Committee on Development & Community Relations provided initial review of the proposals and drafted opinions for discussion by all of
CPB. Council submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel. CPB received and endorsed five endowed chair proposals:

1. Alec P. Alexander Chair in Economics, established through an endowment from a gift of $1 million from Emeritus Professor Walter Mead and his wife, Thelma.
2. Michael Douglas Endowed Chair for the Dean of Humanities & Fine Arts, from a gift of $500,000 with additional funding from the Chancellor.
3. Seoul Optodevice Chair in Solid State Lighting, using $500,000 from a gift of $2.5 million.
4. Evans Endowed Chair in Structural Materials, from an endowment of $500,000 with a generous gift from Dr. and Mrs. Mehrabian and matching memorial gifts and pledges.
5. Yzurdiaga Chair in Nanoscience, from an endowment of $500,000 with a generous gift from Pat and Joe Yzurdiaga.

For the Seoul Optodevice Chair, CPB expressed a concern regarding the narrowly-worded focus of the position, which stated “The incumbent should be renowned for previous work in the field of gallium nitride (GaN) materials and devices.” It was CPB’s opinion that this wording unnecessarily limited the scope of the appointment.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2011-12 academic year.

FTE Planning

CPB was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = full-time equivalent appointments). The EVC’s call for FTE plans was sent to the deans in November, and they were made available to CPB in spring quarter. The Council on Planning & Budget spent a great deal of time in winter and spring quarters consulting with Deans regarding their visions for their college / division. CPB reviewed the departmental and deans’ FTE plans from the divisions of the College of Letters & Science, the College of Creative Studies, the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, and the College of Engineering. (An FTE plan from the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management was not available during the review period.)

CPB was originally requested by the EVC to recommend a total of 15 FTEs for priority hiring. CPB was concerned about the slow hiring rate, and sent memos to the EVC in April and May expressing its concerns. The EVC responded to CPB’s recommendations and agreed to approve additional searches over a two-year period, modifying his request to CPB for a prioritized list of 40 FTE searches: 25 in the first year and an additional 15 FTEs for year two.
In its June recommendation to the EVC, CPB recommended a list of 26 recommendations for year 1 (25 plus an LSOE), and a list of 16 for year 2 (including 7 that would be opened only if a department’s year 1 search is successful).

**Engineering:**  
*Year 1 (4):* Materials; Computer Science / ECE; Mechanical Engineering; Chemical Engineering  
*Year 2 (4):* ECE; Materials*; ME* / Chemical Engineering*; Computer Science

**MLPS:**  
*Year 1 (8):* Geography; Environmental Studies; Marine Science Program; EEMB; Earth Science; Physics; Psychological & Brain Sciences; Mathematics  
*Year 2 (4):* Statistics & Applied Probability; Chemistry; Marine Science Program*; Physics*

**HFA:**  
*Year 1 (7):* English; Classics; Music; History of Art & Architecture; Theater & Dance; Religious Studies; East Asian Languages & Cultural Studies  
*Year 2 (4):* History; Philosophy; Film & Media Studies; English*

**Social Sciences:**  
*Year 1 (4):* Economics, Political Science; Black Studies; Communication  
*Year 2 (3):* Chicano & Chicana Studies; Communication*; Economics*

**Bren:**  
*Year 1 (1):* Environmental institutions

**Graduate School of Education:**  
*Year 1 (1):* Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology  
*Year 2 (1):* Education

**College of Creative Studies:**  
*Year 1 (1):* LSOE in Mathematics

*to be searched in year 2 if year 1 search is filled, otherwise held over

Response: The EVC sent the deans a list of approved FTE searches on June 26. Many – but not all – of CPB’s recommendations were followed. The approved FTEs for Social Sciences, Bren, and Creative Studies were identical to CPB’s list. CPB’s recommendation for two FTE for the Gevitz Graduate School of Education were approved, and then supplemented with an additional three FTEs.
Various changes were made to CPB’s list of recommendations for Engineering, MLPS, and HFA.

Proposed Masters Degree in Actuarial Science

In November, the Council on Planning & Budget reviewed two proposals from the Department of Statistics & Applied Probability which would allow the department to establish an M.S. degree for the purpose of creating a combined five-year bachelor’s / master’s program with the existing B.S. degree in Actuarial Science.

The Council addressed the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council with its comments, noting the plan was strong, well-justified, and useful for students. CPB had only one concern. In a time of budgetary constraints CPB wanted confirmation that the Department of Economics was committed to support the ECON 234 A/B sequence for fifth year students. CPB’s endorsement was conditional on this commitment.

Response: In consultation with the Executive Vice Chancellor, Chancellor Henry Yang sent his endorsement of the proposals in April. The M.S. Degree and a combined 5-Year B.S./M.S. Degree in Actuarial Science were approved at the April 26 meeting of the Faculty Legislature.

Proposed Centers

1) Confucius Institute at UCSB. CPB believed that it would present a real opportunity to provide Chinese language instruction and Chinese cultural awareness to UCSB students at almost no monetary cost. Nonetheless, there were a number of concerns that CPB felt must be addressed before offering an endorsement of the agreement. These concerns centered on the following: a clause allowing the application of both Chinese and U.S. law; the process and timescale for reviewing the center; the academic authority of UCSB for final approval of courses and content; and the maintaining of academic freedom.

Response: The proposal was widely reviewed and the Divisional response in March noted that many reviewing groups found the proposal to be an exciting initiative for the campus that would assist the EALCS Department in fulfilling a need for Chinese language instruction. At the same time, groups had areas of concern in several categories including curriculum in relation to academic freedom, leadership and governance structure, proposed budget, and the degree of influence on current policies and practices on campus.

2) Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Fluids. CPB endorsed the proposal without reservation. Council saw the center as a worthy and exciting intellectual enterprise. Although this appeared to be part of a retention package, the proposed center evidently had a broad base of faculty support. In order to ensure the long-term success of the center, raising the $500,000 endowment would clearly need to be a priority for the new Dean of Engineering.
Response: The Division offered an unqualified endorsement of the proposed center in November.

3) **Center for Nanomedicine.** CPB offered a qualified endorsement. The proposal was based upon a partnership with the Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute. CPB assumed that this would fall under the more general agreement that already exists between Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute and UCSB. The proposal included a plan to bring six new faculty to the Center during the first five years after its formation. Given the current scarcity of FTE allocations across the campus, CPB wanted to know more about the mechanisms envisioned to allocate and recruit these new faculty positions, and the role that SBMRI would play in this process.

Response: The Divisional response in April shared endorsements of the proposal from the Graduate Council and the faculty executive committees for Engineering, Education, and Creative Studies. CPB’s reservations were included, along with extensive concerns of the Council on Research & Instructional Resources.

**CNSI Review**

The Council on Planning & Budget discussed the review of UCSB’s California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI). CPB agreed that CNSI has been a success in terms of leveraging its initial investment into substantial research funding and activity. As a consequence of this report, Council believed that a reassessment of UCSB’s commitment to the institute would be reasonable. Hence, assuming that there were a request from the institute based upon specific unrealized goals and needs, CPB encouraged UCSB to review its level of support for the program. In addition, CPB noted the recognized value of the UCSB CNSI’s outreach and educational programs. CPB supported the recommendation to develop stronger channels of communication and collaboration between the UCSB and UCLA Institutes.

Response: The Divisional response – which included input from the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR) and the Graduate Council – was sent to Larry Pitts (Provost and Executive Vice-President) and Steven Beckwith (Vice-President Research and Graduate Studies) in March. It noted the many positive comments contained in the review summary regarding the accomplishments of the CNSI on both campuses, and it included CPB’s recommendation (shared by CRIR) to develop stronger channels of communication and collaboration.

**Dynamical Neuroscience**

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed a proposal from the Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences which would establish an interdepartmental graduate program in Dynamical Neuroscience. CPB’s comments were sent to the Graduate Council in May. The Council considered this a reasonable plan with minimal resource implications. CPB endorsed this proposal.
Earth Science Proposal

In January, the Council on Planning & Budget reviewed a proposal by the Department of Earth Science which sought to:

1. Discontinue the B.S. in Geophysics
2. Establish a Geophysics Emphasis within the B.S. in Earth Science
3. Establish a Geology Emphasis within the B.S. in Earth Science
4. Discontinue the Science Education Emphasis within the B.A. in Earth Science

Council agreed that the proposed actions will increase flexibility for students in the department. There did not appear to be any significant budget implications. CPB endorsed the proposal without reservation.

Response: In February the Undergraduate Council approved the latter three actions (establishment and discontinuation of emphases), effective fall 2012. During its meeting on April 26, the Faculty Legislature unanimously approved the discontinuation of the BS in Geophysics.

Financial Systems Report

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed documents related to the adoption of a new financial system at UCSB in winter quarter. CPB agreed the case for adoption of the People/Oracle system was well made and Council supported acquisition of that software. CPB’s concerns with the proposal were regarding the implementation phase of the project, but these concerns were alleviated by CPB’s understanding that there would be additional study of that part of the proposal via a committee that would have Peter Rupert, representing CPB, as co-Chair.

Although the final cost of the overall system clearly would depend on the decisions made vis-à-vis the implementation phase, CPB supported the decision to proceed with procuring the full $18 million line of credit from UCOP.

Response: The Divisional response was sent to Ron Cortez (Associate Vice-Chancellor) in February.

Five-Year Perspective

In February CPB reviewed the campus update of the Five-Year Perspective and had no comment.

Parking Proposal

In January, the Council on Planning & Budget reviewed a proposal from Parking Services which sought to raise parking permit rates. After reviewing the written materials provided and meeting with proponents of the proposal, CPB supported an increase of $1.50, but did not endorse the requested amount of $3.00.
Council was dissatisfied with the presentation of the proposal, which came in several documents and was very difficult to follow. Several of CPB’s questions remained unaddressed. However, based on budgetary data presented in the proposal, Council agreed that a budget increase of perhaps $150,000 was satisfactorily justified. Based on the information presented that a $1 increase in parking permit fees translated to a budget augmentation of approximately $100,000, then an increase of $1.50 appeared warranted.

Furthermore, CPB was uneasy about the nebulosity of the tiered-fee option. Council had numerous concerns about possible unintended consequences and was unconvinced that the proposal has been sufficiently considered.

**Response:** The Academic Senate’s Divisional response (which included input from the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards) was sent to Marc Fisher, Senior Associate Vice-Chancellor on February 29. The Senate supported a parking permit fee increase of $1.50 per month, based on projected cost increases through 2012-13. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services increased long-term and short-term parking rates effective July 1, 2012. Monthly permits for faculty and staff (“A” and “B” permits) increased from $36.00 to $37.50.

**Technology Management Proposals**

In May, the Council on Planning & Budget reviewed proposals in spring quarter to establish a graduate degree program for the Technology Management Program (TMP) and to establish it as an academic unit (“capital P” program). After considerable deliberation and consultation with EVC Gene Lucas, CPB offered a qualified endorsement of both proposals (graduate degree and academic unit program). This was based partly on CPB’s perception of the interest and enthusiastic participation of the students in the current (“small p”) program, and the fact that TMP would be a source of positive publicity and interaction with our surrounding community.

Nonetheless, the Council had several reservations. First, CPB was concerned with the costs of TMP to the campus and to the College of Engineering (COE) if the “optimistic” budgetary plan were not achieved. It was assumed that the initial budgetary deficit of $1M would transition to a break-even position by the third year of operation. An even bigger issue was the propriety of allocating FTE to a new program when there are such severe needs for FTE in the existing departments of COE (several of which are top 10 or better departments according to the ERC report). Therefore, CPB recommended that the allocation of any additional FTE (and/or the approval of any FTE searches) for this program should be conditional on the final approval of the academic unit, and should be done in light of competing needs elsewhere in COE (as well as elsewhere on campus). Finally, CPB also expressed concern that recruitment and retention of top faculty may be difficult, given high salaries in the field and the fact that UCSB does not have a business school.
Response: The Graduate Council’s (June) response was supportive of the proposal, but it included several significant reservations from the other Senate reviewing agencies. GC asked for a second opportunity to review the proposal after it is revised, before it is reviewed at higher levels (i.e., Faculty Legislature, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the Office of the President).

West Campus Point Leak Remediation Proposal

In winter quarter, the Council on Planning & Budget reviewed a proposal for leak remediation in the West Campus Point faculty housing project. CPB offered its opinion after much deliberation and after meeting with Marc Fisher (Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Management), Todd Lee (Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning), and two officers of the West Campus Point Homeowners’ Association Board: Harold Marcuse (History professor) and Gail Humphreys.

CPB did not support any of the options offered in the document. CPB had significant reservations about the plan vis-à-vis its financial viability and the principle of who should pay. CPB was disappointed by the lack of a “Business Case Analysis”, which it understood was required by the Board of Regents. Therefore, Council strongly urged that further consultation occur with CPB after the Business Case Analysis is completed and after any new proposal is developed.

CPB strongly recommended that a new proposal be developed, and suggested a set of principles that it believed should underlie any subsequent proposal. Council also provided an appendix, which offered some additional ideas in developing an alternative plan.

Response: The Academic Senate’s Divisional response included input from the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards. Extensive comments were sent to Marc Fisher, Senior Associate Vice-Chancellor, Administrative Services on April 3. The Senate was unable to endorse the proposal as presented, citing two primary concerns: the financial viability of the plan and the inherent unfairness of passing costs to future homeowners. The Divisional response commented on the Senate’s difficulty with the review, noting that the situation “is deeply troubling with no easy or good solution.” The Senate was promised that the settlement would be documented in writing and a copy would be provided to the Academic Senate; as of the writing of this report, the administration’s response has not been received.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2011-12 term:

APM 668

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed a proposal for a revision to the Academic Personnel Manual – APM 668 (negotiated salary program). The intent of the proposed
policy was to increase the compensation of certain UC faculty who have grants, endowment or other funds, thus making them less likely to seek outside offers, and preventing certain science faculty from moving all or part of their FTE to a professional school on their own campus, or at another UC campus to augment their salaries.

CPB opposed the proposal. In its discussions, CPB raised a number of serious reservations:

- The proposal circumvents the current merit system in a variety of ways.
- There are potential unintended consequences that suggest that the revised policy has not really been thought through from a big-picture, systemic point of view.
- By creating incentives for faculty to pursue private donations and external funding, it could distract them from the core of their scholarly work and reward them for non-academic pursuits.
- There will likely be pressure on Deans and Department Chairs to provide the funding to allow and/or maintain a salary supplement for many faculty from institutional gift funds and other non-state sources. In the end, it is likely that many faculty would receive supplemental income, all of which would be outside the purview of the faculty merit and promotions system.

CPB urged that every effort should be made to re-establish realistic and competitive salaries, but it did not support this “ad hoc” way of trying to cope with current deficiencies with our salary scales.

Response: The UCSB Divisional response – which included broad input from Senate review and beyond – was sent to systemwide Academic Senate in December. All of the reviewing groups had deep concerns about the impacts of the proposal and were unanimously opposed to its implementation, as proposed.

Faculty Diversity Report

Council members spent considerable time reviewing the (April 2012) report and recommendations of the Faculty Diversity Working Group. Council noted that the working group’s recommendations are far reaching and potentially consequential at the levels of individual faculty members, departments, divisions, campuses and divisional Senates. Council agreed that Practice 1 (APM 210 approved by faculty) must be implemented. CPB made specific comments about several of the proposed practices. In particular, Council strongly supported increased funding for the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, which it felt would directly help meet the goal of increasing faculty diversity.

Response: UCSB’s Divisional comments – which included review by the Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE), the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), and the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA) – were sent to the systemwide Academic Senate on June 19. Some of the recommendations in the report were endorsed by all groups and other recommendations drew a mixed response. The President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program was strongly
supported on the campus and most groups recommended increasing the funding for this program, especially given the funding reductions over the past few years.

Faculty Salaries Task Force Report

In April, the Council on Planning & Budget studied the Faculty Salaries Task Force Report and Recommendations for action over the next several years to begin to improve faculty salaries. CPB also sought input by telephone from Robert Powell, who was a member of the task force and also was the systemwide Senate vice chair. Council’s recommendations were as follows:

1) CPB strongly supported any action to begin to improve the faculty salary levels, but insisted that this not be done as an unfunded mandate from systemwide to the campuses. Any new action to increase salaries must be based upon new money to the campus via increased state funding, or a combination of increased state funding and tuition increases.

2) CPB strongly supported Step 1, with some qualifications, namely the increase each year in the ladder to the median of systemwide salaries at each rank and step (though presumably smoothed).

3) CPB also supported Step 2, namely the Irvine plan, to make the minimum salary at a given step on our campus equal to the median of all faculty at that step on our campus.

Response: The Divisional response (dated April 18) included comments from three additional Senate groups: Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), and the Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE). The Academic Senate agreed that “the salaries of campus faculty are significantly below the Comparison Eight and this problem will continue to have serious consequences for the entire institution. It is an untenable situation that needs immediate attention.” The UCSB Division concurred with the statement made by CPB: “We strongly support any action to begin to improve the faculty salary levels, but insist that this not be done as an unfunded mandate from systemwide to the campuses. Any new action to increase salaries must be based upon new money to the campus via increased state funding, or a combination of increased state funding and tuition increases.”

Review UC Observatories

In March, the Council on Planning & Budget has discussed the systemwide review of the UC Observatories (UCO). In the process CPB consulted the external review committee report, the memo from the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), a letter from the UCSB astronomy and astrophysics faculty, and a letter from the UCO Director that criticized the UCORP memorandum.

CPB applauded the critical role played by UCO and the associated observatories (Keck and Lick) in the development of a broad systemwide, internationally respected research presence in astronomy and astrophysics. Though CPB had reservations about various
aspects of the UCO, the Council accepted the statement from UCSB faculty that the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) review process could be derailed at NSF if there were any indication that UC was not going to fully participate, and CPB was extremely reticent to see any actions taken that could have that consequence.

On the other hand, UC participation in the TMT project via UCO apparently commits us to long-term and significant expenditures, and CPB strongly regretted the fact that this review process was occurring in a time-frame that did not allow this commitment to be fully vetted from the overall UC perspective.

CPB expressed difficulties in balancing the apparent need for rapid endorsement of the UC participation in TMT with the need for a broader assessment and evaluation of all systemwide programs including UCO. However, given the time frame, it seemed to CPB inevitable that the commitment to TMT (and thereby to at least some aspects of UCO) must move forward without the benefit of such an internal UC-based review process. The Council reluctantly supported that action, but with condemnation of UCOP primarily for allowing the process to get to a point without such review.

Response: The UCSB Divisional comments – primarily citing opinions by CPB and the Council on Research & Instructional Resources – were sent in March to the systemwide Academic Senate. The Division acknowledged that the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) is a top priority for the UC astronomy and astrophysics community, as evidenced by the UC-Astronomy Task Force review. It also recognized that the TMT review process is in a critical stage and was wary of derailing it. Nonetheless, it supported an examination of the structure, budgeting, and management of UCO in order to strengthen the organization for the future.

VII. Committees

The Council’s has three standing committees:
- Committee on Academic Planning & Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
- Committee on Development & Community Relations
- Committee on Capital & Space Planning

Committee business was conducted 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.

The principal issues under review by CPB were spearheaded by CAPRA. These included systemwide reports and reviews, as well as many of the local issues under review. The Committee on Development & Community Relations conducted a preliminary review of endowed chair proposals.

The Council also continued a tradition of four ad hoc “area subcommittees”, based on colleges and divisions:
- Social Sciences and Education
- MLPS and Bren
The area subcommittees primarily were tasked with conducting preliminary reviews of the academic program reviews. In addition, EOR requests were first sent to the respective area subcommittee for initial consideration and a recommendation to the full Council.

VIII. Council Representation

The Council Chair served as a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and as Vice Chair of the Campus Planning Committee. Both the CPB chair and the chair of the Committee on Development & Community Relations served as Trustees of the UCSB Foundation. A representative of the Committee on Capital & Space Planning was also invited to attend meetings of the Campus Planning Committee.

IX. CPB Relationship with University Committee on Planning & Budget (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. It was noted by the outgoing Chair that the campus policy of having the CPB Chair serve as the UCPB representative puts UCSB at somewhat of a disadvantage given that most CPB chairs serve for only one year. Representatives from other campuses to UCPB often serve for a number of years, and their familiarity with the issues and people that UCPB consults makes it difficult for the UCSB representative to play a major role at UCPB.

X. Coordination with the Administration

The Council on Planning and Budget consulted with several members of the Administration during the 2011-12 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 held 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 Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy continued its work this year. Composition of the committee included University administrators as well as Academic Senate leadership, including the Chair of CPB.
Capital Planning

Because of the state budget crisis, no new funding for capital projects had been allocated.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:

- Budget challenges and continued reductions in state funding, including mid-year cuts and corresponding increases in tuition
- Budget allocation formulas for state funding (re-benching)
- Online instruction
- Faculty compensation (including supplementing with external funding) and salary equity
- Non-resident enrollment

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gary Leal (CPB Chair / UCPB rep)</th>
<th>Chemical Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irwin J. Appel</td>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Begley</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blascovich</td>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodo Bookhagen</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cline</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Foran (CPB Vice Chair)</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joao Hespanha</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Kaplan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Kendall</td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Davies King</td>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Martin</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Millett</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Douglas Moore</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Rupert</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Stohl</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Warner</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volker Welter</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison E. Weber (Associated Students Rep)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>