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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 sixteen requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EOR) and six requests for FTE transfers.
- Council reviewed three 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 Art
2. Department of Asian American Studies
3. Department of Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology (CCSP)
4. College of Creative Studies
5. Department of Earth Science

In addition, CPB continued its review of Computer Engineering (beginning with the ERC report and program response) and considered a progress report from Spanish & Portuguese (in follow-up to its review in 2006).

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Engineering (Computer Engineering); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Art and Spanish & Portuguese); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences (Earth Science); and Social Sciences / Education (Asian American Studies and CCSP). 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 winter quarter, the CPB chair (or designate) attended a luncheon with the External Review Committee. In spring quarter, CPB reviewed each of the ERC reports and department responses and provided further comments.

When asked to provide recommendations for the PRP reviews for 2014-15, 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. Biomolecular Science &amp; Engineering (BMSE)</td>
<td>1996-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious Studies</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Theater &amp; Dance</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Black Studies</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: As of this writing, the Executive Vice Chancellor has not yet announced the academic units for review for the 2014-15 cycle.

III. Exceptions to Open Recruitment and FTE Transfers

1. 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 sixteen requests for exceptions to open recruitment. Council endorsed all of these requests, including a qualified endorsement of one of them.

Response: The Executive Vice Chancellor approved all sixteen of the requests.

2. The Council on Planning & Budget endorsed six departmental requests for permanent FTE transfers (or partial FTE transfers):
   a. Request for the transfer of 17% FTE from ECE to the Technology Management Program.
   b. Request for the permanent transfer of an FTE from Mechanical Engineering to the Technology Management Program.
   c. Request for the permanent transfer of an FTE from Communication to the Technology Management Program.
   d. Request for the permanent transfer of an FTE from Feminist Studies to Anthropology.
   e. Two requests for the transfer of 1/3 FTE (for two separate positions) from the Department of Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology (MCDB) to the Biomolecular Science & Engineering Program (BMSE).

Response: The Executive Vice Chancellor ultimately approved all of the requests.

CPB notes that there has been a striking rise in the number of EOR’s recommended by Departments and Deans and approved by CPB (with one qualification) and by the EVC: a total of 16 for the 2012-2013 academic year. By contrast CPB recommendations for new FTEs for all departments and divisions for the 2013-2014 recruitment season totals 32. While we never had a focused discussion about the role of EORs, various potentially
negative effects were noted, among them, a) a decrease in the number of open searches (where departments are able to assess and develop their understanding of advanced research through the search process); b) this hiring, while “opportunistic,” inevitably rewards those departments who are most energetic in exploring EOR opportunities (the EOR mechanism for hiring was never meant to be replace open searches); and finally, c) a large number of EORs foreshortens the shared governance that CPB’s role in FTE planning and allocation is intended to promote. It might therefore be useful for Council to discuss the EOR process next year, with input from Deans, the EVC, and other relevant parties.

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 reviewed and endorsed three endowed chair proposals:

1. Marvin V. Clarke Chair in Theoretical Physics: would utilize the current Chancellor’s Research Fellow Endowment (current fair market value of $1.06 million) to establish a new endowed chair position.

2. Robert and Patricia Duggan Chair in Organic Chemistry: would rename the current chair (Duggan Chair I in Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences) and establish a new endowed chair (the Robert and Patricia Duggan Chair II in the Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences). The new chair would use $625,000 of the existing endowment of $1.5 million.

3. Herb Kroemer Endowed Chair in Materials Science: established through an endowment of $500,000 from Dr. and Mrs. Mehrabian and an anonymous donor to honor a distinguished member of the UCSB faculty

CPB was also asked to comment on the Mellichamp Chair (Academic Initiative III) cluster, but the proposal was ultimately withdrawn and postponed.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2012-13 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. The FTE plan from the Division of Social Sciences was not received until the middle of May, well after the review process had begun. An FTE plan from the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management was
CPB was originally requested by the EVC to recommend a total of 30 FTEs for priority hiring. Given CPB’s concern about the slow hiring rate, the Council ultimately recommended additional searches over a two-year period: 14 in the first year (2013-14) and 21 in the second year (2014-15). The recommendations were ranked by department within each college/division.

**Engineering:**
- **2013-14 (3):** ECE; Mechanical Engineering; ECE / Computer Engineering
- **2014-15 (4):** Materials; Mechanical Engineering; Chemical Engineering / Materials; Computer Science

**MLPS:**
- **2013-14 (4):** Physics; Earth Science; Geography; Quantitative Biology (Q Bio)
- **2014-15 (6):** Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science (IGPMS); EEMB; Environmental Studies; Psychological & Brain Science; MCDB; Dean’s discretionary FTE

**HFA:**
- **2013-14 (4):** Linguistics; History; Classics; Film & Media Studies
- **2014-15 (6):** History of Art & Architecture; Religious Studies; Music; Theater & Dance; Spanish & Portuguese; History

**Social Sciences:**
- **2013-14 (2):** Anthropology; Sociology
- **2014-15 (4):** Economics; Communication; Political Science; Feminist Studies

**Bren:**
- No recommendations

**Graduate School of Education:**
- **2013-14 (1):** Education
- **2014-15 (1):** Education

**College of Creative Studies:**
- No recommendations

**Response:** The EVC sent the deans a list of approved FTE searches on June 26, which aligned very closely with CPB’s recommendations, for which we are grateful.

**Active Service, Modified Duties**

In May, CPB considered a request to review the UCSB policy on Active Service – Modified Duties (*UCSB Campus Policies and Procedures for Academic Personnel*, “Red Binder” section VI-5). CPB noted its support for family-friendly policies that address the needs of all University employees. Nonetheless, CPB agreed with the policy as written,
and did not see the need to revise it. Council favored a broad and flexible policy and believed that it was unnecessary and would be inefficient to spell out all possible family circumstances to be addressed.

Response: The policy was also reviewed by the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards and the Committee on Diversity & Equity. As of this writing, no Divisional response is available.

Proposed Centers

1. **Center for Nanomedicine.**

CPB reviewed a revised proposal to establish a Center for Nanomedicine at UCSB in May. The initial proposal was reviewed by CPB last year (memo of March 8, 2012), at which time CPB declined to endorse the proposal. CPB was somewhat surprised to find that its understanding of two criteria—funding sources and distinctness of focus—had become *less clear rather than more clear* since it first considered the proposal. There were three issues of concern to the Council: 1) the dropping of the Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute as a collaborator (and funding source); 2) the eliminating of 6 FTE; and 3) the resubmission of outdated letters of support.

In order to proceed with the proposal, CPB recommended that the Center’s proponents renew and update discussions among primary stakeholders: the primary members of the proposed Center, relevant Deans, and those writing supporting letters.

Response: Several groups reviewed the second version of the proposal for the Center for Nanomedicine, including: Council on Research & Instructional resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees (FEC) for Letters & Science, Engineering, Bren, Education and Creative Studies. CRIR discussed information regarding the Center’s connection to Sanford-Burnham, but endorsed the proposal. The Graduate Council and the Education FEC continued to endorse the proposal. The College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) was overall supportive of the proposed Center, but offered several constructive comments.

2. **Digital Games Research Center.**

Also in May, CPB reviewed a proposal to establish a Digital Games Research Center. CPB noted that the primary resource issue was with regard to space, and this issue had already been addressed with the identification of an existing space (previously occupied by the Health Games Research program). CPB endorsed the proposal without reservation.

Response: The Division’s response included input from the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR) and Graduate Council (GC). There was a unanimous endorsement of the proposed Center.
Course Scheduling Policy

In December, CPB reviewed a proposed campus policy on course scheduling. Under this new policy, departments would be forced to schedule a certain percentage of their classes during non-prime hours. Council acknowledged that this policy is an attempt to address a very difficult and logistically complex problem. Although the current system is flawed, with faculty and students unable to teach and take classes at their preferred times, CPB felt the intent and direction of the course scheduling policy is sound.

Council endorsed the proposal, with the suggestion that implementation be monitored to document the campus’s severe need for classroom space. In light of the campus’s shortage of available classroom space, CPB also recommended the consideration of a new classroom building, especially to accommodate large- and medium-sized classes.

Response: Several groups reviewed the proposed policy, including: Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees from L&S, COE, and CCS. All groups acknowledge that the proposed policy addressed a significant problem on campus in terms of course scheduling and available room space and, with the exception of the CCS FEC, all groups supported its full implementation.

Earth Science Proposals

In November, CPB reviewed proposals from the Department of Earth Science to change the name of its M.S. and Ph.D. degrees and to discontinue the M.S. in Geophysics. CPB supported both of these proposals.

Council noted a prior review by agencies within the Academic Senate and from relevant departments regarding the name change for the department itself. Therefore, there seemed to be little reason to expect other agencies or departments within UCSB to raise concerns about this alignment of degree with department name. Similarly, the request to eliminate a separate M.S. degree in Geophysics in light of requirements that are identical for their M.S. degree in Earth Science seemed likewise innocuous, consistent with their department's reconceptualization, and more efficient with department and University resources.

Response: After receiving input from various campus agencies (Graduate Dean, Letters & Science FEC, and the Undergraduate Council), the Graduate Council submitted proposals at the January 31st Faculty Legislature meeting to approve the proposed name change for the M.S. and Ph.D. in Geological Sciences and to approve the proposed discontinuation of the M.S. in Geophysics. Both motions passed unanimously.

Joint Doctoral Program in Geography

In March, CPB reviewed the Report of the External Review Committee of the Joint Doctoral Program (JDP) in Geography and the joint response by the Departments of Geography at San Diego State University and UCSB. CPB endorsed the report and the suggested responses and encouraged the departments to follow through on their jointly produced action items, most of which required faculty time commitments rather than campus resource commitments.
With respect to new resource needs, CPB also noted the stated intent to request a new FTE in Human Geography. CPB stated that it would review that request in the context of the forthcoming FTE plans from the department and Dean of Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences.

**Response:** Following reviewing agency comments (including CPB’s) the Ad Hoc Review Committee issued a report with its findings. Per the review procedures, Graduate Councils (GC) at each institution reviewed the Ad Hoc Review Committee’s report and made a recommendation with respect to program renewal. At its meeting of May 6, UCSB’s GC voted unanimously to recommend that the program be renewed for the full seven years.

**Global & International Studies Proposed PhD Program**

In February, CPB reviewed a proposal by the Global & International Studies Program to create a Program of Graduate Studies in Global Studies for a PhD degree. Council offered its tepid support of the proposal while raising several issues that should be taken into consideration. CPB’s primary concern was with regard to the need for continuous coordination between the Program and the different departments on campus. Council recommended formalizing such coordination through an executive committee (or a similar inter-departmental committee) of faculty across departments that could assess and plan for resources, as needed. Furthermore, CPB raised questions related to the following: funding for Teaching Assistants; succession planning in light of anticipated retirements; funding for staff FTE; and support for visitors and PhD students.

Then in May, CPB reviewed a re-submitted proposal and response by the Global & International Studies Program. CPB acknowledged the response provided to its concerns and repeated its support the proposal. Nonetheless, CPB argued that its successful implementation would depend upon fully addressing issues related to curriculum implementation, succession planning, and resources that were not fully answered in the program’s reply.

**Response:** The proposal for a new PhD in Global Studies was approved by the Graduate Council and endorsed by the Chancellor during the spring quarter. The proposal will go before the Faculty Legislature for final campus approval in October 2013. If approved, the proposal will then be transmitted to the Office of the President, for review by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the Provost & Executive Vice President, and the University President.

**Speech & Hearing Program**

In February, CPB reviewed the proposal for the discontinuation of the undergraduate and graduate degrees in Speech & Hearing Sciences, and the disestablishment of the Department of Speech & Hearing, submitted by Dean Wiltzius. Council noted that:

a) the graduate and undergraduate programs suspended admissions in the early 1990s;
b) the three members of the department voted unanimously for the proposal;
c) two of the three remaining members of the department will retire in June 2014; and
d) Professor Roger Ingham has given his consent to transfer to another department.

Therefore, once Professor Ingham’s transfer to another department is finalized, there will be no resource or planning concerns that should delay concurrence with the proposal.

Response: At the May 30th meeting of the Faculty Legislature, proposals to disestablish the Department of Speech & Hearing Sciences and discontinue its degrees were approved.

Student-Initiated Democratic Education (SIDE) Program Proposal

In February, CPB reviewed the Student-Initiated Democratic Education (SIDE) program proposal. While the Council had various substantive perspectives on the merit of the proposed program, comments were restricted to those aspects of the proposal which fall directly under the purview of CPB. CPB’s main concerns fell into two categories. The first is the use of space, particularly small classrooms which are normally under the purview of departments. The second major concern was the use of faculty time. The success of this program would rely to a large degree on the uncompensated role of faculty. Although this mentoring may be considered university service, it should not detract from other duties, or count towards teaching credit.

CPB also reviewed a 2007 report from UCLA on their experience with a similar program. Council noted that an essential element of the program was the requirement that students offering the SIDE courses take a formal course on pedagogy. We note that this would require buying out a course for a faculty member who was willing to offer said course, probably from the School of Education.

CPB opined that should the pilot program be adopted, it should be implemented on a smaller scale than proposed. There should also be explicitly articulated goals and metrics with which to evaluate the pilot program.

Response: The proposal received wide review by the Faculty Executive Committees and several groups in the Academic Senate, including: Undergraduate Council (UgC), Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), Committee on International Education, and Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE). Some reviewing agencies (UgC, L&S FEC and the CDE) were unequivocal and felt they could not support the proposal. Overall reactions indicated support for the idea in principle, yet the UCSB Senate, as a whole, was unable to support the proposal as presented.

Technology Management Program Proposals

In November, CPB reviewed the proposals for the establishment of the Technology Management Program and the master’s degree in TMP. After much discussion, and consultation with Executive Vice Chancellor Gene Lucas and the Dean of the College of Engineering, Rod Alferness, CPB endorsed both proposals.

In CPB’s estimate, the TMP would thrive best if it is fully integrated into the structure and planning of the College of Engineering, with full buy-in from its departments and an
integrated FTE plan that takes account of TMP by both the departments and the Dean. Because the TMP program represents a new kind of program for UCSB and the College of Engineering, and because it carries curricular and budgetary risks as well as opportunities, CPB recommended careful and continuous monitoring and evaluation of the program.

Response: The proposal for a new academic unit, the Technology Management Program, was approved by the Chancellor earlier this year. The proposal for a new professional Master’s program, the Master of Technology Management (MTM) was approved for implementation by President Yudof in May. The campus is in the process of requesting approval to establish Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for this program, which will need to be approved by The Regents.

UCSB Water Action Plan

In February, CPB reviewed the Water Action Plan, which was drafted by a group of graduate students in the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management. The report provided a comprehensive assessment of water resource issues at UCSB, with a historical perspective on water demand and supply, as well as a detailed analysis of the current situation. CPB noted that UCSB had already achieved the 20% by 2020 reduction goal set by the University of California, Office of the President (UCOP) from the baseline to the benchmark time periods, as defined in the report. The proposed goal is to achieve another 20% reduction in 15 years, maintaining a lead over peer institutions while saving money.

Council provided specific comments and posed several questions regarding the budgetary implications of the report’s recommendations. However, CPB withheld its endorsement or definitive opinion on the report.

Response: CPB was the only Senate body to review the report, and CPB’s comments were forwarded in their entirety to Bruce Tiffney and Ron Cortez, co-chairs of the Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee.

WASC Documents

In spring quarter, CPB was given the opportunity to comment on two documents related to UCSB’s reaccreditation from the Western Association of Colleges & Schools (WASC): the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) and Program Review Essay. Council declined to opine on either report.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2012-13 term:

Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM)

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed several proposals for revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM):

1. APM 015: Faculty Code of Conduct
2. APM 241: Appointment of directors of Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs)
3. APM 430: Visitors & Visiting Scholars
4. APM 600: Salary Administration

1. APM 015: Faculty Code of Conduct.
   In January, CPB reviewed a proposed change to APM 015 which would add a sentence to Part I of the code. Although this is the continuation of a systemwide review which was begun last spring, CPB did not review this issue on the first round. While this revision may be outside of CPB’s budget and planning purview, CPB had no objections to the proposed addition to the APM.

   Response: This revision to APM 015 received broad review by most Senate groups and the Faculty Executive Committees. With the exception of two groups, all groups either concurred with, or had no objections to, the proposed revisions to APM 015.

2. APM 241: Appointment of directors of Multi-campus Research Units (MRUs)
   CPB reviewed a proposed revision to APM 241 (Faculty Administrators, less than 100%), dealing with the appointment of directors of Multicampus Research Units (MRUs). CPB found this to be a rather straightforward revision in the APM which changes the authority to appoint Multicampus Research Unit directors from the Chancellor of the host campus to the UC President. The changes were also an attempt to bring APM 241 into conformance with Regents policy and with the Compendium. CPB had no objections.

   Response: UCSB had several groups review the proposed revision to APM 241. All groups were either in support of the proposed revisions or had no comment on them.

3. APM 430: Visitors & Visiting Scholars.
   In November, CPB reviewed a proposed addition to the Academic Personnel Manual; APM 430 would create a new classification for “Visiting Scholars”. Council noted that “visiting scholars” are often invited by faculty to visit campus for short periods of time to collaborate on research or as part of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with a foreign university. It is important that these visitors have a clearly-defined appointment and that their rights are delineated. There did not appear to be any significant fiscal impact, and CPB noted that the proposed policy requires that visiting scholars be self-supported and that they would be ineligible for compensation from the University. CPB had no objections to the proposed policy. When the proposal was distributed for final review in March, CPB had no additional comments.

   Response: The proposal for APM 430 was reviewed widely by several groups at the Santa Barbara Division. The campus review produced a mixed response on its first round in November, with several groups commenting that they were supportive of the concept and of the language as proposed, while other groups stated they were generally supportive of the concept and the proposed language, but offered hesitations about the new section. For the final review, several groups had no further comment or declined to opine. The Council on Faculty Issues & Awards reiterated its reservations and concerns while the Graduate Council continued to object to the proposal.
4. **APM 600: Salary Administration.**

   In April, CPB reviewed a proposed revision to the Academic Personnel Manual: APM Section IV, Salary Administration (APM - 600 Series). CPB was not clear about what prompted these revisions; they seemed to be a response to specific issues that may have arisen, but were not detailed. CPB had no objection to the changes at the level of detail provided.

   **Response:** The proposed revisions to the APM 600 series were widely reviewed by the Santa Barbara Division. All groups had no objection or no comment on the proposed revisions, with the exception of the Education Faculty Executive Committee which indicated support for the recommended changes.

**Financial Aid Funding Proposals**

   In March, CPB reviewed the documents describing three final options for funding of undergraduate financial aid and supported Option A among the three options outlined in the proposal. First, CPB argued that options A and B would be preferable to option C (and the status quo) in that these options would align UC’s financial aid commitments to the Education Financial Model benchmark. This model would provide clear expectations on education borrowing costs and facilitate a cost-benefits analysis by students and their families.

   Regarding the choice between options A and B, the council strongly recommended Option A, as the alternative would result in an unacceptable increase in projected costs for low-income families, who should be the primary beneficiaries of UC’s financial aid policy.

   **Response:** The financial aid proposals were also reviewed by Undergraduate Council (UgC) and the Faculty Executive Committee for the College of Letters and Science (L&S FEC). Of the options discussed in the proposal, UgC agreed that Option A or B would be preferable to Option C. None of the groups recommended that Option C be deployed. Given the feedback presented from the reviewing groups, the Division recommended that either Option A or B be utilized.

**Negotiated Salaries Trial Program**

   In November, CPB reviewed the proposed Negotiated Salaries Trial Program. CPB reiterated its opposition to this program as well as its concerns that were previously expressed in a memo dated November 15, 2011 to Henning Bohn. In particular, CPB continued to be concerned that this program of salary enhancement may jeopardize the transparency of the current system of salaries and promotions, in addition to threatening the meritocracy of our CAP system. Given that a trial of the program is underway, Council offered a number of suggestions and comments about its implementation.

   **Response:** In addition to CPB, the Negotiated Salaries Trial Program was reviewed by the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). These same groups reviewed the Proposed APM 668 last year. The Santa Barbara Division continued not to support or endorse the Negotiated Salary Plan Pilot in spite of the proposed changes in the proposal.
Last year, the Division’s objections were to the fundamental principles in the proposed model, and those objections continue to stand.

Open Access Policy

CPB reviewed two versions of the proposed Open Access Policy, as put forth by the University Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). For the first round of review in December, CPB strongly endorsed this effort. Council believed that in the long run the new policy may have a beneficial effect in several areas that are of considerable long-term benefit to the university and the students and public it serves.

CPB agreed with the restrained or conservative side of the UC Senate’s approach. Recognizing that many faculty may wish to publish in the privately-controlled expensive journals where they have traditionally published, CPB endorsed the “opt out” provision embedded in these proposals for implementing an open access policy.

In June, CPB reviewed a revised version of the proposed policy on Open Access. Council reiterated its endorsement, noting that the revised proposal adequately addressed many of the concerns that were raised initially.

Response: The Santa Barbara Division conducted a broad review of the proposed Open Access Policy, including a full distribution to all Senate faculty on campus inviting them to comment. In August 2013 it was announced that the University had adopted the Open Access Policy, ensuring that future research articles authored by faculty at all 10 campuses of UC will be made available to the public at no charge. While reviewing groups recognized that there is a problem with regard to the current process and costs of publishing scholarly work, there was a significant split on the campus between reviewing groups who generally support the proposal and reviewing groups who did not support it. The Academic Council eventually adopted the policy on July 24. Articles will be available to the public without charge via eScholarship (UC’s open access repository) in tandem with their publication in scholarly journals.

Rebenching Budget Committee Report

In November, CPB reviewed the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. CPB noted that UCSB is at the bottom of the list vis-à-vis state funding per undergraduate student, as compared to other UC campuses. CPB enthusiastically endorsed the report and recommendations. CPB noted that the principle of equal treatment of campuses for state of California’s per-student support is so widely accepted that there can be little ground for disputing the recommended changes.


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
- HFA and Creative Studies
- Engineering

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. Finally, the subcommittees took the lead in developing the respective parts of the overall FTE plan for 2013-15, presenting recommendations for full Council discussion.

 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. The CPB chair along with a designate 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.

 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. Unfortunately, the Chair of CPB was not informed of this appointment until the very end of the academic year. This should be corrected in the coming year, as CPB representation on this Committee is crucial for effective shared governance to bear fruit on the university budget.

Capital Planning

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

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:
- Online instruction
- Faculty compensation (including supplementing with external funding) and salary equity
- Non-resident enrollment

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Foran</td>
<td>CPB Chair / UCPB rep</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin Appel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Begley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Blascovich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodo Bookhagen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cline</td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gerber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joao Hespanha</td>
<td>CPB Vice Chair (winter)</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Keller</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Davies King</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Doug Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Film &amp; Media Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Pincus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials and Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambuj Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science, Biomolecular Science &amp; Engineering Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Skenazi</td>
<td></td>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Stohl</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Warner</td>
<td>CPB Vice Chair (fall &amp; spring)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin Rathe</td>
<td>GSA Rep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A final note from the Chair

The Chair of CPB wishes to thank the Vice-Chairs and all members of the Council for their diligent, collegial, and effective work this year on the wide range of issues we considered.

The Chair would also like to thank and commend EVC Gene Lucas for his commitment to shared governance and constructive and transparent engagement with the Council. This is one of the hallmarks of UCSB, and a feature not generally found to such a high degree elsewhere in the UC.