

**COUNCIL ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
ANNUAL REPORT: 2013-14**

SEPTEMBER 17, 2014

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 four 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 one request for an FTE transfer.
- Council reviewed two proposals to establish endowed chairs.

COUNCIL ON PLANNING & BUDGET (CPB)
ANNUAL REPORT: 2013-14

I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for twenty-three regularly scheduled sessions (seven in fall, seven 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
- Requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EORs)
- Endowed chair proposals

II. Academic Program Reviews

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

1. Bren School of Environmental Science & Management
2. Department of Classics
3. Department of Feminist Studies
4. Department of Materials

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB's respective area subcommittee: Engineering (Materials); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Classics); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Bren); and Social Sciences / Education (Feminist Studies). As per the review procedures, in fall quarter CPB reviewed the 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 2015-16, CPB reiterated its concern that several programs have not been reviewed for 10 or more years. As pointed out by CPB in previous years, the Academic Review Procedures, as established by the Program Review Panel, call for reviews to occur on a "cycle of approximately eight years". Given that almost 60 academic units fall under the purview of PRP, in CPB's estimate more than seven units per year would need to be evaluated in order to maintain this schedule. CPB noted that in 2012-13 and 2013-14 the Program Review Panel reviewed 4 programs each year; at the current rate, the average cycle will be more than 11 years.

CPB recommended that the Executive Vice Chancellor examine the resource needs and current review structure to investigate alternatives that would enable a return to an 8-year review cycle. Meeting the stated review schedule goal will require either additional resources, particularly in PRP staff and faculty for the PRP committee, or a smaller investment of resources per PRP review (a choice that the CPB did not favor).

CPB recommended the following units for review (in priority order) in 2015-16:

Program / Unit	Last Review
1. Global & International Studies Program	2004-05
2. Mechanical Engineering	2005-06
3. History of Art & Architecture	2005-06
4. Latin American & Iberian Studies	2005-06
5. Spanish & Portuguese	2005-06
6. Geography	2006-07
7. Physics	2006-07

Response: As of this writing, the Executive Vice Chancellor has announced four academic units for review for the 2015-16 cycle: Electrical & Computer Engineering; Political Science; History of Art & Architecture; and the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Marine Science.

III. Exceptions to Open Recruitment and FTE Transfers

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 fifteen requests for exceptions to open recruitment (EOR), one request for an FTE conversion (from a continuing lecturer), and one request for an interdepartmental FTE transfer (.4 FTE from Chicana & Chicano Studies to Feminist Studies). One of the EOR requests was withdrawn, and CPB endorsed 13 of the requests. CPB objected to the FTE conversion but endorsed the FTE departmental transfer.

Response: The Executive Vice Chancellor approved the 13 EOR requests that were endorsed by CPB, and the remaining one was denied. Following CPB's advice, the FTE conversion was also denied. As of this writing, a decision has not been announced regarding the FTE transfer.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB's *Policy on Endowed Chairs*, CPB was consulted on two endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the 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 and reviewed and endorsed two endowed chair proposals:

1. **Mellichamp Chairs – Cluster III:** A proposal to utilize a \$2 million gift from Duncan and Suzanne Mellichamp to create three endowed chairs in a particular academic program initiative area. The Council endorsed authorizing the search for these faculty FTEs. However, CPB expressed reservations about the process to identify areas for the Mellichamp clusters, specifically with regard to the allowed scope of proposals (e.g. the inclusion of additional university resources), the time permitted to develop such proposals, and selection criteria. CPB also withheld endorsement of a proposed *Center for Sustainable Materials & Product Design*.

Response: In April, the Interim Executive Vice Chancellor announced the authorization of three endowed chairs: *Sustainable Manufacturing* (Engineering); *Economics of Sustainable Technologies* (Bren); and *Green Chemistry* (MLPS).

2. **Wilcox Chair in BioMedicine:** Established through a release of \$500,000 from the Wilcox Family Fund which was originally established through a gift from Gary and Sue Wilcox. CPB agreed that the proposal met the criteria for creating a new endowed chair and supported the plan.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2013-14 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 three divisions of the College of Letters & Science; the College of Creative Studies; the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education; the College of Engineering; and the Bren School of Environmental Science & Management.

CPB was originally requested by the EVC to recommend a total of 30 FTEs to authorize for hiring: 15 for 2014-15 (in addition to the 22 FTE previously approved last year) and 15 for 2015-16. Given CPB’s concerns about the slow hiring rate, the Council ultimately recommended additional searches over a two-year period: 18 in the first year (2014-15) and 20 in the second year (2015-16). The recommendations were ranked by department within each college/division.

Engineering: **2014-15 (3):** Mellichamp Chair (Sustainable Manufacturing); ECE (Controls); and ECE *or* MATP (Sensor Networks / Physical Computing)
2015-16 (4): Dean’s discretionary (Materials / ECE / Mech. E); ECE / CE (Captstone) *LSOE*; Materials (Inorganic / Structural); and Chemical Engineering

- MLPS:** **2014-15 (5):** Mellichamp Chair (Green Chemistry); Physics (EOR); Quantitative Biology (Q Bio); Physics; and Geography (Human Geography)
- 2015-16 (5):** Mathematics (Geometry); Marine Science (Organic Geochemistry); Physics; Statistics (Statistics / Probability); and Earth Science (Geodynamics)
- HFA:** **2014-15 (4.5):** Linguistics (Sociocultural); Film & Media Studies (Digital Media); Philosophy (Meta & Epistemology); French & Italian; and English (Writing) *.5 FTE*
- 2015-16 (5):** History of Art & Architecture (Ancient World); Dean's discretionary FTE; Music (Voice); Spanish & Portuguese (Portuguese); and History (Modern Europe)
- Social Sciences:** **2014-15 (3):** Economics (Theory / Econometrics); Global Studies (Global Political Economy); and Black Studies (Social Sciences)
- 2015-16 (4):** Political Science (Identity); Chicana & Chicano Studies (Immigration); Sociology (Cultural Sociology); and Asian-American Studies (American Historian)
- Bren:** **2014-15 (1):** Mellichamp Chair (Economics of Sustainable Technologies)
- 2015-16 (1):** Conservation Biology
- Gevirtz Graduate School of Education:**
- 2014-15 (1):** Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology (Risk & Resilience)
- 2015-16 (1):** Education (Special Education) *LSOE*
- College of Creative Studies:** **2014-15 (.5):** Writing Studies
- 2015-16:** No recommendation

Note: During its FTE deliberations, CPB discussed the increasing difficulty of making faculty FTE recommendations in the absence of a campus-wide academic strategic plan. For the last several years, CPB's recommendations have generally reflected the status quo in terms of relative numbers of FTEs by college / division. Although CPB has been able to make marginal, tactical choices from year to year, the overall relative proportions of the FTE have remained constant by division. Without an overarching strategic plan, CPB did not feel it would be appropriate to make FTE recommendations that would significantly alter this balance. An academic strategic planning document will be necessary for the campus to address whether limited resources should be distributed in a different way moving forward.

Response: The Interim EVC sent the Deans a list of authorized FTE searches on July 23, which – with the exception of HFA – aligned closely with CPB’s recommendations. CPB was pleased that there were more FTEs approved than originally indicated: 25 new FTE searches for 2014-15 and 20 for 2015-16.

Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education

In June, CPB reviewed a proposal to create the position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education / Dean of Undergraduate Education. CPB endorsed this proposal as addressing an important need on campus. CPB believed that this proposal would better assure that UCSB administrative practices would be aligned appropriately to provide integrated leadership for undergraduate education. However, CPB raised a number of questions and made several comments about the proposal, including issues regarding the authority of the proposed AVC; the rationale for consolidation; budgetary resources; reporting relationships; and research opportunities for undergraduates.

Response: The proposal was reviewed broadly by the Academic Senate and Faculty Executive Committees. The Senate’s Divisional response was sent to the Interim EVC in July and included a number of wide-ranging thoughts and suggestions. Senate Councils and Committees felt, in general, that while a proposed reorganization within this administrative unit is welcome, the current plan would not achieve its intended goals of helping the university further enhance its undergraduate – and graduate – responsibilities.

Campus Centers

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed and commented on a number of administrative actions related to existing or proposed centers.

1. *California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI): External Review*

In November, CPB discussed the external review of the California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI). CPB recognized the many outstanding achievements of CNSI. However, as noted by the letter of Robert Power (May 16, 2013) a number of administrative features of the UCSB and UCLA collaboration could be strengthened. CPB endorsed the reviewers’ call for a more integrated, cooperative relationship between the two campuses. CPB was also concerned about the continuity of CNSI leadership on the UCSB campus. CNSI is not a traditional MRU, but given its unique initial funding and relatively modest continued state investment, CPB does not agree that opening up competition for research funds in the area of nanotechnology in the UC system would create greater benefits. CPB suggests that CNSI reach out to researchers within the UC System in collaborative efforts consistent with central UCOP funding.

Response: The Academic Senate’s Divisional response was sent in January, and it included comments by CPB and the Commission on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR).

2. *Center for Multi-Modal Big Data Science for Healthcare.*

In May, CPB reviewed a proposal to create a Center for Multi-Modal Big Data Science for Healthcare. CPB was unable to endorse the proposal, noting a number of questions and concerns about the following: the purpose and scope of the center; a lack of letters of support from participating institutions (Cottage Hospital, Pueblo Radiology, the Santa Barbara Cancer Research Center, etc.); the outcome and benefits of the center; the terms of potential collaborations; and the sources of the data and the measures taken to ensure its security.

Response: The following Senate groups reviewed the proposal: Council for Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees (FEC) in the College of Engineering and the College of Letters and Science. With the exception of CPB, all groups endorsed the proposed center.

3. *Center for Multiscale Modeling, Analysis, Simulation, & Software (MASS)*

CPB reviewed the proposal to create a Center for Multiscale Modeling, Analysis, Simulation, & Software (MASS) in March. CPB enthusiastically supported the proposal, making note of the following:

- a. The proposal involves a significant research area, well represented on campus, for which a center would promote multidisciplinary benefits.
- b. The Center also would enhance graduate training in these areas across multiple departments.
- c. Support for the Center would be drawn from current extramural grants.
- d. The proposal identifies enthusiastic support across departments with wide individual faculty support.

Response: Several Senate groups reviewed the proposal, including: Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Engineering, Letters & Science, and the College of Creative Studies. All groups endorsed the proposed Center, several with enthusiasm, noting that the Center will serve the campus in numerous ways.

4. *Center for Research in Financial Mathematics & Statistics*

In April, CPB reviewed a proposal to change the name of the Center for Research in Financial Mathematics & Statistics to the *Center for Financial Mathematics & Actuarial Research*. CPB had no objection to the change.

Response: The proposal was reviewed by: Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committee from Letters & Science. All groups endorsed the proposed name change.

5. *ISBER Centers: Transfer and Disestablishment*

In June, CPB reviewed requests for administrative actions on three centers within the Institute for Social, Behavioral, & Economic Research (ISBER): the disestablishment of the Center for Advanced Studies of Individual Differences

(CASID); the transfer of the Center for Spatially Integrated Social Sciences (CSISS) to the Department of Geography; and the disestablishment of the Social Science Survey Center (SSSC). CPB endorsed the disestablishment of CASID without comment. The transfer of CSISS to Geography was supported with the assumption that any remaining resources of the center will also be transferred to the department.

The Council also endorsed the disestablishment of the Social Science Survey Center, but noted that the closure of the SSSC will result in a withdrawal of methodological assistance for the campus, and CPB felt this loss of resource should be mitigated in some way. CPB voiced its support to purchase a campus license for Qualtrics survey software so that its availability is not dependent on its purchase by a single individual or department, and to request a commitment to high quality survey research methods training and consulting on campus.

Response: Four Academic Senate groups reviewed the proposal: CPB, Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC) and the Faculty Executive Committee from Letters & Science. All groups endorsed the proposed administrative actions.

6. *Neuroscience Research Institute (NRI): External Review*

The Council on Planning & Budget discussed the external review committee report on the Neuroscience Research Institute (NRI) in May. CPB noted that the (internal) pre-review found some issues that NRI should focus on, and the review panel was fully supportive of the institute but identified similar issues. CPB endorsed the external review committee report and agreed with its recommendations. In particular, CPB shared concerns regarding the appropriateness of the co-director model of leadership; the narrow focus on molecular and cellular biology; and NRI's connection with the broad community of neuroscientists.

Response: The Committee on Research Policy & Procedures (CRPP-a subcommittee of the Council on Research & Instructional Resources) and the Graduate Council (GC) also reviewed the NRI External Review. Senate groups had feedback similar to the Extramural Review Committee in the areas of overall mission, broadening the engagement of faculty in other disciplines into the Institute's work, and the current leadership model. All three Senate groups supported the recommendation of the Extramural Review Committee that the NRI develop a mission statement that will clarify its role on the campus.

Proposed MOU with Chevrolet / Bonneville Environmental Foundation

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Chevrolet and the Bonneville Environmental Foundation in November. Chevrolet/GM instituted a program of working with Universities that are leaders on sustainability and Carbon-mitigation. They wished to purchase – and “retire” – carbon credits (C-credits) that UCSB has accrued in recent years from campus activities reducing overall energy use and CO₂-emissions. CPB recognized that for a major, energy intensive industry to purchase C-credits to retire them is a major step to be supported. CPB supported the concept of this initiative, as there appeared few

drawbacks to UCSB and clear benefits. However, there were questions that emerged to which CPB did not have answers and therefore CPB did not fully endorse the MOU. CPB recommended that a small committee be assembled to address questions surrounding the ethical/PR/credibility issues.

Response: The Academic Senate provided preliminary and informal feedback about the proposed MOU. Three Senate groups reviewed and commented on the documents: CPB, Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA). No group was able to provide endorsement of the proposed MOU at this time and there were several areas of concern and numerous questions that each group raised.

Discontinuation of Economics / Mathematics BA program

In February, CPB reviewed the proposal for the discontinuation of the Economics / Mathematics BA program and had no objections.

Response: The Undergraduate Council (UgC) approved the discontinuation of the BA in Economics and Mathematics, and recommended that the proposal be presented to the Faculty Legislature for final approval, pending prior endorsement by the Chancellor. Although a date for this action was not specified in the proposal, UgC recommended that the degree be discontinued as of Fall 2015.

ESCI Online Pilot Program

In March, CPB reviewed a pilot program for the online delivery of ESCI teaching evaluations (*Evaluation System for Courses & Instruction*), including a report by the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Course Evaluation as well as a memo by the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA). It appeared that a number of issues were being addressed in what will be an expanded three-year pilot project. While some of the problems encountered are being corrected, CPB nonetheless shared many of CFIA's concerns.

The Council was concerned by the amount of effort and resources being devoted to what may be a flawed evaluation system. In effect, we may be trying to fix something that is not broken. Furthermore, CPB viewed course evaluations fundamentally as part of the instructional responsibility and privilege of the faculty. The Council was skeptical of what may amount to unnecessary and unhelpful administrative intrusion.

UCSB Extension Initiatives and International Agreements

In May, CPB reviewed a memo from Dean Michael T. Brown regarding UCSB Extension Initiatives and International Agreements. CPB agreed with Interim EVC Michaelsen that the memo was a good faith effort to explain the context and philosophy within which Extension seeks to collaborate with campus constituencies in the development of international agreements. CPB also agreed that that Extension has and should play a part in creating agreements to bring international students to campus. CPB recommended that such initiatives should have a participating "academic partner"—department, division, etc. in developing the agreement (even if that partner is "invisible" to the foreign partner) to ensure that departments are not blindsided by such

agreements and that the memoranda carefully lay out the potential courses (by department) from which such students can choose.

CPB was not as comfortable with Extension playing a role in outgoing student agreements, faculty exchanges or research projects and indicated that these more properly fall under the purview of academic departments, programs and colleges.

Response: The following groups reviewed the proposal and were included in the Divisional response: CPB, Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Committee on International Education (CIE), and the Faculty Executive Committees from L&S, Engineering, Bren and CCS. Some groups commended Dean Brown for his interest in collaborating with departments to develop international agreements and bringing international students to the campus. However, the majority of reviewing groups were not supportive of the initiatives as outlined in the proposal and did not endorse the involvement of Extension in initiating additional international agreements.

Faculty Code of Conduct – Campus Procedures

Over the course of several meetings in January and again in April, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the campus procedures for the enforcement of the Faculty Code of Conduct. CPB had a number of questions and concerns about the document that were addressed through a consultation with Carol Lansing (Charges Officer) and Stephanie Smagala (Academic Senate advisor to the Charges Committee) in January. Nonetheless, CPB had some lingering concerns and offered some recommendations for the improvement of the document. CPB received a response to its questions in April, and offered additional comments regarding the draft.

Response: Many of CPB's suggestions were incorporated into the document, which was approved by the Faculty Legislature at its June meeting.

Task Force on Utilizing Technology to Enhance Student Learning

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the report of the Task Force on Utilizing Technology to Enhance Student Learning in April. CPB broadly agreed with the conclusions and recommendations of the Task Force. However, Council also noted several questions or misgivings concerning the report, including: an absence of sources that describe current uses, costs, and funding sources of online technology on the UCSB campus or in the UC system; a lack of an explanation of why the commercial licensing of online courses does not serve the interest of faculty and students; the report's endorsement of specific commercial products; campus-supported access to a variety of developing instructional technologies or software; the assertion that fully online courses *cannot* be justified as cost-saving; and a description of the "UCSB Brand" that is *not* shared by many on the Council.

Response: The following groups commented on the report: CPB, Undergraduate Council (UgC), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Committee on Courses & General Education (CCGE), Committee on Diversity & Equity (D&E), and the Faculty Executive Committees from the Colleges of L&S, Engineering, and Creative Studies. Overall,

most reviewing groups found the analysis and the recommendations in the report to be comprehensive and thought provoking and their respective comments reflected many different perspectives on the role of technology and student learning. However, the Divisional response was mixed, and included support for several of the report's ideas as well as skepticism about other aspects of the document.

Retroactive Authorization of Veteran's Benefits: Update to Procedure

In December CPB reviewed a draft procedure that would clarify our campus process for handling retroactive fee exemption claims under the California Department of Veteran Affairs College Fee Waiver Program. CPB had no objections to its implementation.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2013-14 term:

Five-Year Campus Planning Perspective

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the proposed update to the Five-Year Campus Planning Perspective in February. CPB suggested two minor edits, but otherwise had no objection to the document.

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 025, 670, and 671
2. APM 190: Whistleblower Protection Policy
3. APM 600 Series: Salary Administration (Final review)

1. APM 025, 670, and 671

In December, CPB reviewed the following proposed revisions and addition to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM): revisions to APM section 025, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members; revisions to APM section 670, Health Sciences Compensation Plan; and proposed new policy, APM section 671, Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities of Health Sciences Compensation Plan Participants. CPB had no objection to the proposed changes.

Response: The Division received comments from the following Senate groups: CPB, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Engineering and Letters & Science. All groups either endorsed the proposed revisions to APM 025 or chose not to opine. All groups chose not to opine or had no objection to the proposed revisions to APM 670 and the proposed new version of APM 671 given that there are no Health Sciences faculty on the UCSB campus. Several groups noted that the revised versions have more clarity overall.

2. APM 190: Whistleblower Protection Policy

In March, CPB reviewed a proposal to revise the Whistleblower Protection Policy: Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 190, Appendix A-2. CPB noted that the changes are meant to comply with the California Whistleblower Protection Act which went into effect in 2011. CPB had no objections to this revision.

Response: The following Senate groups commented on the proposed revision: CPB, Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committee from Letters & Science. The following groups decided not to comment: UgC, D&E, and the FEC's from Engineering and Creative Studies. The Graduate Council and the L&S FEC endorsed the proposed revisions. CFIA and CRIR had significant concerns.

3. APM 600 Series: Salary Administration (Final review)

CPB reviewed the updated revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual regarding salary administration (APM 600 series) in November. For most sections, CPB had either no objection or did not wish to comment. However, Council did seek clarification on two sections (510-2 and 510-10).

Response: The Divisional response included comments by CPB and the Committee on International Education (CIE); most groups declined to opine. CIE suggested that international education be added to the list of Regents' Lecturer's achievements in agriculture, labor, law, medicine, and also commented on section 650-18.a.2 (Salary Administration – Technical Assistance Projects).

Compendium

CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the Compendium (*Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units and Research Units*) in May. The Council endorsed the changes without any objection or comment.

Response: The following Councils commented on the proposed revisions to the Compendium: CPB, Graduate Council (GC), Undergraduate Council (UgC), the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), and the Letters & Science Faculty Executive Committee. All groups endorsed the proposed revisions.

Presidential Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

CPB reviewed the proposed revision to the Presidential policy on Copyright and Fair Use in May. CPB noted that the changes move much of the information contained in the policy to a website, and Council agreed that the revision makes the policy more comprehensible. On the assumption that the policy includes the indemnification of faculty with regard to copyright and fair use, CPB had no objections to the proposal.

Response: The UCSB Division's response included review by CPB, Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Letters and Science and the College of Creative Studies. For the most part, all groups regarded the Policy as a necessary revision given changes in law,

technology and academic practices. The Division endorsed the Policy as written with a few minor suggestions.

Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Policy

The Council on Planning & Budget reviewed the proposed revision to the Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (Regents Policy 3103) in February. CPB endorsed sensitivity to the potential negative effects of supplementary tuition on diversity and student debt, but felt that the detailed financial data stipulated in this regard may be too onerous. Council agreed that a requirement for consultation with students and faculty in the process of requesting supplementary tuition should remain in the proposal, but that the micro stipulations as to how this be done would be best left to the units requesting the supplementary tuition.

Response: The UCSB Division's response included review by CPB, Graduate Council (GC), Committee on Diversity & Equity (CDE), and the Faculty Executive Committees from Bren and Education. UCSB recently received approval (Spring 2013) for our first professional degree program, and thus consider ourselves to be in an especially unique position to comment on the draft policy. Graduate Council (GC) urged that, given the lack of clarity in the policy and the implementation criteria, the documents be revised and distributed for a second review. Their main concern was the "lack of stated principles for determining whether a program should be offered as a state-supported professional program or a self-supporting graduate professional degree program (SSGPDP)". Given the substantive concerns expressed by Graduate Council and other groups, the UCSB Division recommended that revisions be made to the policy and a second review take place shortly thereafter.

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs Policy

In January, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs. CPB withheld support of the proposal and expressed a number of questions and concerns about the revisions. CPB did not believe that the document provided an adequate basis for what constitutes a "Graduate Professional Degree Program". CPB was concerned about programmatic inconsistencies between campuses. CPB was also concerned about the lack of budgetary criteria for determining program fees and was dismayed at the lack of budgetary guidelines. Finally, CPB was troubled by the lack of criteria for program evaluation.

Response: The UCSB Division's response included comments by CPB, Graduate Council, Council on Research & Instructional Resources, Council on Faculty Issues & Awards, Undergraduate Council, Committee on Diversity & Equity, and the Faculty Executive Committees from Engineering and Letters & Science. Many of the groups objected to the policy, and the Division Given the many concerns that reviewing groups have raised, the UCSB Division was not able to endorse the revised policy as presented.

Senate Bylaw 55

In November, CPB reviewed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 which would allow departments to permit non-Senate faculty in the health sciences to participate in

departmental personnel votes. While not directly affecting UCSB, CPB had no objection to the proposal and believed that local units should be allowed the decision as to whether particular titles are entitled to voting rights.

Response: The proposal was reviewed broadly by UCSB Senate groups, including: CPB, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Council on Faculty Issues & Awards (CFIA), the Council on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR), the Committee on Diversity & Equity (D&E), and the Faculty Executive Committees from College of Creative Studies, Engineering, and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education (GGSE). The majority of reviewing groups (with the exception of CFIA and CPB) were against the proposed changes.

VII. Committees

The Council 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 email. 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 2014-16, 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 2013-14 term, including the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; 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 (monthly) consultations with EVC Gene Lucas (fall) and Interim EVC Joel Michaelsen (winter and spring). These meetings were an efficient way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

Capital Planning

Because of the continuing budget crisis, CPB did not make any new recommendations for state-funded capital projects. However, the Bioengineering Building – which appeared on previous years' lists – was accepted for funding under the AB 94 mechanism in the 2013-14 budget year, and the Infrastructure Renewal Phase 1b project is anticipated to be funded via the mechanism next year depending on the State budget. UC Office of the President (UCOP) is requesting shovel ready projects for 2015-16 to be put forward as funding for planning and design will likely not be available.

Furthermore, CPB was very pleased that a much-needed general assignment classroom building has been included in the capital financial plan, along with the renovation/replacement of Campbell Hall.

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.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

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

- Campus-wide academic strategic plan
- Classroom building
- Non-resident enrollment

Council Membership:

Michael Stohl	CPB Chair / UCPB rep (Winter & Spring)	Communication
Matthew Begley	CPB Chair / UCPB rep (Fall)	Mechanical Engineering
Joshua Schimel	CPB Vice Chair	Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology
Kevin Almeroth		Computer Science
Irwin Appel		Theater & Dance
James Blascovich		Psychological & Brain Sciences
Bodo Bookhagen		Geography
Sarah Cline		History
Timothy Cooley		Music
Patricia Holden		Bren
Cynthia Hudley		Education
Cynthia Kaplan		Political Science
Carlos Levi		Materials
W. Patrick McCray		History
J. Douglas Moore		Mathematics
Lisa Parks		Film & Media Studies
Cynthia Skenazi		French & Italian
Jack Sutton		Sociology
Kimberly Turner		Mechanical Engineering
John Woolley		Political Science
Angela Lau	Associated Students	

A final note from the Chair

The Chair of CPB wishes to thank the Vice-Chair 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 and Interim EVC Joel Michaelsen for their 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.

Finally, the Chair commends Kyle Richards for his continuing outstanding work in organizing and supporting Council in all its endeavors.