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 25 requests for Exception to Open Recruitment (EOR) one request for an FTE increase, and one request for an interdepartmental FTE transfer.
- Council reviewed thirteen proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 21 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, seven in winter, and eight 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 five academic units:

1. Department of Black Studies
2. Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Biomolecular Science and Engineering (BMSE)
3. Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences
4. Department of Religious Studies
5. Department of Theater & Dance

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Engineering (BMSE); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Religious Studies and Theater & Dance); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Psychological & Brain Sciences); and Social Sciences / Education (Black 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 2016-17, 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. Global &amp; International Studies Program</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Latin American &amp; Iberian Studies</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physics</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. English</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Writing Program</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 one request for an FTE increase (Linguistics), one request for an interdepartmental FTE transfer (from Feminist Studies to Chicana & Chicano Studies), and 25 requests for exceptions to open recruitment (EOR) from the following departments: Anthropology; Chemistry & Biochemistry; Earth Science; Electrical & Computer Engineering (2); English; Feminist Studies; Geography; Materials (2); Mathematics (2); Mechanical Engineering (2); Physics (4); Political Science (2); Psychological & Brain Sciences; Religious Studies (2); Sociology; and Technology Management Program. CPB endorsed 18 of the requests (often with some reservations), opposed six of the requests, and remained uncommitted on one.

CPB expressed a great deal of frustration in reviewing several EOR requests this year. In some instances, CPB members believed that the existing language in the Red Binder was too vague. In one case, the department established a search committee to recruit candidates for a position for which it had not been authorized to hire and interviewed candidates without an open search, all of which was done without prior consultation with the Senate. In other instances, requests were made by departments to appoint at the Associate Professor level following the open recruitment for an Assistant Professor. In particular, the Council expressed concern that in an advertised Assistant Professor search a department would be permitted to interview a candidate who had already received tenure without approval as an EOR.

IV. Review of Endowed Chair Proposals

In accordance with UCSB’s *Policy on Endowed Chairs*, CPB was consulted on thirteen endowed chair proposals, regarding the appropriateness of the proposed subject areas and the conformity with the academic mission of our campus. During the regular academic year, the Committee on Development & Community Relations provided initial review of the proposals and drafted opinions for discussion by all of CPB. Many of the endowed chair proposals were received over the summer, and for these the entire CPB conducted a review over email. Council reviewed the following endowed chair proposals and submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel:

```
7. Chicana & Chicano Studies
8. Physics

Response: Five academic units will be reviewed for the 2016-17 cycle: Chicana & Chicano Studies; Education; History; Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science; and Mechanical Engineering.
```
1. **Arnhold Chair in English**: The John P. Arnhold Presidential Chair in English would be established through a gift of $500,000 from John & Jody Arnhold with matching funds provided by the University.

2. **Aster Chair in Economics**: The Richard F. Aster, Jr. Chair in Economics would create an unrestricted endowment of $1 million (out of a $3 million bequest to the department). CPB wholeheartedly supported the proposal.

3. **Bedrosian Coyne Chair**: The Bedrosian Coyne Presidential Chair in Neuroscience would be funded by a $500,000 gift by Karen & Ted Coyne and John & Judith Bedrosian and matched in equal amount by the University.

4. **Bertelsen Chair in Technology & Society**: The Bertelsen Presidential Chair in Technology & Society would be endowed with a $500,000 gift from Mark Bertelsen, in conjunction with matching funds via the UC Presidential Endowed Chair matching program. CPB supported the proposal with reservations regarding its administration.

5. **Duca Chair in Technology Management**: A gift of $1 million from 2005 would be used to create the Investment Group of Santa Barbara Founding Director of the Master's of Technology Management Program and Duca Family Professor of Technology Management. Noting that the endowment and the FTE for the position has already been approved and allocated, CPB had no objections and supported the proposal.

6. **Duval Chair in Energy Efficiency**: The Duval Family Presidential Chair in Energy Efficiency would be established through a gift of $500,000 from Glenn & Betina Duval with matching funds from the University.

7. **Erickson Chair in English**: The Robert & Liisa Erickson Presidential Chair in English would be established with a gift of $500,000 from John & Jody Arnhold with matching funds through the University.

8. **Felipe Chair in Technology Management**: The Christian Felipe Chair in Technology Management would be established through a gift of $1 million already received from the donor. CPB agreed that the proposal meets the academic planning criteria for creating a new endowed chair and supported the plan.

9. **Gerber Chair in Instructional Innovation & Technology**: The Michael M. Gerber Chair in Instructional Innovation & Technology for Exceptional Children in the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education would be established through a generous irrevocable testamentary commitment of $2 million by an unnamed donor. CPB agreed that the proposal meets the academic planning criteria for creating a new endowed chair and supported the plan.

10. **North Hall Chair 1**: The North Hall Chair 1 is the first in a cluster of endowed chair requests created to acknowledge the crucial role that Black students played in establishing the Black Studies Department and the Center for Black Students. This endowed chair would support the scholarly and programmatic activities of a faculty member in Economics and would be established through a campus commitment of
unrestricted gift funds totaling $250,000 along with matching funds of $250,000 from the UC Office of the President.

11. **North Hall Chair 2**: The North Hall Chair 2 would support the scholarly and programmatic activities of a faculty member in Psychological & Brian Studies and would be established through a campus commitment of unrestricted gift funds totaling $250,000 along with matching funds of $250,000 from the UC Office of the President.

12. **Wolf Chair in Media Studies**: The Dick Wolf Director of the Carsey-Wolf Center and Presidential Chair in Media Studies would be established through a gift of $500,000 from Dick & Noelle Wolf with matching funds from the University.

13. **Yzurdiaga Chair in Theoretical Physics**: The Pat & Joe Yzurdiaga Chair in Theoretical Physics at the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics would be established through the generous gift by the Yzurdiagas of $1 million. While CPB supported the concept of this chair position, Council also offered some questions and concerns regarding the administration of the Chair and the authority to appoint.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2014-15 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 recommended to the EVC an unranked list of 15 FTE for 2015-16 (Top Tier) in addition to a ranked list (Second Tier) of eight more FTE. Furthermore, the Council offered an unranked list of proposed FTE allocations for 2016-17.

2015-16 Proposed Allocations (Top Tier, unranked)

Unless noted otherwise, all positions are recommended to be at the Assistant Professor Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials:</th>
<th>Inorganic Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering:</td>
<td>Soft Robotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering:</td>
<td>Signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science:</td>
<td>Physical Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological &amp; Brain Sciences:</td>
<td>Spatial cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability:</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Environmental Studies: Ecological Economics
Theatre & Dance: Classical/Contemporary Ballet
Classics: Greek Literature
Writing Program: LSOE
Economics: Environmental (open level)
Communication: Organizational (open level)
Anthropology (IAS): Biomedical/Demography
Education: Clinical Psychology (open level)

2015-16 Proposed Allocations (Second Tier, ranked)

1. Economics: Econometrics
2. ECE (possibly joint w/ CS): Internet of Things (IoT)
3. EEMB: Quantitative Biology (Q-Bio)
4. Linguistic: Phonetics
5. Education: LSOE—Special Ed & Teacher Ed
6. Music: Voice
7. Geography: Spatial Cognition
8. Social Sciences—Dean’s discretionary FTE (This was left flexible because the next specific recommendation was in Economics, yet Econ is already being recommended for two.)

2016-17 Proposed Allocations (Unranked)

Engineering:
1. Materials: Macromolecular (open level)
2. Mechanical Engineering: Marine Fluids
3. Electrical & Computer Engineering: Electronics/Photonics
4. Computer Science: Security
5. Media Arts & Technology Program (Computer Science): Computational Fabrication

MLPS:
2. Physics: Condensed Matter
3. Chemistry & Biochemistry: Experimental Physical Chemistry
4. Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology: Molecular Genetics

HFA:
1. Theater & Dance: One of Classical/Contemp.
2. Religious Studies: Environmental Ethics (joint with Environmental Studies in MLPS)
3. French & Italian / Germanic & Slavic Studies: European Media
4. History: Early Modern
5. Spanish & Portuguese: Portuguese & Comp. Lit

Social Sciences:
1. Economics: Open area
2. Anthropology (SAAB): Political Anthropology
3. Sociology: Cultural Sociology (Quantitative)
4. Political Science: International Relations
**Gevirtz Graduate School of Education:**
1. Developmental Disabilities
2. Counseling, Clinical, & School Psychology: Stats & Research Methods

**Bren School of Environmental Management:**
1. Earth Science
2. Earth Science

*Note:* During its FTE deliberations, five primary considerations informed CPB’s recommendations: 1.) In the absence of a campus-wide strategic plan, CPB did not have appropriate criteria by which to make major deviations from the long term distributions of FTE between and among divisions that have prevailed for decades; 2.) CPB acknowledged and privileged the Deans’ recommendations for their divisions but did not endorse a Dean’s recommendations when Council was not convinced that the Dean had provided, or had followed, the decision criteria that the Dean indicated was the basis of the requests; 3.) CPB attempted to provide support for highly rated programs and for programs that are in a position to become highly rated programs in the near future; 4.) CPB attempted to address critical teaching needs of departments due to enrollment growth, faculty losses or both; and 5.) CPB attempted to address critical programmatic needs, particularly for smaller departments that may not be highly ranked (or not ranked at all because of their size or their field), but have suffered losses of major faculty leaders, or researchers that require rapid replacement for program stability.

**Earth Research Institute (ERI): External Review**

In February, CPB reviewed the documents related to the external review of the Earth Research Institute. CPB acknowledged the thoughtful and thorough work of extramural review committee as well as the Earth Research Institute’s response. The Council identified three issues raised in the review that required additional attention: 1.) CPB questioned the extent to which the needs of affiliated faculty reflect the FTE priorities of ERI and requested that ERI provide a list of priority fields for FTEs with a time horizon to the respective departments; 2.) CPB suggested that the need for bridging funds to assist researchers on soft funding be a policy issue which includes the Academic Senate Committee on Research & Instructional Resources (CRIR) and the Office of Research and not decided based on requests by individual Organized Research Unites (ORUs); and 3.) CPB endorsed the provision of services of a Development Officer for ERI.

**Discontinuation of Ed.D. in Educational Leadership**

In February, CPB reviewed a proposal from the Graduate Council for the discontinuation of the Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership, formerly offered as a Joint Doctoral Degree (JDP) with California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly). The Council had no objections to the proposal.

**Germanic, Slavic, & Semitic Studies Proposal**

In November, CPB reviewed a proposal by the Department of Germanic, Slavic, & Semitic Studies to change its name to the Department of Germanic & Slavic Studies. The Council had no objections to the proposal.
Global & International Studies Proposal

In November, CPB reviewed a proposal by the Global & International Studies Program for: a) the departmentalization of the program; b) a connected name change of the academic unit, and finally; c) the name change to its terminal Master’s Degree. The Council had no objections to the proposal.

Middle Eastern Studies Proposal

In March, CPB reviewed a proposal to transfer the Middle Eastern Studies undergraduate degree program from Global Studies to the Department of Religious Studies. The Council had no objections to the proposal, which it saw primarily as an administrative transfer meant to benefit the advising of students in the program. CPB recognize that this move makes administrative sense given that Middle Eastern languages are currently taught in Religious Studies. However, CPB expressed concerns about the programmatic implications highlighted by this change. Specifically, this transfer suggested that the Middle East is of scholarly interest primarily in terms of its religious traditions rather than its political, economic, and social dynamics, while as a program, it would seem that Global Studies ought to be the more intellectually appropriate setting for any regional studies program. While CPB endorsed the proposal, Council suggested that the question of the structure and emphasis of the program should be reviewed for further discussion.

Proposal on Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST)

In October, CPB reviewed the proposal by the Dean of Graduate Education (Carol Genetti) regarding Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST) for international graduate students. CPB supported the Dean’s efforts to make the recruitment of international doctoral and MFA students financially equivalent to the recruitment of domestic non-resident doctoral students.

CPB agreed that either proposal – to collect NRST for one year and use that money to seed the fund, or to allow the fund to go into deficit, and be paid back from the payments it made – would represent a step in the right direction. CPB preferred the second option, as it would be simpler and ultimately allow UCSB to alleviate NRST problems sooner. CPB considered that the overall cost-benefit balance of this proposal is strongly in the positive. It would increase departments’ abilities to compete for the most talented students anywhere in the world. CPB also noted that efforts should continue at the UC system level to eliminate the NRST for international students beyond their first year of doctoral study. Finally, CPB recommended that the overall costs and impacts of this initiative be monitored, and suggests that the Graduate Division report on the financial impact on the campus in each of the next three years.

Partial Fee Reduction for Graduating Seniors

In February, CPB initiated its review of a proposal by the University Registrar to allow partial fee reduction for graduating seniors needing 10 or fewer units to graduate. While CPB favored the principle behind the policy, it believed that as a matter of procedure that all such revenue proposals should be accompanied by a financial analysis that clearly presents the budgetary impact. Additionally, CPB noted that the proposal was received without the endorsement of the Registrar’s control point (in this case, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs). In short, CPB
wanted to know: (1) what the proposal would cost, and (2) if there is a cost, what is the source of the required funds.

In May, CPB received additional information from the Registrar and completed its review. CPB appreciated the additional information and offered its endorsement of the proposal.

Proposals from Psychological & Brain Sciences

In February, CPB reviewed a series of proposals by the Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences which sought to:
1. Discontinue the BA in Psychology
2. Establish a BS in Psychological & Brain Sciences
3. Make minor changes to the BS in Biopsychology

The Council noted that all actions were supported by the department faculty by votes of 22-0-0 and was inclined to endorse the actions. CPB also noted that all of the departmental letters of support were made contingent upon the allocation of additional resources by the Dean, including the appointment of an LSOE and temporary sub-zero resources.

CPB questioned a statement made in the Dean’s letter declaring that CHEM 1A and 1B would be taught without the introductory laboratory. While CPB ultimately deferred to the Undergraduate Council and the departments on whether the chemistry labs are a necessary part of the curriculum, CPB opined that the labs are a vital part of the pedagogy for CHEM 1A and 1B, and believed the resource requirements should be remedied as soon as possible if this change is approved.

CPB endorsed this proposal with the understanding that the Dean’s commitments would be upheld and address the pedagogical requirements of the curriculum.

Red Binder Revisions

In November, CPB reviewed a proposal for several revisions to the Campus Policies and Procedures on Academic Personnel (“Red Binder”) by the Office of Academic Personnel. CPB had no objections to the changes.

Task Force on Global Engagement

In November, CPB reviewed the work of the Task Force on Global Engagement, including the draft campus guidelines for international agreements and proposed templates for such agreements. CPB supported the work that has been done to clarify the establishment, approval, and tracking of these agreements.

VI. Systemwide Reviews

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2014-15 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 080 and 330
   In December, CPB reviewed proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) in Sections 080 (Medical Separation) and 330 (Specialist Title Series). CPB had no objection to the proposed changes.

2. APM 133, 210, 220, and 760
   In December, CPB reviewed proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) in Sections 133, 210, 220, and 760 regarding evaluating contributions to diversity as well as extending the eight-year limitation on service (suspending the tenure “clock”). CPB had no objection to the proposed changes.

Proposal on Doctoral Student Support

CPB reviewed the systemwide proposal and recommendations on doctoral student support in November. The Council endorsed the recommendations found in the proposal. While CPB preferred a systemwide approach to eliminate the non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) for international students beyond their first year of doctoral study, the Council also continued to support Dean Carol Genetti’s local efforts to make the recruitment of international doctoral and MFA students financially equivalent to the recruitment of domestic non-resident doctoral students at UCSB.

Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services – Draft Guidelines

In May, CPB discussed the proposed draft guidelines for a pilot program to allow financial equity as payment for access to University facilities or services. CPB was in principle supportive of the idea of fostering faculty entrepreneurism when consistent with the research mission of the university. The concept of granting access to laboratory space and equipment for equity, rather than on a cash basis appears an attractive way in which to encourage these efforts. However, CPB found that the proposal raised a number of questions, even at the trial stage. The proposal provided no indication as to whether this had been done at other public universities and, if so, what the results have been. CPB appreciated the trial nature of the proposal, but found the program risky without greater specification of the program, an increased role for faculty supervision, and the inclusion of financial experts.

Open Access Policy for Non-Senate Authors

In December, CPB reviewed the proposed systemwide policy on open access for University of California authors who are not members of the Academic Senate. CPB agreed that the policy for non-Senate authors should be consistent with that for Senate faculty. The Council supported the expansion of these rights and privileges and has no objections to the proposal.
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 recommendations for 2015-17, 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 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 2014-15 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 & Science; Interim 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 David Marshall. These meetings were an efficient way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

Capital Planning

No state-funded capital projects were under consideration this year, so no capital plans were reviewed. However, CPB expressed its concern regarding the lack of medium and large classrooms and supported the addition of a Classroom Building to the Campus Planning Committee’s (CPC’s) list of “state funding eligible” projects. CPB also agreed with the proposal to replace 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Stohl</th>
<th>CPB Chair (Fall &amp; Winter)</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Schimel</td>
<td>CPB Chair (Spring) / UCPB rep</td>
<td>Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Marine Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Sutton</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Jensen Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Almeroth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio Campagnari</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Cooley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Pierre Fouque</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics &amp; Applied Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry (Ted) Frech</td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songi Han</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Holden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A final note from the Chair

CPB has operated well and collegially, dealing with many pieces of business, including some challenging issues. We dealt with numerous EOR cases, and have provided input to the Senate and EVC about the scope of EOR cases and how they currently fit within overall academic planning and development. Interactions with Senate leadership and the Administration have been cordial and effective.

There are two issues, however, that I would like to note as having raised some concern among CPB members. These are 1) planning and 2) budget. Much of what CPB deals with is individual cases—these are important and require careful consideration. However, particularly as CPB is expected to offer advice on faculty recruitment, we are faced with large campus-level challenges of retirements, shifting student interests, and the evolution of the University. CPB is strongly of the opinion that UCSB needs to undertake serious campus-level strategic planning. CPB is a powerful committee for providing ongoing advice about the implementation of a campus vision, but developing a clear campus strategy for excellence, excellence that builds on our broad-based and interdisciplinary strengths requires a larger process that can focus on strategic planning undistracted by the day-to-day business that is our bread and butter. From conversations with EVC David Marshall, I understand he intends such an exercise and we strongly support the endeavor and look forward to contributing actively to that larger process—CPB members individually and CPB as an entity have deep experience and insights into UCSB that will be vital in any strategic planning exercise.

Second: budget. CPB has relatively little engagement with the overall budget planning for UCSB. Particularly in the last year, when the University’s budget was up in the air (caught within the so-called Committee of Two made up of the Governor and UC President) future budgets were very uncertain. But with a multi-year settlement now in place, it would seem appropriate to involve CPB more actively in budget planning, at least as it relates to academic development.