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 six 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 20 requests for Academic search waivers (formerly, Exceptions to Open Recruitment) and three requests for interdepartmental FTE transfers.
- Council reviewed two proposals to establish endowed chairs.
I. Overview

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) met for 20 regularly scheduled sessions (six in fall, seven in winter, and seven 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 Academic Search Waivers (formerly “Exceptions to Open Recruitment”)
- Endowed chair proposals

II. Academic Program Reviews

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

1. BioMolecular Science & Engineering (BMSE) Program – continued from last year
2. Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
3. Department of Spanish & Portuguese
4. Department of History of Art & Architecture
5. Department of Geography
6. Department of Political Science

Initial reviews of these units were first conducted by CPB’s respective area subcommittee: Engineering (BMSE and Electrical & Computer Engineering); Humanities & Fine Arts / Creative Studies (Spanish & Portuguese and History of Art & Architecture); Mathematical, Life, & Physical Sciences / Bren (Geography); and Social Sciences / Education (Political Science). 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. The review of BMSE was continued from last year, with CPB commenting only on last spring’s ERC report and program response.

When asked to provide recommendations for the PRP reviews for 2017-18, CPB recommended the following units for review (in priority order):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department / Unit</th>
<th>Last Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Global &amp; International Studies</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Latin American &amp; Iberian Studies</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physics</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. English 2006-07
5. Writing Program 2006-07
6. Chemical Engineering 2007-08
7. Communication 2007-08

Response: Four academic units will be reviewed for the 2017-18 cycle: Department of Education; Department of English; Global & International Studies Program; and Department of Physics. And four units had previously been selected to be reviewed in 2016-17: Chicana & Chicano Studies; History; Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Marine Science; and Mechanical Engineering.

III. Academic Search Waivers and FTE Transfers

In November, a revision of UCSB’s Campus Policies & Procedures on Academic Personnel (section VII-1 of the “Red Binder”) included a change to “Exceptions to Open Recruitment” (EORs), which were hence referred to as “Search Waivers.” Under the revised policy, departments may request a search waiver for three reasons, in the absence of an approved FTE or an open search: 1) the hire of a spouse or domestic partner in order to hire or retain a Senate faculty member; 2) an “exceptional opportunity” to hire “an individual who has qualifications that are so uniquely outstanding as to justify the waiver...” or 3) for a President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship recipient.

CPB reviewed three requests for interdepartmental FTE transfers (all from the Department of Art to the Media Arts & Technology Program), and 20 requests for search waivers from the following academic units: Bren; Communication; Chemical Engineering; Computer Science; Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology; Earth Science; Electrical & Computer Engineering; English; Feminist Studies; Film & Media Studies; Geography; Mathematics; Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology (MCDB); Religious Studies; Philosophy; and Physics; Psychological & Brain Sciences. Of these, the following departments requested to make two appointments from one open search: Electrical & Computer Engineering; English; Philosophy; Physics; and Psychological & Brain Sciences.

The Council endorsed two of the FTE transfer requests but withheld its support for the third. CPB endorsed 17 of the search waiver requests, gave a qualified endorsement of one, and opposed two.

CPB continued to work with Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) David Marshall over its concerns about search waivers. On the one hand, the waivers are necessary to streamline our campus hiring process for stellar academic candidates and for partner/spousal hires. At the same time, the number of search waivers continues to represent a large proportion of the total campus FTE allocations, and excessive use of this mode of hiring undermines the campus’s strategic academic planning and CPB’s resource allocation discussions/recommendations. One change that was implemented by the EVC this year was about requests for a second offer from an open search when the department or Dean already has another FTE that has been approved. In these cases, CPB has already had an opportunity to make its recommendation about the FTE, so the
EVC considers this an administrative review and has decided to bypass an additional round of CPB input.

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. Council reviewed the two endowed chair proposals and submitted final recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor via the Office of Academic Personnel:

1. Towbes Graduate Dean: The Anne and Michael Towbes Graduate Dean Chair in the Graduate Division would be established through a gift of $1,000,000 from Michael Towbes through the UC Santa Barbara Foundation. CPB supported the proposal.

2. Wilcox Family Presidential Chair in Molecular Biology: The Wilcox Family Presidential Chair in Molecular Biology in the Division of Mathematical, Life, and Physical Sciences would be established through a release of $500,000 from the Wilcox Family Fund and matched in an equal amount by the Presidential Match for Endowed Chairs fund held with the UC Regents. CPB supported the proposal.

V. Review of Campus Issues

The Council on Planning and Budget participated in reviews of the following campus issues during the 2015-16 academic year.

FTE Planning

The Council on Planning & Budget was consulted by the Executive Vice Chancellor for its recommendations on academic positions (“FTEs” = Full-Time Equivalent appointments). The EVC’s call for academic FTE plans was sent to the Deans in December, and those Departmental plans were made available to CPB in spring quarter. CPB 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’s deliberations culminated in recommendations to the EVC of ranked lists of FTEs within each college/division (see memo of June 22, 2016). CPB did not attempt to offer a ranking across the divisions. Specific recommendations resulted from extensive discussions over spring quarter, beginning with the various subcommittees, and then moving into integrated discussions of the whole Council. The Council considered individual requests from the departments and programs, the recommendations of the Deans, and the collective knowledge base of the members of CPB (in which members were careful not to advocate for individual departments and divisions). The Council’s priorities did not always match perfectly with the Deans’ recommendations. Notably, CPB was more focused on teaching needs than several of the Deans appeared to be. In particular, the Council was sympathetic to those units that provided
fundamental support for a broad range of departments and whose teaching needs cannot be met just by continuing lecturers (e.g. Mathematics). Equally there were programs that have been swamped by the large number of undergraduate students—these units’ scholarly and graduate training programs could be threatened by the excess of undergraduate riches.

During its FTE deliberations, three primary considerations informed CPB’s recommendations: The primary considerations in developing our list were as follows:

1. In the absence of an articulated campus-wide strategic plan, CPB did not recommend substantive shifts across units, and did not single out programs for particular growth.
2. CPB acknowledged and privileged the Deans’ recommendations for their divisions to a degree. Council did not, however, endorse the Dean recommendations when it was not convinced that the Dean had provided, or had followed, the decision criteria that they indicated was the basis of the requests.
3. CPB considered departmental standing and the need to support highly rated programs to maintain the strength of their research and graduate training programs. Nonetheless, Council balanced these responsibilities against departments’ critical undergraduate teaching needs, an issue of particular import this year.

Center for Mindfulness & Human Potential

In November, CPB reviewed the proposal to establish a Center for Mindfulness & Human Potential within the Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences. CPB offered its qualified support of the proposal. Council noted that the proponents of the center requested a modest allocation of resources (space) for a promising endeavor that is poised to secure extramural funding to support its research operations. Nonetheless, CPB also took note of the department’s failure to address the space issue in its support letter, although the Council was persuaded by the Dean’s assurances in this area. In addition, CPB expressed some concern about the existing funding that is set to expire in fall 2017. In the absence of a detailed budget, the Council was unable to offer a thorough assessment of its financial prospects.

While noting the list of members “who will participate in the unit’s activities,” CPB was unclear if these participants were identical to the proposed members of its board of advisors, as referenced in the support letters. If not, then which are advisory board members and which are not? Furthermore, although the proposal received the near-unanimous support of the department, CPB wondered about the basis for the opposition. Finally, Council noted the somewhat unambitious five-year benchmarks that have been proposed.

Institute for Terahertz Science & Technology

In April, CPB reviewed the proposal for an administrative relocation of the Institute for Terahertz Science & Technology (ITST) from an Organized Research Unit (ORU) under the Office of Research to a non-ORU center within the Department of Physics. While Council agreed with the rationale for making this administrative move, there were concerns that CPB wanted addressed before offering an endorsement. First, CPB questioned how overhead funds would be divided. Members of CPB also expressed concern regarding the implications of the relocation on its
faculty participants, particularly those outside of the Physics department. Finally, CPB requested additional details about the staffing needs of the center.

CPB received a detailed response to its questions in May, and offered a final response in June. Council was satisfied that that its concerns were sufficiently addressed and offered its endorsement of the proposal.

**Orfalea Center Proposal**

In November, CPB reviewed the proposal by the Orfalea Center for Global & International Studies to transfer its administration from the Department of Global & International Studies to the Institute for Social, Behavioral, & Economic Research (ISBER). The Council noted that the Orfalea Center expansion in recent years was negatively impacting the Department of Global & International Studies. As mentioned in the request, the increased administrative load on the department became “untenable.” CPB also noted that the request was supported by both ISBER and the Dean of Social Sciences. CPB’s sole reservation about this administrative action was with regard to the wishes of the donors. CPB endorsed this request with the understanding that the move is consistent with the original donor agreement.

**Community Housing Authority Draft Guidelines**

In November, CPB reviewed the proposed guidelines for UCSB’s Community Housing Authority. CPB’s discussion primarily focused on the membership requirements of the board. First, Council found language requiring board members to be residents unclear and suggested that it be reworded. Also, while CPB agreed with requiring at least 75% of the board members to be full-time UCSB employees, Council also suggested consideration of a requirement of a certain proportion of Academic Senate members (e.g. 50%).

**Revisions to the Red Binder**

In October, CPB reviewed the proposed revisions to the *UCSB Campus Policies & Procedures for Academic Personnel* (Red Binder) and offered several comments. For most sections, CPB had no comment or objections regarding the proposed changes. CPB’s review primarily focused on the proposed revisions in Section 7-1, Policies on Open Recruitment.

**Simultaneous Enrollment Minimum Units**

In February CPB reviewed a proposal from the Registrar to require that undergraduate students participating in Simultaneous Enrollment be enrolled in a minimum of 12 units at UCSB. Although the Council appreciated the arguments raised, it was tepid in its support.

CPB believed that the policy should be more explicit about possible exceptions that may be allowed. In the Registrar’s memo, she stated that if “a student had a legitimate need to take fewer than 12 units at UCSB in a particular term,” then there is a process for petitioning their college. CPB agreed that there are several circumstances that may warrant an exception. Nonetheless, the proposed language of the policy did not mention this, and CPB suggested that this should be made explicit.
CPB also expressed concern with the process through which the proposal was brought forth. The proposal originated from Registrar and the letters of support were all from administrative offices: Deans, an Associate Dean, and the Director of Financial Aid. Yet policies relating to enrollment and academic requirements should normally emerge from and be fully vetted by the appropriate Academic Senate committee before circulating for comment. In the Chair’s Divisional response on this review, this latter point was clarified: “Senate staff had advised the Registrar to gather feedback from the Deans prior to submittal to Senate in order to streamline the Senate review, given the expectation that [Undergraduate Council] would want information from the Deans. Thus any reservations about that part of the process are best addressed to me, as Senate Chair, as I fully support the Senate staff suggestion that this be done.”

**Proposed Ph.D. Program in Technology Management**

In December, CPB discussed the proposal for the creation of a Ph.D. program in Technology Management. CPB was unanimously in support of the creation of this Ph.D. program and noted that the proposal made a strong case for this program. There were, however, a few planning and budget-relevant issues that CPB wanted to be clarified:

1. **Staffing.** The request for 3 additional staff members for the Ph.D. program seemed excessive. Most departments of similar size have fewer staff to administer a Ph.D. program.
2. **The course requirements seem extensive for years 1-3 of the program.** With the size of the program specified in the document, this will mean a number of courses with possibly very small numbers.
3. **TA support.** Will the program be able to get enough TA support to support the students in years 2-3 as specified in the proposal?
4. **CPB urged TMP to be very careful with how they state that professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST) funds from the M.S. program will be used for things like fellowships for Ph.D. students.** The rules for using PDST funds are quite detailed and strict.
5. **Space.** While both the Dean of Engineering and the Executive Vice Chancellor were in support of this proposal, there was no space allocated for this program.

**VI. Systemwide Reviews**

The Council on Planning & Budget participated in the following systemwide reviews during the 2015-16 term:

**Retirement Options Task Force Report**

In February, CPB conducted a thorough analysis of the proposed 2016 Tier Retirement Plan options. The committee was in full agreement that the pension reform in either of the proposed options constituted a large reduction in benefits that would affect most faculty members due to the PEPRA (Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act) cap on salary. CPB recalled that during the last UC Retirement Program (UCRP) reform, the Academic Senate took a leading role, and the resulting 2013 Tier, a complete restructuring of UCRP, put the UCRP into a more stable and healthy position. CPB noted that the proposed 2016 plans were not prepared with Academic Senate involvement, would not lead to financial savings or stability, and would come with a
serious benefit reduction for UC faculty and staff. Furthermore, the addition of a 2016 Tier as presented would hurt recruitment of new faculty and leave UC more susceptible to failed retentions. The next generation of UC faculty would be worse off in retirement. The portable benefit packages would leave our faculty and staff vulnerable to ready recruitment by other universities. Further analysis and commentary was offered to support CPB’s position. CPB was unanimously opposed to the adoption of either 2016 Tier plan and additionally urged the entire Senate to oppose the adoption of either proposed 2016 Plan.

Guiding Principles for Search Waivers for Academic Appointees

In March CPB reviewed the systemwide proposed “Guiding Principles for Academic Appointment Search Waivers.” CPB’s discussion primarily focused on the sections on search waiver categories. CPB first noted two related issues with the proposed search waiver category “Target of Excellence.” First, to CPB this title seemed too broad—after all, all UC faculty appointments are expected to be “excellent,” so this would seem to open up the category to almost any appointment. A related issue was that this category (Section A.2) did not include mention of faculty diversity in its description. It was Council’s understanding that one justification for approving a search waiver would be for a department to recruit an “exceptional scholar who would make special contributions to diversity in a particular program or field,” as is described in UCSB’s Policy on Open Recruitment (Red Binder, VII-1). Furthermore, CPB found the last sentence of these sections very unclear: “This search waiver is of indefinite duration.” Council recommended that this sentence be reworded to increase clarity.

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 analyses of the academic program reviews. In addition, Academic search waiver 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 2016-18, 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 2015-16 term, including the Executive Vice Chancellor; Assistant Chancellor for Budget & Planning; Director of Capital Development; Associate Vice Chancellor for Development; the Deans of the College of Letters & Science; Interim Co-Deans 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 provided a way to discuss issues and concerns informally and highly effective in promoting shared governance.

Capital Planning

In May, CPB was asked to review and comment on a Preliminary Project Proposal for a Music Building renovation. Following its initial discussion, CPB sent a list of questions seeking additional clarification from Chuck Haines, Director of Capital Development. CPB was persuaded on the need for the renovation and endorsed the project and its goals. From the information provided, CPB found the project to be complimentary to the proposed new Music Building and would address immediate seismic / structural concerns of the existing building. Furthermore, it appeared to CPB that the funding for the renovation was likely available through General Funds, and the project was feasible. While CPB recommended that this project be given a relatively high priority on the list of state-eligible projects in the 10-Year Capital Financial Plan, it was unable to offer an opinion on the specific rank without additional details on the other projects.
No state-funded capital projects were under consideration this year, and CPB did not review any other capital projects besides the Music Building renovation. However, CPB reiterated its concern regarding the lack of medium and large classrooms.

XI. Carry-Over Issues

Issues that CPB should expect to revisit in the coming year include the following:
- State-mandated enrollment surge
- Campus-wide academic strategic plan
- Classroom building
- Non-resident enrollment

Council Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Schimel</td>
<td>CPB Chair and UCPB Rep</td>
<td>Ecology, Evolution, &amp; Marine Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Jensen Adams</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>History of Art &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bruhn</td>
<td>(winter &amp; spring)</td>
<td>Political Science</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>William Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Major</td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological and Brain Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. S. Manjunath</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Seibold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Sutton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina (Naomi) Tague</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Valentine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayfair Yang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Studies and East Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Turner</td>
<td>(fall &amp; winter)</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final note from the Chair

UCSB has been on relatively sound financial footing compared to some of our sister campuses, due in part to increased revenue from rebenching, and partly due to a relatively conservative financial strategy. However, a number of campuses are noting that fixed costs are rising faster than revenue, threatening their long-term fiscal health. UCSB is vulnerable to the same pressures and must maintain a focus on long-term dynamics so that we can adapt in time to avoid the kind of crises that Berkeley is currently struggling to deal with.

Such issues highlight our ongoing lack of an academic strategic plan. Campus has a solid long-range development plan, but that says little about specific academic priorities. CPB is thus
regularly challenged with making specific ad hoc decisions and recommendations in something of a strategic vacuum. The increases in undergraduate enrollments forced campus planning energies into immediate problem-solving this past year, but those very increases enhance the need for clear strategic vision as we are faced with assimilating the additional numbers. Thus, such strategic planning should be a high priority for the Administration and Academic Senate over the next year or two.