

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT 2009-2010**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) met ten times in Academic Year 2009-10, including one conference call, to conduct business with respect to its duties – to advise the President and other agencies of University Administration on policy regarding planning and budget and resource allocation – as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 190](#) and in the *Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units* (the “[Compendium](#)”). The major activities of UCPB and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

UCPB set out this year to lead the Senate’s response to the deteriorating state and University budget situation. The Committee took active positions regarding the budget and responded quickly to a series of administrative proposals intended to address shortfalls. UCPB monitored the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento; analyzed UC’s budget choices and “plan B” budget scenarios; received high-level briefings from senior administrators on UC’s debt strategy and potential options for post-employment benefits design; tracked the implementation and impact of furloughs; discussed appropriate metrics for space planning and capital construction; reviewed factors contributing to the growth of UC administration; examined and commented on pension benefits and total remuneration; analyzed opportunities for achieving local and system-wide budget efficiencies; assessed the degree to which local budget committees have access to information and input into budget decision-making; and worked with other Senate committees on issues of common interest and concern.

THE CHOICES REPORT

Many of the topics UCPB investigated and commented on during the first half of the year later formed the basis of a chapter or section of the March 2010 *Choices Report*, which followed UCPB’s earlier well-regarded publications, the *Cuts Report* (2008) and *Futures Report* (2006). Indeed, *Choices* was the culmination of UCPB’s 2009-10 discussions about the future of the University of California. It lays out a range of issues related to UC budget and planning, analyzes potential options for cuts and their impact, and addresses a series of budgetary trade-offs and alternatives on matters of fee policy, cross-subsidization, salaries and benefits, faculty workload, indirect cost recovery, administration, and a number of potential efficiencies and new revenues.

The Academic Council endorsed the *Choices Report* in June, after a systemwide Senate review, as a document that provides history, context, and analysis supporting Senate and Administration discussion of next steps in the budget process. The Academic Council also charged an ad hoc committee to prepare a summary of comments received in the systemwide review of the report. UCPB expects to continue discussing the concrete implementation of various recommendations from the *Choices Report* on the campuses, particularly in matters of Senate involvement in the budget process on each campus, and in thorough and ongoing reviews of space planning, administrative growth, faculty salaries and benefits, appropriate metrics for faculty workload across campus, research funding, and campus base budget allocations. The *Choices Report* was submitted to UC President Yudof, the UC Regents, the system-wide UC Academic Senate, the UC Chancellors, and the members and work groups of the UC Commission on the Future. See <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/ucpb.choices.pdf>

UCRP AND POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

UCPB believes a competitive Defined Benefit plan encourages the renewal of faculty and staff and has been a major contributing factor to UC's excellence. UCPB actively sought this year to understand and confront the issues and problems facing the UC Retirement Program, and to engage in a conversation the options being considered by the President's Post-Employment Benefits Task Force for modifying UC retiree health and pension benefits. UCPB member James Chalfant served as an at-large member of the UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) and as a member of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force. TFIR Chair Robert Anderson joined several UCPB meetings to discuss TFIR's analyses and recommendations. Randy Scott, Dwaine Duckett, Peter Taylor, and Nathan Brostrom also visited UCPB to present and discuss the preliminary recommendations of the Task Force. In March, UCPB released a Statement on Post-Employment Benefits in which it encourages decision-makers to focus on the fundamental goal of preserving UC excellence and faculty total remuneration rather than cost savings, and calls on the Senate to oppose any proposal for benefits re-design that changes the future accrual of pension benefits for current employees, noting that such a move could spur an exodus of faculty and staff.

SENATE-ADMINISTRATION BUDGET SUMMIT

On March 31, members of UCPB, the Academic Council, and the administration met in Oakland for a budget "summit" hosted by the Provost. The intent was to arrive at a consensus about the budget options on the table and how to manage the crisis. There were presentations from the Budget Office about funding streams, from External Finance about UC's debt programs, and from Human Resources about future post-employment benefits scenarios. Chair Krapp introduced UCPB's *Choices Report*, and the UCFW chair presented UCFW's views on post-employment benefits. Although no decisions were made at the event, discussion continued in a series of monthly follow-up teleconference meetings.

UCFW'S FISCAL CRISIS MITIGATION OPTIONS

In May, the Senate vice chair asked UCPB to collaborate with UCFW on a resolution emphasizing the primary importance of maintaining competitive total remuneration and post-employment benefits for current faculty, and recommending three fiscal crisis mitigation options: downsizing the university by reducing the number of employees, including faculty, through attrition; instituting a moratorium on non-essential construction projects; and requiring Chancellors to identify specific offsetting FTE cuts in other programs when they propose a new academic program. UCPB responded in writing to UCFW, and a UCPB-UCFW subcommittee crafted a joint memo that attempted to synthesize the committees' points of agreement. Although UCFW and UCPB shared similar concerns about a lack of leadership on the budget and a sense that campuses have been unwilling to recognize the seriousness of the crisis and make tough decisions, UCPB opinion was split on calling for a new construction freeze, and that memo failed a UCPB vote; however, the UCFW recommendations ultimately formed the basis of an Academic Council recommendation to the UC Commission on the Future.

INVESTIGATION INTO NON-ACADEMIC FTE AND SALARY GROWTH

Administrative growth at UC over the past decade outpaced both student enrollment growth and faculty headcount. Indeed, ladder rank faculty is the only major group of employees that did not keep pace with student numbers. Given that ladder rank faculty directly carry all three parts of UC's mission, this decline raises questions. UCPB continued its investigation into the growth of academic and non-academic personnel and salaries and the factors driving non-academic

personnel growth. Staff from the Office of Institutional Research (IR) joined UCPB's October and February meetings to present and discuss data on FTE and salary growth between 1997-1998 and 2008-2009, which UCPB had requested to aid its investigation into the expansion of management and executive positions.

In preparing its own analysis of these data, IR focused on the role of hospitals, auxiliaries, and research as the main drivers of employee growth, along with advances in technology requiring a more technically qualified workforce. Yet UCPB notes that the number of non-medical center employees in the MSP category, paid from General Funds, increased by 125% with earnings increased, in constant dollars, by 192%. And far more MSPs were added in the institutional support functional area than in the research area. IR may attribute this increase in MSPs to "increased professionalization of the workplace" - but that is merely a reiteration of the fact that there are more than twice as many senior managers as there used to be. The IR report also did not disaggregate ladder rank faculty from lecturers and instructors. Over the same period, student numbers increased by 33% while ladder rank faculty increased by 25%. UC added 56,178 students but only 1,900 ladder-rank faculty members – a marginal student-faculty ratio of 30:1.

UCPB issued a follow-up request for data on the growth of non-academics and academics over time proportional to a per-patient or per-student ratio. IR communicated its view that these might not be useful metrics unless the salaries and FTEs are restricted to instructional sources. In addition, staff growth in some auxiliaries is not a function of faculty or student growth, and research might contribute to staff hiring. In June, IR began to disaggregate academic employee data; provided a breakout of total salaries and FTE for ladder-rank faculty and lecturers; and salary and FTE data to distinguish SMG, MSP, and PSS administrators working in academic departments. IR reiterated that they see themselves unable to support UCPB's request for campus-level data or data comparing the growth of non-academics and academics over time proportional to a per-student and per-faculty member ratio.

FUNDING STREAMS AND BUDGET "RE-BENCHING"

In November, Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley and Operating Budget Director Michael Clune presented the findings of a comprehensive analysis of UC revenue sources and the process by which the major pieces of State funds, student fees, and other revenues are generated and allocated to the campuses. In July, they updated UCPB about a developing proposal to change the way the campuses and UCOP are funded and to "re-bench" the historical per-student ratio of state funds allocated to campuses general fund allocation formulas, which over time accumulated very significant per-student funding imbalances across the system. UCPB also received regular updates about the "funding streams" and "re-benching" projects from VP Nathan Brostrom and EVP Lawrence Pitts, who asked UCPB to consider principles to guide UCOP's efforts. In July, UCPB submitted a memo to Council recommending principles for the use of revenues from educational fees, non-resident tuition, indirect cost recovery, and the operation and maintenance of the campus physical plant in the General Fund campus allocations, as well as the role of funding for graduate students and line item funding for organized research units. UCPB's memo included advice about the timing of the transition; the distribution of new incremental state funds; the need to establish appropriate weighted formulas that account for doctoral, master's, and undergraduate programs; the danger of establishing new inequities if non-resident enrollment grows disproportionately in the absence of a cap; and the need for transparency and fairness in campus base budget allocation. In July, Council agreed to submit UCPB's Principles to the group that Provost Pitts convenes this fall to discuss "re-benching".

INVESTIGATION INTO UC'S DEBT PROGRAMS

At the October and February meetings, Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor and Executive Director of External Finance Sandra Kim joined UCPB to discuss UC's borrowing programs and their goals for using debt to finance long-term capital assets and short-term projects. Nathan Brostrom joined UCPB in January and May to discuss UC's strategies to enhance debt capacity and efficiency, a new asset management tool for the Short Term Investment Pool, and a long-term initiative to restructure campus financial systems funded through commercial paper. On several occasions, and in the *Choices Report*, UCPB expressed concern that campuses continue to issue more debt to fund construction of dormitories and other buildings at a time when enrollments are not growing. Members encouraged EVP Brostrom to spend time at each campus to learn more about their financial situations. They encouraged UCOP to consider pension obligation bonds as a means to address the unfunded liability of UCRP, and to postpone new capital construction, except at UC Merced, which has a critical need for facilities to attract faculty and students. The committee's view is that even if capital construction is funded through debt or from a non-state source, filling new buildings with activity draws considerably on General Funds, whether by way of utilities and laboratory set-up costs, or salaries and benefits.

DIFFERENTIAL FEES AND NON-RESIDENT TUITION

In October, UCPB recommended that the Senate oppose differential fees by major, citing unanticipated consequences for educational quality, access and diversity, and the public character of UC. The Academic Senate has long opposed any kind of UC stratification and privatization. In January, UCPB expanded on these views in a position paper that makes connections between differential fees by major or by campus, non-resident enrollment, and non-resident tuition (NRT) revenue, which UCPB argues all promote campus stratification. Just as differential campus fees undermine the notion of UC as "one university," NRT has this same effect because individual campuses have unequal capacities to recruit and generate revenue from non-residents. UCPB's view is that financial incentives to campuses to increase non-resident enrollment impose a political cost on the entire system, as well as a financial cost on campuses that are not able to attract as many non-residents, because it shifts resident enrollment and the cost of over-enrollment to other campuses that could see an unexpected spike in yield. UCPB asks UCOP to plan for reducing unfunded enrollment to zero and allowing campuses to maintain capacity by enrolling more non-residents, but suggests that NRT, and by extension any differential revenue, could be centralized and allocated to systemwide priorities, like faculty salaries and the UC Retirement System. The systemwide Senate review of UCPB's paper revealed a consensus against differential fees by campus and major, but the NRT issue was contentious. Chair Krapp withdrew the paper, noting that its agreed-upon sections are covered in the *Choices Report*.

ONLINE EDUCATION

In November, UCPB submitted a memo to Council about the possible expansion of online education at UC, citing a draft prospectus for a proposed systemwide pilot project and the report of the Special Senate Committee on Remote and Online Instruction. This memo also became the basis for a section of the *Choices Report* addressing online instruction. UCPB notes there that remote and online instruction should be evaluated first and foremost for any real increase in the quality of instruction so as to fulfill the university's mission. Pointing to a series of (costly and failed) precedents at other top US universities, UCPB challenges unrealistic assumptions that online instruction could yield budget savings and increase access, or that online environments are comparable to classroom interactions.

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF UC COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE WORKING GROUPS

UCPB submitted responses to the first and second set of UC Commission on the Future recommendations. UCPB Chair Krapp and member Carol Lovatt were members of the Funding Strategies Working Group and briefed UCPB regularly about its deliberations. UCPB also met with UCSC Chancellor George Blumenthal, who was co-chair of the Size and Shape Working Group, Mary Croughan, who co-chaired the Research Strategies Working Group, and Keith Williams, who co-chaired the Education and Curriculum Working Group.

GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH FUNDING

Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steven Beckwith joined the January meeting to discuss graduate student and research funding issues—specifically, UC’s indirect cost recovery (ICR) practices and a draft report from the UC Task Force on Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education (PDPE) documenting how UC is falling short of its graduate education goals. UCPB agreed that faculty should insert themselves more actively into the campus planning process to ensure that each campus sets, and regularly reviews, realistic goals and expectations for graduate education as part of the campus strategic planning process. Again, meaningful ongoing Senate involvement in that local and systemwide planning process is crucial for shared governance to work. – In May, Director of Student Affairs Kate Jeffery briefed UCPB about existing guidelines for the use of graduate student financial support funds, the underlying rationale for the use of systemwide funds, and proposals from the Council of Vice Chancellors for modifying the guidelines to provide more flexibility.

UCPB-UCORP SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIRECT COST RECOVERY

Chair Krapp, Vice Chair Evan Heit, and Warren Gold participated in a UCPB-UCORP subcommittee charged by the Academic Council to update the Senate’s investigations into UC’s indirect cost recovery practices, particularly practices that may hinder UC’s ability to recover the indirect cost of research. The subcommittee met several times over the phone and conferred with Vice President Beckwith and former Senate Chair Mary Croughan. The subcommittee’s [April report](#) concluded that UC is not recovering the full indirect cost of research conducted on the campuses; that current ICR practices are confusing, obscured, cumbersome, and technically challenging; that ICR funds are increasingly important to the UC budget, yet increasingly spread thin and over-committed; and that when UC is unable to recover the true costs of research, it strains other funding sources and the campus community. It recommended clarifying ICR accounting and explanations, renewing efforts to raise UC’s negotiated rates, revisiting UC’s waiver policy, and examining ways to increase efficiencies. Council endorsed the recommendations and forwarded them to the President for adoption.

UCPB-UCORP SUBCOMMITTEE ON DANR REVIEW METRICS

James Chalfant, John Ellwood, and Carol Lovatt were UCPB’s representatives to a joint UCPB-UCORP subcommittee charged by the Academic Council with developing queries to help facilitate critical thinking by the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) about its strategic vision and how to attain it, to help DANR generate a more compelling academic review. In April, the final subcommittee [report](#) recommended additional, more rigorous metrics to guide future academic reviews and the Division’s strategic planning process. Council endorsed these recommendations unanimously.

FACULTY SALARIES SUBCOMMITTEE AND COMPENSATION STEERING COMMITTEE

The Academic Council established in September that the Senate's top budgetary priority should be the restoration of competitive benefits and salaries. Thus in December, the chairs of UCPB, UCAP, and UCFW recommended to the Academic Council that UC examine cost projections on different scenarios for returning salaries to competitiveness based on UC's "Comparison 8" institutions. A joint UCPB-UCAP-UCFW subcommittee met several times between December and May to review data provided by UCOP on the salary lag and the costs associated with restoring competitive salaries. Those data highlight the fact that the current faculty salary scales do not serve UC's merit- or market-based goals to compensate faculty appropriately. The salary scales provide the foundation for UC's system of peer-review, and are therefore a cornerstone of UC's excellence. By allowing the scales to become obsolete, UC has put at risk the very character of the University. The scales lag the market considerably; for instance, UC's base salary for Professor IX, a very senior step many faculty do not achieve, is now below the *average* salary for the Professor rank among the Comparison 8. Actual UC faculty salaries lag considerably behind the Comparison 8—for 2009-10, the average lag is 13.3% for Full Professors, 15.2% for Associate Professors, and 9.2% for Assistant Professors. Chair Krapp, Jim Chalfant, and Brent Haddad represented UCPB on the joint senate subcommittee. – In addition, Donald Senear represented UCPB on a Joint Senate-Administration Compensation Plan Steering Committee, which examined a framework that tries to encourage individual general campus faculty to draw from grant funds to supplement their salaries.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE COMPENDIUM

UCPB agreed that the University should examine all proposals for new programs, schools, and entities not only on the basis of their individual merits, but also in the context of long-term systemwide planning—particularly their impact on FTE and other programs within the campus and across the system, and their ability to address state need and demand. UCPB also believes that the Compendium should prescribe a resource review during campus-level undergraduate program reviews or when a campus wants to add an item to the five-year perspectives.

COMPARISON OF CAMPUS BUDGET ACTIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Most campuses were forced to implement short-term cost saving measures this year that included staff hiring freezes, cancelled faculty searches, and delayed plans for new programs and facilities. UCPB members shared information about the impact of local budget cuts in these areas and on the impact of furloughs. Members also compared thoughts about how faculty on each campus perceived the quantity and quality of information their administration was providing to the campus community about budget cuts and strategies for reducing budget deficits. Members also discussed specific areas on their own campuses that were either losing money or that lacked adequate support from the state or other funding sources, and thus strain campus resources and are unsustainable in the new budget reality. UCPB hopes that such suggestions can help guide partners in the process internally. UCPB continues to be concerned that many campus administrators remain in denial about the seriousness of the UC budget situation.

UC ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK

Vice Provost Dan Greenstein joined the November meeting to discuss the [2009 UC Accountability Report](#), and the online education pilot initiative. Vice Chair Evan Heit was UCPB's representative on the joint Senate-Administration Accountability Advisory Group, which provided guidance to the vice provost about a new rendition of the report. UCPB notes that UC can do a better job of selling its research as a value-added to the state, and could view

the Accountability Framework as a marketing tool. Yet the state tends to fund UC primarily on the basis of undergraduate education and teaching and is more concerned about how to improve efficiencies in undergraduate education than about graduate education and research.

UCPB noted that UC routinely collects such measures as degrees per filled senate faculty FTE, or average student credit hours per instructor; but urged that UC must also look at the ratio of a school's operating base budget to its student credit hours, and at how total school expenditures per faculty FTE, or per student FTE, compare across campus. Although any productivity metric is always merely a proxy, it can be shown, for instance, how enrollment-based revenues (from state funds and student fees) accrue to campuses, and how grants and contracts accrue to the units that are best positioned to benefit from them. UCPB observed that some high-enrollment units on the campuses see little money spent on their research, or on their base budget allocation, to the considerable benefit of certain low-enrollment units with much higher faculty salaries and research expenditures. This tends to be obscured when the Accountability Framework focuses on research expenditures. If one takes seriously what students pay UC, and what the state provides UC per enrollment, then one cannot afford to deny basic facts about enrollment-derived revenues and workloads. Finally, UCPB has long been recommending that OP adopt as a key metric net State funds per enrollment (i.e., net of health sciences, MRUs, and agricultural field stations). Such a metric, "Net State Funding per Budgeted Enrollment," normalized to remove from the numerator State fund allocations to health sciences (different basis, applicable to four general campuses), MRU/MRPIs (which serve a system-wide mission), and Agricultural field stations (historically line-item funded), would also remove health sciences enrollments from the denominator.

UC EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM

In October, UCPB reviewed three proposed budget models for the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) and expressed concern that further cuts would compromise the integrity of EAP's academic mission and threaten the academic viability of the program, although it was also clear to UCPB that UCEAP needed to improve procedures, cut costs, and increase efficiencies, expand its reach, offer more research-oriented exchanges, improve coordination of the study centers, and provide the actual academic services that faculty want internationally. In November, UCPB commented on the final report of the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force on UCEAP, noting strong support for EAP as an essential component of UC's academic program and academic excellence, but recognizing that changing circumstances necessitate thorough review of UC's education abroad programs. UCPB also noted that EAP's future director must continue to be academic administrator who has or can qualify for a tenured faculty position at UC. David Lopez and Jean Bernard Minster served as UCPB's representatives on the UCEAP Governing Committee established by the Provost.

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE ANALYST OFFICE REPORTS

UCPB reviewed two California Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) reports—*The Master Plan at 50: Improving State Oversight of Academic Expansions* and *Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts—Coordinating Higher Education in California*—which call for increasing the state's influence in and control over the development and approval of new programs and schools at UC and CSU. UCPB rejected the LAO's recommendations, noting that a top-down state role in UC's academic mission is an inappropriate intrusion that would send California higher education down a road to mediocrity, and urged the Senate and Administration to oppose any attempt to remove UC's autonomy and constitutional independence.

CONSULTATIONS AND INTERACTIONS WITH UCOP

For the most part, UCPB enjoyed fruitful, informative, candid interactions with UCOP administrators. Vice President for Budget Patrick Lenz joined each meeting to update the committee about budget negotiations in Sacramento, UC Retirement Plan funding, the suspension of bond funding supporting UC construction and research projects; UC's advocacy efforts; and other UC-specific budget matters. Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley and Director of Operating Budget Michael Clune gave thoughtful, informative presentations about the budget allocation process and campus funding model. Randy Scott, Nathan Brostrom, Peter Taylor, and Larry Pitts joined several meetings at UCPB's request to share high level updates and observations about UC's pension obligations and debt programs, contingency scenarios for UC's budget expectations, and a plan to move UC campuses toward common administrative systems and increased strategic sourcing contracts, shared service centers, and e-procurement. Other administrators responded to UCPB requests with timely, informative data. For their part, UCPB members asked thoughtful, probing questions and challenged administrators to do more to communicate UC's chronic under-funding and demonstrate the real consequences of state de-funding on student fees, enrollment, and programs. However, UCPB was not permitted access to all slides from the "Funding Streams" PowerPoint presentation in November, due to concerns about further distribution of the data absent a clear context. UCPB members also were repeatedly frustrated and disappointed with the efforts of the Office of Institutional Research to provide information about FTE growth. UCPB understands and respects the importance of confidentiality, as well as the demands placed on an understaffed UCOP, but believes that having access to accurate and complete data is necessary for UCPB to consult meaningfully with UCOP on the budget. The Senate and administration, as always, should work together to foster understanding.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

In response to requests for comment from the Academic Council, UCPB also issued formal views on the following issues and proposals:

- *Professional Degree Fee Proposals (May)*
- *State Assembly Bill AB 2400 (authorizing selected community college districts to establish baccalaureate degree pilot programs)*
- *Letter from UCORP Appealing COR Cuts*

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2010-11

Vice Chair Heit will leave UCPB to serve as 2010-11 Merced division chair, and James Chalfant and Jean-Bernard Minster will lead UCPB in 2010-11 as chair and vice chair. UCPB will play an active role next year in helping UCOP and the Senate confront difficult choices in terms of both short-term and long-range budget planning resulting from the reduced state funding to UC. UCPB will continue to advocate that UCOP develop a plan addressing short-term possibilities for generating revenue and increasing efficiencies that does not involve salary cuts, a long-term strategy for restructuring the funding model, and a political strategy for restoring the Master Plan. We remain focused on budgetary planning that will maintain the quality of education, research, and service throughout the 10 UC campuses. UCPB will endorse no plan for UCRP that further erodes compensation and benefits for UC faculty, whose total remuneration is already uncompetitive.

UCPB REPRESENTATION

UCPB Chair Krapp represented UCPB at the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, the Provost's Advisory Group for Budget Strategies, and the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues. UCPB Chair Krapp also served on the Academic Planning Council and the Joint Administration-Senate Leadership Group. Vice Chair Evan Heit was UCPB's representative on the joint Senate-Administration Accountability Advisory Group. David Lopez and Jean Bernard Minster served as UCPB's representatives on the UCEAP governing board; Donald Senear represented UCPB on a Joint Senate-Administration Compensation Plan Steering Committee; and James Chalfant represented the Committee on the Post-Employment Benefits Workgroup. Chair Krapp continued to represent UCPB on the Task Force on Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education (PDPE). James Chalfant, John Ellwood, and Carol Lovatt were UCPB's representatives to a joint UCPB-UCORP subcommittee charged by the Academic Council with developing queries to help facilitate critical thinking by the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) about its strategic vision. Chair Krapp, Vice Chair Evan Heit, and Warren Gold participated in a joint UCPB-UCORP subcommittee charged by the Academic Council to update the Senate's investigations into UC's indirect cost recovery practices. Chair Krapp, Jim Chalfant, and Brent Haddad participated in the UCPB-UCAP-UCFW subcommittee charged by the Academic Council to address the widening faculty salary lag.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCPB acknowledges the valuable contributions of the following regular committee consultants and guests: Provost Lawrence Pitts; Vice President for Budget Patrick Lenz; Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom; Vice Provost for Academic Information and Strategic Services Dan Greenstein; Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steven Beckwith; Director of Student Financial Aid Kate Jeffrey; Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor; Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley; Operating Budget Director Michael Clune; Executive Director of External Finance Sandra Kim; Executive Director, HR Strategic Planning & Work Force Development Randy Scott; Chancellor George Blumenthal, co-chair of the Gould Commission's Size and Shape workgroup; former Senate Chair Mary Croughan, co-chair of the Gould Commission's Research Strategies workgroup; Keith Williams, co-chair of the Education and Curriculum Working Group; TFIR Chair Robert Anderson; Director of Institutional Research Kathleen Dettman; and Institutional Research Content Director Rosemary Chengson.

Thanks also to the faculty who served as alternates for regular committee members: Daniel Weiss (UCSF) and Marc Mangel (UCSC).

Respectfully submitted:

Peter Krapp, <i>Chair</i> (UCI)	Evan Heit, <i>Vice Chair</i> (UCM)
James Chalfant (UCD)	Michael Colvin (UCM)
John Ellwood (UCB)	Warren Gold (UCSF)
Brent Haddad (UCSC)	David Lopez (UCLA)
Carol Lovatt (UCR)	Jean-Bernard Minster (UCSD)
Jane Mulfinger (UCSB)	Donald Senear (UCI)
Henry Powell, <i>ex officio</i>	Daniel Simmons, <i>ex officio</i>
Christopher Childers, Undergraduate (UCSD)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst