

ACADEMIC DIVISION LONG RANGE SUMMARIES

Academic Planning Committee

June 12, 2001

Introduction

The Academic Planning Committee¹ (APC) was asked by Campus Provost Simpson in his letter of March 26, 2001 to provide written comments on the plans and proposals included in the divisional summaries. The committee was asked for comments on (1) the overall quality of the plans relative to the articulated campus goals; (2) the extent to which individual plans address the specific goals formulated for the academic plans;² and (3) the synergies and opportunities for collaboration among divisions.

Methodology

In one four-hour meeting held on April 10, 2001, the divisional deans each presented a synopsis of their respective divisional summaries. Owing to schedule constraints, there was insufficient time to critically examine the proposals. In a one hour special meeting held on May 15, the APC discussed in some detail the goals presented in appendix A; and on May 22, in a four-hour joint meeting between the Provost's Advisory Council, the Academic Planning Committee, and the Academic Support Planning Committee, the divisional summaries were discussed in further detail.

General Issues: Campus Goals

In its May 15 meeting, the APC discussed issues relevant to all of the divisional summaries. There was a general consensus on the following *Campus Goals*:

1. Managing enrollment growth necessary to accommodate 5,200 new student FTE between now and 2010. There are three general comments that can be made about enrollment growth management:

1. The campus is enrolling about seven hundred new students each year. At this rate the campus will have reached its fall-winter-spring on-campus target of 13,000 undergraduate students with the entering class of 2003-2004. By 2004-2005, the campus will have reached its LRDP limit of 15,000 on-campus students.
2. At a faculty-student ratio of approximately 18:1, this growth rate will require the recruitment of about 40 new faculty per year, plus an approximately equal number of faculty replacements arising from separations and retirements. This is probably well beyond the institution's capacity to hire, let alone provide the necessary housing, start-up funding, and office and laboratory/studio space. As a consequence,

¹ The APC comprises the five academic deans; the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; the Dean of Graduate Studies; the Dean of Undergraduate Education; the Vice Chancellor for Research; and representatives from the following academic senate committees: the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Educational Policy; the Committee on Research; and the Graduate Council.

² Campus and specific goals are presented in Appendix A.

managing enrollment growth will undoubtedly require substantially greater temporary academic staffing than has been historically the case.

3. The most rapid enrollment growth is taking place in the Engineering, Social Sciences, and Arts Divisions. Enrollments in the Natural Sciences and in the Humanities Divisions are relatively static. This imbalance must be addressed in, among other places, our admissions and outreach strategies.

2. Strengthening UCSC's position as a major research university. This campus goal will be achieved by attracting the most distinguished senior faculty, and the most promising junior faculty, to UCSC. Strategies for accomplishing this goal will obviously be discipline dependent. In all cases, however, excellence in hiring will be contingent upon the committed leadership of the hiring departments and divisions.

3. Doubling UCSC's Graduate enrollments: The campus goal of doubling graduate enrollments needs further critical examination and elaboration. In a thoughtful note,³ former Acting Graduate Dean Gill argued that an appropriate Ph. D. program should comprise 10% of the total student body, a number consistent with other UC campuses at the time. Additional graduate enrollments would arise in professional master's degree programs, established for entirely different academic purposes. APC members seriously questioned whether a campus of 15,000 on-site students could support major professional degree programs of a magnitude that would bring the overall graduate program up to 20% (3,000 students). Based on long-range graduate enrollment growth plans derived from division proposals, a projected 750 new graduate students will be derived from five areas:

Engineering (MS/Ph.D.)
Education MA/MAS/Ph.D.
Environmental Studies MES
Community Studies MA
Digital Arts (est.) MFA/PHD

This growth added to the current 1,100 graduate students will bring enrollment to 1,850, 12% of the proposed 15,000 on-site total campus enrollments and does not include enrollment projections from the 25 other preliminary graduate proposals.

This matter deserves further thoughtful discussion. In this regard, reference to Appendix E, UC Comparative Graduate Student FTE, should be helpful.

4. Increasing contract and grant support two-fold: The priority placed upon this goal will markedly affect campus resource allocation. Two points are relevant here. Historically, and across the UC campuses, the bulk of overhead-generating contracts and grants are awarded to the sciences and engineering. Within these units, a substantial increase in contract and grant funding will necessarily arise from the formation of new institutes as exemplified by the Center for Adaptive Optics and the Ca-ISI institutes. Such institutes will require substantial initial investments in space and faculty startup funds.

5. Enhancing quality at the undergraduate and graduate levels, promoting innovation, and enhancing access for the diverse population that comprises today's California: The

³ James Gill, Appendix B, 2005 Report. This article is also reproduced as Appendix D of this report.

first of these campus goals, quality at the undergraduate and graduate levels, is most relevant to academic planning. Here the APC agreed that the campus culture and tradition must shift. UC Santa Cruz has always been known, and should continue to be known, for its commitment to undergraduate education, despite increasing student-faculty ratios and diminishing state support. The campus culture has been more one of ‘protecting’ the undergraduate program from the depredations arising from new graduate programs. The new paradigm must be one of harnessing the talent arising from new graduate programs, so that new (and existing) graduate programs actually *enhance* the quality of the undergraduate program. Here, UCSC can provide some major innovations, such as creating prestigious teaching fellows among the cohort of most talented graduate students who have advanced to candidacy. Many similar innovations are possible, as the campus matures.

General Issues: Academic Goals

In addition to the *Campus Goals*, the APC discussed the eight *academic goals* upon which the academic plans will be reviewed. The APC comments on goals 1, 2, and 4 were given in the preceding section.

1. *Strengthening research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction.* See *Campus Goal #2*, above.

2. *Markedly increasing graduate programs and enrollments.* See *Campus Goal #3*, above.

3. *Developing interdisciplinary programs at all levels.* Interdisciplinary programs have been a hallmark of the UCSC campus since its founding. Such programs were a natural consequence of the early college system, in which all faculty held appointments jointly with their discipline (Board of Studies) and their college. This administrative structure proved unworkable, and was dissolved in the 1979 reorganization.⁴

It is the considered opinion of the APC that a high priority attaches to the removal of administrative barriers to interdisciplinary research, graduate programs, and undergraduate programs. This being said, interdisciplinarity should not be taken as a goal in itself, since it suggests that lesser importance attaches to excellence within disciplines.

4. *Markedly increasing external support, from grant/contract as well as private fundraising.* See *Campus Goal #4*, above.

5. *Creativity in combining present resources with new resources.* Owing to time constraints, this goal was not discussed.

6. *Innovative programming in non-traditional areas, including the Silicon Valley Center, state-funded summer session, and other off-campus enterprises (e.g. distance learning, EAP, UC-DC, others).* The APC is well aware that all campuses of the University of

⁴ See, e.g. Robert Sinsheimer, **Strands of a Life: The Science of DNA and the Art of Education**. University of California Press, 1994.

California are being asked to enroll significant numbers of students through non-traditional means that do not count against the Long Range Development Plan ceilings. Each of the possible modes of instruction has its own set of challenges, which are the subject of intense analysis and debate. Members of the APC agreed that the most cost-effective and substantial program would be state-funded summer instruction, for obvious reasons. Instruction at the Silicon Valley Center and at UC-DC will be significantly more costly than on-campus traditional instruction, and detailed financial analysis should inform these programs well in advance of their serious proposal.

7. Enhancing faculty, staff, and student diversity. The APC concurs that academic units should set overall goals for diversity, and should be held accountable for those goals as growth funding is awarded.

8. Proposing accountability measures. The APC concurs that academic units should set accountability measures early in the proposal development process, and that the APC should be given an early opportunity to comment on those goals.

General Issues: Undergraduate Education

Many members of the APC felt that the health and the excellence of the undergraduate program was conspicuously lacking in the eight academic plan goals. In a written communication,⁵ the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy expressed its specific concerns about the pursuit of the eight academic goals absent a careful consideration of the undergraduate program.

General Issues: Next Steps

Divisions are asking for clear criticisms of the executive summaries to facilitate revisions and inform faculty. Department faculty and deans are embedded in their planning details and will benefit from external feedback. Identifying questions, omissions, and other comments is beneficial, and thoughtful dialogue will build better campus understanding of planning goals. Interdivisional collaboration is strong and must continue to guarantee successful programmatic outcomes. Administrative feedback on program priorities and resource realities will help faculty prioritize the wealth of new programs.

Expanding the academic senate role in the planning process to include comprehensive dialogue and feedback to faculty is recommended. The committees on Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, Graduate Council, and Research are the most expert faculty bodies to offer sophisticated, detailed, programmatic advice. The Academic Planning Committee recommends that substantial discussions between the deans and the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Graduate Council, and the Committee on Research will advance the plans to the next level. The format of discussions must avoid any perception of final decisions, and promote informal candor. The meetings should be modeled after department external review closure meetings, with discussion targeted to the highest priority issues. Productive dialogue will provide faculty with issues they can be responsive to in completing comprehensive plans.

⁵ CEP Chair Freeman to VPAA Brown, May 17, 2001.

APC recommends that a subset of these senate committees meet with deans and key administrators over the summer.

Specific Issues: All Academic Divisions

Many of the program proposals are interdisciplinary in nature and offer a number of opportunities for collaboration. The comprehensive plans will benefit from a discussion of the overlap and how they contribute to each other. Articulate the range of differences among potentially overlapping fields and specific areas proposed for faculty recruitment. Overlapping themes in (but not limited to) environment, health, technology and policy should be clarified. What are the divisions' strategies for pursuing interdisciplinary collaborations? How can Human Health be organized with Health Sciences? How can Natural Sciences and Social Sciences environment themes complement without duplication? Are Public Humanities and Social Policy and Public Advocacy related? What are the interdisciplinary connections in Engineering Management?

What is the phasing planned for new graduate programs? In what ways will they enhance the undergraduate interests and faculty scholarly agendas? How does graduate program growth affect the division's space needs? Which programs are critical to the disciplines, and which are interesting but not absolutely critical? What are the implications to the disciplines if one or more new graduate programs are not pursued?

Arts and Humanities organization at other UC campuses is very fluid. At UCSC, the Arts and Humanities division was once combined. Larger campuses include the Social Sciences in a school of Arts and Letters. Is the current division administrative structure the best to accommodate the disciplines and facilitate new programs? How does this structure avoid program duplication, and support interdisciplinary collaborations?

Do the Division of Natural Sciences and School of Engineering plan ties with the new California Institutes for Science and Innovation? Resource leveraging, potential for enhancing professional connections, and other advantages are likely if connections are pursued. What collaborations are considered between the division and school to best position UCSC in these fields? Are there opportunities for Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences?

How are the proposed programs attractive to diverse student populations? What are the divisional strategies for collaborating with Student Affairs regarding increasing student diversity?

Divisions are asked to describe the interplay between enrollment management and plans to maintain and strengthen program quality. What is each division's capacity for a targeted number of majors based on intellectual quality? What are the divisions' positions on their most appropriate share of campus enrollments? How can historical disciplines be best balanced with current student demand?

Can distance learning or web based instruction contribute to meeting student demand and help implement programs at the Silicon Valley Center? What impact might that have on

campus instructional technology infrastructure? What instructional technology enhancements are needed to support on campus enrollment growth and new programs?

Divisions are asked to provide comprehensive analysis of potential summer quarter plans and how summer curriculum can be useful for students. Will the summer plans shift enrollment from the conventional academic year or introduce separate components?

What is each division's leadership role in outreach to K-12 and community colleges? How do the divisions support public school instructors as they develop curriculum preparing future UC students? What does the Arts division plan to support public school instructors as they develop arts curriculum to meet the new G requirement? Do these issues affect all division plans for hiring new faculty?

What are the space impacts of division plans? How does space capacity influence program priorities and timing? All divisions should provide student, faculty, and staff numbers for the entire ten year planning period and provide a business model describing how program growth will drive enrollment growth and at what student levels.

Specific Issues: Division of the Arts

The Executive Summary of the Arts Division Academic plan expressed an excellent description of the discipline's intellectual vision and its development of instructional and research programs. Summer instruction and participation at the Silicon Valley Center are well thought out. The preliminary planning enhances program quality while responding to campus goals.

Can faculty FTE appointments analogous to clinical appointments be considered? Examples include faculty who can contribute to specialized instruction and qualified practicing professionals. Arts might broaden its fields by increasing affiliations with professionals while retaining resource flexibility.

The division should present research on what mix of university funding for Arts graduate students is most appropriate.

Has an architecture or design program been considered?

The Film and Digital Media Department might be an appropriate area for potential professional school development. Has the division considered this? If Film and Digital Media were developed into a professional school, what student-faculty ratio would the division need to support the remaining curriculum? If a school were to emerge, would it make sense to align the remaining arts areas more closely with humanities? What is the division plan to develop departments with slower enrollment growth, and how is this related to the constituencies they serve?

The campus attracts non-major arts students who have difficulty accessing studio courses. Concurrently, the University of California has added a high school "G" arts admissions requirement. How can the division accommodate this student interest? Is there

consideration of developing a minor? To what extent can non-majors be accommodated in summer quarter? At the Silicon Valley?

Specific Issues: School of Engineering

Engineering's instructional goals include the education of engineering professionals in strong demand from private industry. School participation at the Silicon Valley Center might be expected to be strong, particularly as a base for internships and research enhancement. When does the school plan to begin SVC instructional programs? How will SVC programs be phased?

How does the Engineering upper range of 140 faculty FTE affect the discipline's critical needs? How does this size compare with nationwide Engineering Schools relative to the specific disciplines UCSC plans to focus on? Can the division produce quality research programs at the intermediate FTE level? Can faculty hiring, and its associated high start-up costs, be staggered to spread the resource impact? How can the School leverage high external research productivity with undergraduate enrollment demands?

Specific Issues: Division of Humanities

The Division of Humanities proposes new programs to increase enrollments and consolidate division strengths. Identification of the role of humanities in corporate and public organizations is the basis for new master's level and doctoral programs.

What are the department strategies for increasing workload ratios and graduate student support? How do they integrate with promising intellectual developments? Humanities is asked to provide a fuller discussion of the interrelationship between the division's overarching vision and the departments goals.

Are the more applied programs (Public Humanities, Human Health, Science, Medicine and Technology) appropriate for a professional school structure? Could they be combined with policy initiatives from the Social Sciences?

Humanities is asked to provide student demand analysis for the proposed programs.

Specific Issues: Division of Natural Sciences

The Natural Sciences Division planning focuses on managing campus enrollment growth and increasing external funding through contracts and grants. The division's mature complement of doctoral programs and research enterprises positions it well to launch the proposed new undergraduate majors.

Natural Sciences enrollments have leveled off since the mid 1990's. The division is asked to provide enrollment trend analysis and proposed enrollment targets. How do Natural Sciences enrollment trends at other UC's inform the division's planning?

Faculty start-up costs, effective overhead rates, and graduate program competitiveness should be discussed in terms of the Division's faculty recruitment and research goals.

Can the Health Sciences proposal link with UC San Francisco's medical school or other professional public health schools? A multiple institution consortium is likely to have a powerful attraction for external funding.

How do previously funded initiatives fit within Natural Science proposed new programs? How does the forward funded Institute for Geophysics and Planetary Physics (IGPP) initiative overlap with current divisional themes?

Specific Issues: Division of Social Sciences

The Division of Social Sciences plans are focused on enrollment pressures integrated with interdisciplinary intellectual themes. Heavy undergraduate student demand is projected to continue throughout the campus-planning period.

Are professional schools, particularly in Education, under consideration? New programs in policy and engineering management appear feasible for the Silicon Valley Center. The Division is asked to describe their potential. Would a small management program be a useful component to many programs outside Social Sciences?

Attest:

George Brown, Vice Provost
Chair, Academic Planning Committee

Appendix A

Planning Goals and Review Criteria

Campus Goals

- Managing enrollment growth necessary to accommodate 5,200 new student FTE between now and 2010.
- Strengthening UCSC's position as a major research university.
- Doubling UCSC's graduate enrollments.
- Increasing contract and grant support two-fold.
- Enhancing quality at the undergraduate and graduate levels, promoting innovation, and enhancing access for the diverse population that comprises today's California.

Academic Plans will be reviewed based on goals of:

1. Strengthening research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction;
2. Markedly increasing graduate programs and enrollments;
3. Developing interdisciplinary programs at all academic levels;
4. Markedly increasing external support, from grant/contract as well as private fundraising;
5. Creativity in combining present resources with new resources;
6. Innovative programming in non-traditional areas, including the Silicon Valley Center, state-funded summer session, and other off-campus enterprises (e.g., distance learning, EAP, UCDC, others);
7. Enhancing faculty, staff and student diversity; and
8. Proposing accountability measures

Academic Support plans will be reviewed based on goals of:

1. Enhancing overall institutional excellence;
2. Providing the administrative and physical infrastructure needed to achieve the academic goals;
3. Accommodating campus growth, for expanded academic as well as academic support enterprises;
4. Increasing efficiency and effectiveness in campus activities;
5. Creativity in combining present resources with new resources;
6. Innovative academic support programming in non-traditional areas, including the Silicon Valley Center, state-funded summer session, and other off-campus enterprises (e.g., distance learning, EAP, UCDC, others);
7. Enhancing campus diversity; and
8. Proposing accountability measures

Appendix B

Summer Session Proposals

<http://planning.ucsc.edu/pac/Topics/Plans2001/Plans2001Excerpts-summer-010315.pdf>

Appendix C

Silicon Valley Center Proposals

<http://planning.ucsc.edu/pac/Topics/Plans2001/Plans2001Excerpts-SVCenter-010315.pdf>

Appendix D

Academic Planning to 2005

(attached)

Appendix E

UC Comparative Graduate Student FTE

(attached)