In her opening remarks in the fall of 2001 at the annual Chancellor's convocation, UC Santa Cruz Chancellor M.R.C. Greenwood reaffirmed and extended the educational objectives articulated in the 1998 report of the Millennium Committee. She gave particular attention in her remarks to three of these objectives:

1. “Continue our distinction as the finest public research university in the nation for undergraduate education and emphasize the research aspect of our role.
2. Enhance an intellectual environment that attracts and inspires the best faculty and also attracts first-rate graduate students and postdoctoral fellows who will comprise the next generation of academic leaders.
3. Strengthen our culture of diversity, creativity and discovery”.

Stressing her strong endorsement of the Academic Senate’s call for the campus to promote actively significant graduate program growth over the coming decade, the Chancellor emphasized, "Vigorous research activities are integral to developing a quality graduate program. And a mature graduate program is essential to the quality of undergraduate education, which is enhanced by the work of inspiring young scholars in the undergraduate classrooms and laboratories.”

This address and the Millennium Committee Report launched a formal strategic planning process that has brought together all campus stakeholders to translate into concrete institutional programs the report’s collective vision of this University’s future role in serving California, the nation, and the world. In this essay we first describe this current planning process and highlight the collective decisions we have made with respect to what UC Santa Cruz will strive to become over the next two decades. We then present some outcomes of our planning process to date with respect to academic program development and highlight concrete ways in which we are integrating our investments in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources in order to support these programs. We pay particular attention in the last section of this essay to examining how the current budgetary exigencies are pushing our institution to seek new, more sustainable avenues of support, rather than relying on the ever-diminishing funds provided by the State of California.

STRATEGIC PLANNING – THE ROADMAP

The strategic planning process of the past five years is best understood as an overlapping five-phase process involving the work of more than fifty committees and hundreds of faculty, students, staff and administrators. The following provides a brief summary of their work.

Phase 1: Articulation of Core Values and Shared Vision. The 1998 Report of the Millennium Committee resulted in 113 “calls to action” that were assigned to appropriate senior administrative officers or the Academic Senate. One result of this process was that the Senate requested the creation of four new senior administrative positions to implement the recommendations: (1) a full-time Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education; (2) a full-time Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Studies; (3) a full-time Vice Chancellor for Research; and (4) a

---

1 As part of the campus’ budget reductions, the research and graduate studies position has been
full-time Vice Provost of Academic Affairs. More recently, a Vice Provost for Information Technology has been added to the senior administration (see below). In addition, the Campus Provost initiated a two-year process that sought to identify new programmatic ideas from faculty groups, deans, and other senior administrative officers. The Provost's initiative marked the beginning of a major transition from a mainly-workload-driven resource allocation formula (“Managing Faculty Resources”) to a budgetary process giving greater emphasis to qualitative and programmatic goals.

**Phase 2: Development of Detailed Long Range Academic Plans.** Traditionally, much campus planning was done at the departmental and divisional levels and was, to some degree, myopic. Units periodically submitted and annually updated ‘six-year plans’ that focused primarily on short-term resource requests. These plans typically did not look very far into the future, nor did they reflect a shared vision for campus development.

In contrast, the Campus Provost's two-year initiative, developed in consultation with the Academic Senate and articulated in the Fall of 2002 in a major position paper, “Planning for the UC Santa Cruz of 2010,” formulated criteria for evaluating departmental, divisional, and other program proposals based on eight campus-wide priorities:

- Strengthen research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction.
- Markedly increase graduate programs and enrollments.
- Develop interdisciplinary programs at all academic levels.
- Enhance faculty, staff and student diversity.
- Markedly increase external support, from grants and contracts as well as from private fundraising.
- Creatively combine present resources with new resources.
- Develop innovative programming in non-traditional areas (e.g., Silicon Valley Center, State-supported summer instruction, and other off-campus enterprises such as EAP, UC in DC).
- Propose accountability measures.

This phase of the planning process also resulted in increased attention to the development of leadership throughout the campus, in particular the strengthening of the roles of vice provosts, vice chancellors, deans, college provosts and departmental chairs. Also, it is resulting in new departmental review processes. These will provide more focus on assessing undergraduate learning and the development of new graduate programs and large research initiatives and cross disciplinary research initiatives. The new processes are intended to help shift the culture to one of shared responsibility for program and resource development, and accountability. This is discussed in greater detail in the final essay.

The campus continued during this phase to invest in partnerships to leverage state and regional resources, among them the California Digital Library, the Monterey Bay Crescent, (a formal association of the many research institutions that ring Monterey Bay), several multi-campus research centers and research units, and several Cal-ISI projects. UCSC also began negotiation with NASA that recently has led to the establishment of a $330 million research partnership with NASA Ames. Currently the campus is examining the possibility of an acquisition of the Monterey Institute for International Studies (MIIS).

**Phase 3: Implementing the Academic Plan in the Context of Budget Cuts.** As the campus began to move forward during the Fall and Winter of 2002-03 to implement many of the recommendations
resulting from the planning process, the extent of the California and UC budget crisis became clear. That crisis required the campus to reconcile contradictory imperatives (e.g. accommodating increasing enrollment demand, delivering a quality education, achieving our goals for graduate education, fulfilling our research mission, attracting and retaining the best faculty and staff, and investing selectively in the opportunities that will shape our future) while operating on a reduced budget.

The administration responded by launching what is known as the EBC (Executive Budget Committee) process. This process, facilitated by a professional consulting firm, has been working with faculty, students, staff and administrators to find ways to make campus operations and service delivery more cost-effective and efficient, and to develop improved mechanisms for aligning resource allocation with campus goals and priorities. It is also examining the cost-effectiveness of various academic and instructional programs (e.g. our current academic advising systems) and of campus governance procedures.

**Phase 4: Infrastructure and Long-Range Physical Planning.** This part of the planning process, along with that described below (step 5 – development and communication) is referred to as the “Framework for the Future”. The campus is developing a long-range framework for the physical development that will be required to support the long-range academic plans. This planning is crucial to the future of UC Santa Cruz, as the decisions we make now will shape the physical and accordingly the academic character of the campus for decades to come. Three separate committees are working as part of this planning phase. These include the (1) Growth and Stewardship Task Force which has established the principles for addressing growth within the context of campus values; (2) Strategic Futures Committee which is identifying the range of potential academic and research programs that might be considered between now and 2020 and providing insight into the land resources that should be reserved for future campus development beyond 2020; and (3) the Long-Range Development Planning (LRDP) Committee which is working on a revision of the 1988 campus long range development plan, a formal planning document that will be vetted by the campus, the office of the UC President and the local community. One of the biggest decisions that will be made in this plan will be the campus’s enrollment target for 2020, and how that enrollment will be distributed among undergraduate, graduate, and professional sectors.

**Phase 5: Communications and Development.** Good communication has been key throughout this extensive strategic planning process, and the campus realizes that a strong communications system is critical to the campus’ future success. The effectiveness with which we present our messages is an important factor in our ability to attract excellent students, faculty, and staff, as well as enhance significantly our private support.

With the help of Lipman Hearne Inc. (a marketing and communications firm specializing in higher education), the campus has just completed developing a “Strategic Communications Plan” that is currently being vetted throughout the campus. This report identifies a number of concrete actions that will raise awareness of the campus’ goals, programs, and accomplishments, and secure support from a wide array of constituents who will want to invest intellectually and financially as partners in UC Santa Cruz’ next stage of development.

**DECISIONS RESULTING FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING**

The remainder of this essay cannot possibly cover all of the concrete actions presently being taken as a consequence of the planning process described above, but we do offer a glimpse of some of the major developments in (1) academic programs; (2) growth and diversification of our faculty and staff; (3) building programs; and (4) information resources (library and information technology).

**New Academic Programs for the 21st Century UC Santa Cruz**

The ten-year academic plans that were provided by the chief academic officers as part of the planning process described above provided a plethora of proposals for the development of new or expanded
academic programs that would meet the needs of current and future undergraduate and graduate students. Even prior to today’s California budget crisis, the funds required to implement all the new program ideas exceeded budget reality by a factor of about ten to one. To determine which of these programs would be allowed to evolve, the campus underwent an extensive budget process that involved the academic senate, faculty/staff and student committees as well as administrative committees. Summaries of the budget process and decisions are located at http://www.ucsc.edu/news_events/messages/02-03/01-13.evc_budget.html.

There are many ways that we might describe and aggregate the successful programmatic proposals, but here we will focus on the ways in which particular groupings of programs address the criteria articulated in “Planning for the UC Santa Cruz of 2010”. Many of the most promising ideas in the draft plans share common characteristics. These include: the intersection of new scholarly directions and new technologies; public service and knowledge and policy issues; interdisciplinary programs; and programs that address local issues, global/international issues, or both.

The first common area of overlap is the intersection of new scholarly directions and new technologies. As noted in several plans, the campus is ideally situated to develop these programs both on-campus and at off-campus sites. For example, the proposal for a Masters Degree in Fine Arts in Digital Arts and New Media links to the School of Engineering. The campus is encouraging the collaboration of engineering and the natural sciences via the proposed Applied Physics Degree Program, linking the physics curriculum with engineering preparation, and joint research initiatives such as remote sensing involving Engineering, Environmental Studies, and Earth and Marine Sciences. The expanding Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics (IGPP) provides another example of how building on current interdisciplinary strengths can make significant educational and research contributions to the campus. The recent multi-UC campus QB3 and CITRIS awards will provide new opportunities for research collaboration for faculty across many disciplines. The proposed Science, Medicine and Technology Studies program and the Anthropology of Technology emphasis also chart new areas of scholarship that are being created at the intersection of existing divisions and departments. As focused discussion among the divisions continues, refinements of specific program proposals should show how advantages can be maximized and, where possible, linked.

The second set of common areas of overlap will enable a campus-wide integration of research and training with public service, knowledge and policy topics. Our society has a need for faculty who draw on their academic training to contribute to broader public discussions. The importance of the contribution that faculty can make in this arena requires moving beyond the traditional academic conceptualization of “theory” and “practice” as mutually exclusive domains. Some UCSC departments are already engaged in this kind of work. The Division of Social Sciences' new Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community provides an exemplar of how a clear vision and strong research agenda can be developed within and across disciplines. Similarly, proposals for the Integrative Coastal Ecology research program, the Masters in Environmental Studies, the Masters in Public Humanities, and the Education Ed.D. for practicing educators all reflect an interest in linking new research with informed public activism. This consistent emphasis builds on previous campus strengths and should instigate both broader discussion and fuller refinement in many disciplinary areas.

The third area of emphasis is interdisciplinary activities. The proposals show the potential of building on emerging intellectual interests among faculty across traditional academic boundaries to create strong new programs. Some examples of proposals that illustrate the promise of interdisciplinary programs are the Ph.D. program in Visual and Performance Studies, the program in Health Sciences, the Engineering Management program (Engineering with Economics and Psychology), and the Ph.D. program in Comparative U.S. Studies. Within the Division of Social Sciences, examples such as the Center for Conservation Science and Policy and the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems show a commitment to tie new departmental faculty lines to building on the existing strengths in the division’s seven
research centers. These proposals suggest a creative use of existing and new resources toward added excellence and new intellectual directions. Individuals involved in planning new programs are encouraged to delineate explicitly the connections between new and extant strengths both in research and in the curriculum. The range of ideas proffered in the draft plans is most encouraging.

The fourth area of interesting new developments is the range of programs with a global view. Among the many proposals put forward, a number explore the global context in which we now live, and others examine how current configurations of power, resources, and other aspects of the modern world play out in a locality, sometimes in our own region. If appropriately developed, these approaches will link existing programmatic strength such as Community Studies and CGIRS with new initiatives ranging from a major in Health Sciences (as well as the proposed major in Human Health—a collaborative effort by the Divisions of Humanities, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences) to the Honors Minor in Global Studies or the undergraduate and masters major in the Liberal Arts. The expansion of existing programs like International Economics also fits here.

Similarly, the endowed programmatic emphases in South Asian music links with the Humanities Division’s plans for a South Asian Studies Center, a center in which Social Sciences units will also be involved. The Pacific Rim Roundtable for Technology and Society is another promising direction of academic programming, with the capacity to bring together an interest in global concerns with a focus on how those play out in a locality. The proposed Humanities doctoral program in Global Studies, for example, explicitly takes its shape from the collaborations between campus scholars and scholars outside the U.S. Finally, the consistent inter-divisional emphasis in each of these areas suggests that further cross-disciplinary work will be most useful.

Growth and diversification of faculty and staff.

Faculty Diversification. Concomitant with the nearly 50% growth in student enrollments at UC Santa Cruz since our last WASC review, the campus has increased its faculty and staff proportionately. Even considering the very high cost of living in the Santa Cruz geographic area, we have been highly successful at recruiting our top candidates in nearly all searches and we have an overall faculty retention rate of about 97%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty number</th>
<th>1993-04</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent women</td>
<td>29% (125)</td>
<td>35% (184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent minority</td>
<td>21% (89)</td>
<td>24% (125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we recruited our faculty and staff, the institution placed a very high priority on increasing its underrepresented minorities, and to assure that women were well represented in both pools. One of the aims of introducing diversity into the curriculum has been to signal prospective faculty members and to remind departments that the campus is open to and supportive of diversity. A representative curriculum is prerequisite to attracting a diverse faculty, especially in this post-Proposition-209 era.

In any recruitment of academic staff and faculty, search pools must reflect the proportion of minority and women available for positions. As a consequence of these policies and procedures, and the curricular reform initiatives described above, we have significantly increased both our proportion of minorities and women in our faculty ranks over the last ten years. Currently, we have the distinction of having the most ethnically diverse faculty and the highest proportion of women ladder faculty of all UC campuses.

Over the past 20 years, the campus’s greatest success in terms of faculty diversification has been in the hiring of women. One third of the campus's present ladder faculty members are women, although the numbers are spread unevenly over the campus' academic departments. Since 1990, over 40% of the ladder faculty hired have been women. Most of these women, however, are still assistant and associate professors. Somewhat less than a quarter of the full professors are women, meaning that the campus has fewer senior women than would be desirable to draw on for positions of academic leadership. But, as the large cadre of assistant and associate professors steadily advance in rank over the next decade, the campus will have an increasingly rich pool of senior women scholars from which to draw department
chairs, Academic Senate leadership, and major academic administrators.

The campus has also made significant, if uneven, progress over the past two decades in the hiring of ethnic minority scholars. Of the new faculty hired since 1990, 30% are listed in campus records as ‘minority’ faculty. Of the current ladder faculty, 22% are listed as minority faculty. It must be noted that most of these faculty are relatively junior – 35% are assistant professors, 27% associate professors, and only 12% full professors. The campus must thus make a major effort to help junior faculty gain tenure and move into the rank of full professor and into positions of campus leadership. It should also be noted that the greatest progress to date has been in the hiring of Asian faculty (that is, both Asian-Americans and Asian nationals), who constitute half of the minority faculty (about ten percent of the total campus faculty). Hispanic faculty, about thirty in number, constitute about seven percent of the ladder faculty and African American faculty about four percent. Only three ladder faculty are listed as American Indian.

We credit the Campus Curriculum Initiative (CCI) for much of our success in recruiting and retaining new minority faculty. In May 1999, Provost Simpson announced a plan to fund eight ladder faculty FTE aimed “at defining a curriculum that deals with present-day societal issues related to gender, ethnicity, and culture” and that positioned the campus to respond creatively to the challenges presented by an increasingly diverse student body and an increasingly diverse state population. In response, individual faculty and faculty clusters submitted nearly fifty curricular proposals. After a broad consultation process, in part underwritten by the Hewlett Foundation, conference participants and a six-faculty CCI committee recommended using these eight new faculty positions, augmented by eight ‘matching’ positions contributed by divisional deans, to support two academic program themes: (1) Indigeneity, Diaspora, and Comparative Culture and (2) Studies in Difference, Justice, and Citizenship. These programs are discussed in greater detail in the Case Study: Diversifying the Curriculum. This initiative has resulted in ladder faculty appointments in nine departments in three academic divisions. The initiative caught the attention of UC President Atkinson who forwarded a description of CCI to Chancellors at our sister UC campuses extolling UCSC’s creativity and effectiveness in fostering curricular diversity.

**Staff Recruitment, Retention and Diversity.** Even though the campus has worked diligently to recruit and retain talented staff who reflect the diversity of our state’s employee pool, we have not been as successful as we wish to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Staff</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data reveal that even though our career staff increased by about 40% since our last WASC review, we have not been able to increase significantly our pool of minority career staff. Comparisons with other UC campuses reveal that we rank last with respect to the percentage of minorities we employ and close to the median in terms of the percent women in our staff. This ranking is likely a direct reflection of the demographics of our community, which has a significantly lower minority population (in percentage and numbers) of any other community in which a UC campus is located. However, we have pockets of localized success. The Division of Student Affairs, for example, has increased its minority staff pool by six percent during this period. The campus is examining such successes for best practices that may be applied to other divisions.

We do know that both the recruitment and retention of talented staff, be they minorities, non-minorities, males or females, is highly affected by the career development and advancement opportunities made available to them. As a consequence, we have developed a Training & Development Department in Staff Human Resources, with the strategic goal to provide skill-training necessary to build a strong and sustainable workforce for the campus. This department delivers approximately 200 courses to over 1200 participants per year. In the fall of 2003 these courses will include: Supervisory Development, Strategic Thinking & Problem Solving, Situational Leadership, Leading in a
Climate of Change, Performance Management, Correcting Performance Problems, Communicating for Success, Effective Presentation Skills, and the Masterful Trainer. In addition many technical training workshops will be offered to enhance the IT competence of staff and to develop the competencies required to successfully create and lead the campus into our new business paradigm.

**Development of new physical infrastructure.** The dramatic enrollment growth and program expansion that UCSC has experienced since its last WASC review has been made possible in part by a massive capital building program that has brought a multitude of new buildings that serve the educational and research needs of academic programs, buildings that help build and support partnerships in our local and adjacent geographic region, and housing to help meet the needs of both our students and our faculty. In less than ten years we have built nearly 850,000 assignable square feet of new space funded by about $580 million of financial support, about 50% from state resources and 50% from private funds. Our next five-year building schedule should bring on another $225 million of new state-funded buildings.

Some of the largest projects include the (1) new Arts Complex which in total added about 30 million dollars of new studio, performance, classroom and office space to the Arts and space for the new Film and digital media program; (2) two new Social Sciences buildings and additional space in the new engineering building to accommodate the rapidly expanding programs of the social sciences; (3) the renovation of one building to accommodate the new Baskin School of Engineering and the construction of two new engineering buildings (>$90 million total); (4) new buildings for the natural sciences. These include a new building for Earth and Marine Sciences, a large new building for the physical sciences, a building to support the new Center for Adaptive Optics, a new Interdisciplinary Building that houses programs in Physics, Astronomy and Environmental Sciences and a new, privately funded Oceans Health Laboratory and classrooms and a new education center located at Terrace Point (Long Laboratory and Seymour Center); (5) a large new 51,000 square foot building for Humanities. In addition, if the upcoming bond measure is funded, the long-awaited McHenry Project will begin which will provide over 80,000 ASF of space in the library. This space will be the centerpiece of our library's ongoing transformation into technologically cutting-edge knowledge center and node to the California Digital Library (see expanded discussion of our library and its goal to become a member in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in linked case study).

To fulfill our commitment to house as many of our students as possible on campus, the campus has provided nearly 2000 new bed spaces for undergraduate and graduate students during the last several years. Most of the new bed space has been built in existing or new colleges in keeping with our commitment to a college model that provides a community where students both live and learn. As we felt the pangs of growth during the past several years, much of our college housing stock was reserved for first year students. With the addition of new bed space, we now provide two-year housing guarantees to all entering students; and many of our upper division students are electing to live on campus as space is available, thus enriching the social and educational ambiance of the colleges.

Currently we provide on-campus housing to about 25% of our graduate students. During this academic year, the campus will examine means by which more campus housing may be made available to graduate students, and at a lower cost.

---

2 The two new academic buildings were under construction during our last WASC review. But since then, these have become the nuclei of two new colleges totaling nearly 3000 students. These new colleges are associated directly with the division of social sciences and are the homes of our programs in international education and the Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community.

3 Economics will soon be moving to space in the new Engineering building and the Department of Education will be getting new space from new building in other disciplines.

4 In our last LRDP planning document, we stated that the campus hoped to be able to accommodate up to 70% of its students. At present, we house nearly 50%. This is the highest percentage in UC and much higher than almost any other national public research university.
As mentioned previously, we also have an aggressive housing plan to accommodate many of our faculty and staff in campus-owned rentals or faculty purchased homes. Currently nearly 200 faculty and staff live in homes of this type.

**Reorganization and expansion of knowledge resources.**

The rapid growth in information technology that has swept into universities during the past decade has affected every aspect of how we do business at UC Santa Cruz – be that education, research, or management. During this past decade, our information technologies have grown in a highly decentralized manner. The strategic planning process helped the campus recognize the need to provide better integration, coordination and resource sharing to optimize the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of delivery. A two-year study of its information technologies (including those delivered by the libraries) has resulted in a total reorganization of IT, coordinating and managing all knowledge resource delivery services under a Vice Provost for Information Technology (a new senior administrative position).

One of the first decisions of the new Vice Provost and campus has been to consolidate all campus-wide knowledge resources into the new Division of Instructional Technology. This new service division will combine delivery services (a division previously known as CATS (Communication and Technology Services), with media services (previously aligned in the library) and IT applications across the campus. Accordingly, this Division will oversee and set policies for campus email, IT security, Internet infrastructure, portals (student, faculty, alumni, parent portals), campus web pages including departmental web presentations, the campus financial information system (FIS), its new PeopleSoft™ Academic Information Systems (AIS) which is being launched this academic year, and the campus ‘data warehouse’ – the repository and access point for all institutional data. In addition, the campus is expanding its use of wireless technologies, providing wireless nodes throughout classrooms, laboratories, libraries and community space (the wireless node project which will deliver more than 200 wireless nodes during this academic year). Lastly, the Division of Information Technology will also oversee the operations of SEVIS (for tracking international students), on-line graduate applications, classroom technology applications including WebCT, distributed learning technologies and methodologies and it will help keep the campus community aware of new developments and applications in IT through various training programs, seminars and workshops.

**CURRENT BUDGET EXIGENCIES – SEEKING A SUSTAINABLE BUDGET MODEL**

From the perspective of the university, California’s current fiscal condition may be viewed as another in an ongoing cycle of prosperity followed by retrenchment. The current recession resembles those of the 1980s and ’90s, except more profound. University policy makers are recognizing that these cycles are mere blips in a longer-term trend towards diminishing state support for the university. State support to the University of California has declined from over 70% of the university budget in its heyday to less than 40% more recently. Though all Californians fully expect the state to recover within a few years and to resume it role as a major economic engine for the nation and the world, as university administrators, we must also recognize that even after the recovery, state support to the university will likely continue on a downward trend. Therefore, at this moment in our history, we must grapple with serious short term shortages, hoping for a near term recovery, while recognizing that in the longer run the university will inevitably have to rely on new sources of revenue and more efficient ways of doing business.

**Contracts, Grants, Gifts, Regional Partnerships**

Although we continue to rely on state support to provide our most basic resources (i.e. faculty salaries; construction and maintenance of classrooms, laboratories, and offices; and library collections), we are increasingly seeking supplementary revenue streams in the form of contracts, grants, gifts, and regional partnerships to protect the long-run vitality of the institution.
As part of its planning effort, the campus has set a goal to “strengthen research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction” and to “markedly increase external support from grants and contracts as well as private fundraising”. To ensure our success, we have engaged all the campus’s key administrators in the enterprise of raising money. We have brought fund-raising experts to the campus to train our officers and foundation members. In particular, we have recast the roles of our academic deans and college provosts to include, among their primary duties, identifying new sources of revenues, cultivating relationships with potential donors, and closing deals. We have also decentralized the fund raising process by locating development officers within the divisions for which they raise funds with direct reporting lines to deans and vice chancellors, and we have added new development officers in key areas such as the colleges, student affairs, and undergraduate education.

As a growing institution, our campus’s extramural grants would be expected to grow, simply because we have been adding additional research faculty. But last year alone, our faculty raised 17% more in extramural grant support than the previous year, whereas our faculty grew by about 4%. Our successes in both increasing gifts and contracts and grants revenue during the period since our last WASC review are apparent in the following table and are presented in more detail in the Office of Sponsored Projects 2002-03 annual report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (Development)</td>
<td>$5.8M</td>
<td>$22.7M</td>
<td>+393%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$79.5M</td>
<td>+248%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campus has pursued several strategies to increase its extramural grant funding. Among these we have:

- Invested in academic programs and collaborations between existing programs, particularly in interdisciplinary fields at the forefronts of knowledge and built around research institutes and centers of excellence for which there is clear faculty leadership.
- Created the support infrastructure that helps faculty successfully complete for awards (appointed a Vice Chancellor for Research, a Director for a new office of Intellectual Property and additional professional staff support for the office).
- Hired a few ‘catalytic’ faculty who are high-profile experienced senior professors who have the proven ability to write large project grants and manage large interdisciplinary projects such as the Center for Adaptive Optics.
- Increased the campus’s capacity to compete effectively for large, collaborative research projects. For example, through the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Research, other members of the campus’ top management, and a team of faculty members, the campus was awarded (September 15, 2003) a contract to manage a ten-year, $330 million national project to establish a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) at NASA Ames in Silicon Valley.
- Through its collaborative planning process, the campus leadership has articulated a comprehensive set of incentives and strategies for achieving its goals for research distinctiveness.