

CPB REPORT ON EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES OF 10-YEAR ACADEMIC PLANS

MAY 21, 2001

PREFACE

The campus has been asked to plan for a 10-year period that is expected combine rapid enrollment growth with the maturing of our instructional mission to its eventual steady state. There are two, quite different, approaches to this task. The first is to focus on the opportunity to add innovative new programs as the campus moves from scarcity to abundance, thereby avoiding the danger of simply reproducing on an expanded scale what we already have – “merely blowing up the balloon,” as the EVC has described it. In the second approach, new resources would present a welcome opportunity to complete the development of existing departments and programs, thereby avoiding the danger that intense overenrollment could jeopardize the academic quality of the current curriculum while new possibilities are pursued. Each of these approaches makes a different heuristic assumption about resources. The first approach assumes that increased enrollment would be phased in with appropriate augmentations of operating and capital resources so that the maintenance of academic quality is not a long-term budgetary concern. The second assumes that the gap between enrollments and essential capital resources is likely to increase over time, in which case any expansion into new programs must be weighed against the health and maintenance of pre-existing ones. The Deans, as experienced administrators, clearly found it difficult to proceed, as directed, under the first assumption without being strongly influenced by the second.

From CPB’s perspective, the paramount campus goal, which we share with the administration, should be (in the words of a former Chair) “to grow in excellence while we grow in size.” We feel that the plans before us should more directly acknowledge that growth in excellence under these circumstances will be problematic rather than axiomatic. To be specific, there is an unacknowledged possibility that the effects of the present period of accelerated enrollment growth will increase the resource differentials between the least selective and the most selective campuses, driving UCSC further below the median in an increasingly stratified UC system. We believe that a planning process moving us toward steady-state should reverse the pressures of the last decades to compete for enrollments when this requires redefining the meaning of curricular quality so that it does not necessarily imply high levels of rigor and content.

CPB’s challenge in reviewing the Executive Summaries is to place them in a campus-wide perspective that will strike the right balance between expanding our instructional mission, on the one hand, and the preservation and strengthening of existing core programs, on the other. To redress the present balance, we have thus focused on how academic planning for a given department, division, or area of academic interest would be affected if faculty had been asked to base their funding priorities on the most promising development in their area of scholarly expertise, rather than on workload or other enrollment-based issues.

THE BUDGETARY CONTEXT

Much of the emphasis in the current planning process has been directed at identifying new programs that the campus might develop with the resources coming from growth. This part of the planning process is important, but new programs should only be developed if we have the resources to do the job properly. There is justifiable concern among the faculty that the campus has launched a significant number of new programs in the past, but that the initial enthusiasm and support was not followed by a continuing commitment to achieve excellence in these programs. In the past era of scarcity, faculty could take comfort from receding horizons – the promise that

new positions were coming if we could increase enrollments. We have now come to the point at which horizons are fixed, and we must plan for the “final” size of our departments. Our plans have to be made on an assessment of how a known number of new faculty positions can best be used to bring our current programs to optimal levels. At the end of this ten-year period, there will no longer be the same incentive for departments to raise teaching workloads in order to add new faculty. Instead, a more central question in enrollment management will be whether and how to raise the quality of our teaching programs and the rigor of their requirements.

FACULTY RESOURCES

CPB believes that the next phase of the planning process must begin with a realistic evaluation of the faculty FTE that might be available to be divided between new and existing programs. In the year 2000, our campus had 11,000 students and 423 permanent faculty members. Approximately 24% of the budgeted faculty FTE were held in reserve, primarily used to fund temporary faculty. This budgeted faculty size corresponded to an unweighted student/faculty ratio of 20:1. The EVC has indicated that, in the future, he plans to hold “approximately 20%” of FTE funds in reserve, a policy consistent with practice on most campuses. Assuming, then, that 80% of the faculty FTE are permanent, we can project the number of permanent faculty positions based on the student/faculty ratio that is actually funded for the campus.

Even under the currently worsening state budget, there is still hope that the student faculty ratio will fall between 18:1 and 19:1 in the near future. At a ratio of 18:1, the permanent faculty size would be 600 at 15,000 student and 751 at 16,900 students. At 20:1, the permanent faculty size would be 600 at 15,000 students and 676 at 16,900 students. Consequently, the size of the permanent faculty would increase between 177 and 244 positions for an enrollment of 15,000 and between 253 and 328 positions for 16,900 students. However, for the rest of this discussion, CPB will use the more conservative estimates of 177 and 253 new permanent faculty positions at the 15,000 and 16,900 student levels, which assumes that the presently budgeted student/faculty ratio does not improve.

Where will these new faculty go? In order to provide a realistic answer to these questions, we must look at commitments that have already been made.

First and foremost, the campus is committed to build an outstanding School of Engineering. Campus understandings at the time of its inception were that Engineering would absorb 15% of total campus FTE and teach 15% of its students. This School currently has 35 permanent FTE, and plans to make its 50th permanent appointment by the end of the year. Were Engineering to maintain the campuswide ratio of permanent to temporary faculty, it would have 87 permanent appointments at a campus size of 15,000 and 98 permanent faculty at a campus size of 16,900. The Engineering School’s Executive Summary does not, however, address the ratio of permanent to temporary faculty in making its claim on enrollment-generated resources. The midrange of growth projected by Dean Kang is 140 FTE, all of which he plans to fill. For the purpose of this document, we will use more conservative estimates - 115 FTE at a student enrollment of 15,000, or 125 FTE if enrollment reaches 16,900. Thus, engineering is likely to need 80-90 new FTE above its current 35, many of which will have already been hired (through forward-funding) by the time the final 10-year plans of the other divisions are approved. The current hiring program of Engineering cannot (and should not) be frozen merely because the campus has undertaken a new ten-year planning process. We believe, however, that this process must recognize that only 163-173 new permanent faculty positions are likely to be available after the campus has met its long-standing commitment to Engineering.

Outside of Engineering, several new departments/programs have been started in recent years, and a number of these did quite well in getting future resource commitments through the previous Initiatives Process. Building these to a minimal size will require at least 22 FTE.

Film and Video	5 new permanent FTE
Environmental Toxicology	5 new permanent FTE
Ocean Sciences	4 new permanent FTE
LALS	5 new permanent FTE
Education	8 new permanent FTE

This list may be incomplete. Only the EVC is in a position to confirm its accuracy, through an accounting of the outstanding commitments for new faculty hires that have been made through the Initiatives Process and by the Deans. Until this accounting is done, we lack an accurate figure of the number of faculty positions that will be available to be filled in accordance with the plans presently under review.

There is, in addition, a further complication yet to be factored in – year-round operation. Despite the strong preference of most Senate Committees for delay and further consultation, the EVC has requested state-funding for a UCSC summer session beginning in 2002 that, according to his letter would consist largely of “non-traditional programs” – for example programs relying heavily on off-campus instruction. The EVC’s letter acknowledges that under current plans, such non-traditional programs (whether or not they are part of summer session) must eventually “accommodate enrollments equivalent to forty percent of the general campus, fall instructional workload.” (Simpson to Deans, 5/2/01) We cannot know what resources will be available to traditional programs without knowing how - the EVC envisages these “non-traditional programs,” which he expects to accommodate up to 40% of the new enrollment-based student FTE coming to the campus. Will they require reserving up to 40% of expected FTE for “non-traditional” faculty? Or are they, rather, expected to dispense with the “traditional” faculty-student interaction? In the latter case, of course, we would be teaching 3.4 quarters worth of students with only 3 quarters worth of faculty, providing an increment of up to 12% of Faculty FTE for more “traditional” programs. In the former case, however, we would need to deduct up to another 12% from the total faculty FTE available to fund the new programs proposed in the Deans’ Executive Summaries.

The foregoing analysis does not take into account the needs of the core academic departments to add FTE lines. For each department, the primary justification will be to build excellence in its disciplines, but even setting aside these well-founded claims, many departments are going to have greatly increased workloads. Of the 5,900 new students expected perhaps 2,000 will be in Engineering. The other divisions will share the remaining workload, 3,900 students. This would be a 37% increase, requiring 144 additional FTE at current workload ratios.

Neither does the foregoing analysis take into account the possible development of new professional schools. The first phase of the planning process has provided no explicit mechanism for generating proposals for new professional schools from the Divisions. Nevertheless, CPB has been informed that the central administration would like to consider the viability of professional schools before the finalization of divisional ten-year plans. Any new professional school at UCSC would have to be fairly small, perhaps 30-40 FTE, but if the campus were to consider adding more than one it would have to reserve 20-30% of its future FTE for this purpose. This could be done, as we point out below, only if we allow the liberal arts divisions (perhaps no longer including their more applied programs) to pursue departmental excellence at a lower-than-average workload ratio (c. 16.7 seems to be an achievable norm) while maintaining higher-than-average student/faculty ratios in the new professional programs.

In considering new professional schools, we must recognize that we would have only a small (and ever-diminishing) number of faculty positions to reserve for this purpose. As a state-supported university, there are limits to how long we can withhold FTE to develop different kinds of programs (which have yet to be proposed) when the students generating those FTE are already here and need to be accommodated in existing programs. The campus as a whole must be assured in this process that our existing, innovative programs can be brought to a workable size, that the excellence of many of the traditional departments can be maintained, and good instruction can be provided for the large number of students in certain majors. Overall, it is important for our campus to

recognize that when enrollments reach 15,000 or 16,900, we will still be a small campus, and that we will have resources to mount only a selective few, new initiatives if we are going to continue to enhance the quality of what we do already.

The foregoing analysis, however, is only provisional, based on two questionable assumptions: (1) that the Divisional 10-year planning process concerns only the distribution of the surplus FTE resources generated by increased enrollments, and that replacement FTE will be used to reproduce the curricular base; and (2) that a major portion of the growth-generated FTE will not be filled outside the present planning process, as a result of pre-commitments, forward funding, continuing Initiatives, and the like. These two assumptions raise significant questions of accountability for the EVC that **must** be answered over the summer, before the Divisions can seriously begin the second phase of the planning process. The questions can be summarized as follows:

- 1) **What about the base?** The foregoing analysis suggests that 10-year plans currently under consideration are unrealistic if the resources allocated to the Divisions at the beginning of the process are considered to lie outside of it. Before the process resumes in the Fall, the Divisions must have a clear idea of the extent to which the aggregate FTE available in this process will include a portion of the replacement positions that are expected over the next ten years. If this is to be the case, the possibilities for curricular innovation may be much greater than indicated above. We would then, however, need explicitly articulated principles for maintaining the strength of the basic disciplines within the university. What is their optimal size? How can their excellence be assured and enhanced? Do the preliminary versions of the divisional plans put too much weight on applied and interdisciplinary programs at the expense of existing and potential strengths in the disciplines themselves?

CPB recommends that a commitment to excellence in both teaching and research within the basic disciplines should be a primary guiding principle for design of the academic executive summaries, both at the divisional and, especially, at the campus-wide level. Other goals, such as increasing interdisciplinarity and the introduction of new programs, are desirable to the extent that they do not jeopardize the resource base of the core disciplines.

- 2) **What about the interim?** The foregoing analysis assumes that the bulk of the new FTE to be allocated in the ten-year planning process will not have been filled or committed before the process has reached its conclusions about what ought to be done. To some extent, this is both necessary and inevitable – the enrollment growth from 11-15,000 for which we are planning began in 1999-2000 and will be completed by 2004-5. Yet the completed 10-year plans themselves cannot result in new hires until 2002-3, at the earliest. The process will, in effect, have taken up the first four years of the ten years for which we are planning, a period in which most of the planned-for growth will have already occurred.

Before the Fall, CPB requests that the EVC provide a full accounting of the growth-generated positions that have been filled and will be filled from 1999 to 2003. This would include TOE's and double hires, as well as positions funded from existing divisional resources. Such an accounting should specifically advise the Divisions as to whether each of these filled (or allocated) positions should be debited from the growth plans of their respective unit, or merely added to their base. At the same time, specific principles must be developed by the EVC for approving permanent FTE allocations before the ten-year planning process. These principles must balance the difficulties that arise for departments from increasing the time lag between enrollment growth and new faculty against the difficulties that arise from approving positions proposed in plans that have, themselves, yet to be approved.

CAPITAL RESOURCES

As with faculty resources, CPB believes that the next phase of the planning process must begin with a realistic assessment of capital resources. In our oral presentation to the Senate on 2.21.01 (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/svc221sg.html>), we reported that this campus entered Tidal Wave II with capital resources of c. 82.2% of the minimum allowable CPEC¹ space per student. To put this in perspective, the next lowest campus started out at 87.8 – all of the others were higher – and by 2005 no other campus (with the arguable exception of UCSD) will have fallen significantly below where we were at the beginning of Tidal Wave II. We, however, will have fallen an additional 10.6% below CPEC's standard. In contrast, UC as a whole will have declined only 8.1%. Riverside, which is taking the lion's share of the enrollments, will end up approximately where we started out. We reported, moreover, a growing gap between the space resources per student at UCSC and the UC average. The existence and expansion of this gap is not a matter of speculation – all of the UC campuses are already committed to the enrollment growth that is charted here, and UC will build no capital projects that are not already reflected in the space online projected by 2006-07.

In their Executive Summaries, the Divisions were not asked to take account of the serious space shortage facing UCSC over the next ten years, but the next phase of the process must explicitly relate any proposals for spending enrollment-generated operating funds to campus and divisional priorities for capital projects. To do this, they must receive further guidance from the EVC.

1) Resource Dependency: Several Deans explicitly state that they will not be able to accommodate projected enrollment growth unless and until new space resources become available. In the next stage of planning, the EVC must consider whether targeted enrollment growth in each Division should be scaled back or phased in more slowly if the space resources are not forthcoming. (Must we adopt, e.g., program-based admissions caps?) The EVC must also decide how the likelihood and timing of new capital projects will affect programmatic priorities on campus, and how programmatic priorities will affect the phasing of capital projects. These decisions, and the principled basis for them, must be announced prior to the Fall phase of the planning process. They must specifically address two broad questions.

a) Lag: Should it be a planning principle to minimize the lag between enrollments and space? The EVC needs to decide (almost immediately) whether the campus should prioritize programmatic development based on the order in which the necessary space will come online, or whether it should, rather, reprioritize its capital requests in order to accommodate the (i) most important or (ii) most impacted programmatic needs.

b) Prioritization: What principles should govern the campus ranking of state-funded capital projects? Should these principles reinforce or offset the bias resulting from the expected availability of non-state sources of funding? The EVC must decide whether to give highest priority to maximizing campus capacity through leveraging state funds with private sector contributions, or by using state funds to build facilities essential to the academic infrastructure (such as the McHenry extension), which may not otherwise be funded.

2) Phasing-Dependency: What will be the effect on the feasibility of the plans developed of the time taken up by the planning process itself? In the first phase of the present process, Divisions were encouraged to plan on the assumption that necessary capital projects would come online as needed. As indicated above, however,

¹ CPEC (The California Post-secondary Education Commission) is the advisory body that monitors relations between the three tiers of state-supported education under the Higher Education Master Plan. As part of this monitoring, it advises the administration of the three tiers, and the State Legislature, on such matters as the level of facilities required to justify the differentials between the UC's and other segments of higher education (the CSU's and Community Colleges). CPEC standards for minimal allowable space, thus, provide the basis on which OP typically makes requests for capital to the Legislature. Although the absolute validity of these standards may be disputed (What is the absolute minimal space required for a UC-quality education?), the relative compliance of each UC campus with the CPEC standard, and the directions of change are indisputably relevant to the present discussion.

capital projects that are not presently in the pipeline are unlikely to be proposed to OP until 2004-5 at the earliest, assuming that site-planning does not unduly add to the time taken up thus far by academic planning. The next stage of the planning process needs to address the evident fact that not everything proposed can be done at once, and that some proposals may be less desirable in out-years than they are immediately. A further element to be considered is that the success of some proposals may be preconditions for the feasibility of others. This, too, needs to be addressed.

- a) **Timelines:** Although planning is meant to be forward-looking, the process itself has an inherent bias in favor of proposals that will look good at the present moment. Explicit criteria are needed to weigh the present desirability of apparently innovative proposals on the basis of their expected value if commenced in out-years (e.g., 2004, 2008, or 2010).
- b) **Accountability:** To focus this discussion, the EVC must announce his own benchmarks for the phasing-in of enrollment growth and capital resources: accountability. What levels of operating and capital support, if not met by 2005, will trigger changes in plans for 2005-2010? The ten-year planning process must have an internal mechanism for mid-course corrections if its assumptions as to student enrollments or capital resources are not met. As a first step toward accountability, the EVC should identify (in writing) positive and negative models for the type of plan on which he has decided, and specific milestones and danger points that would trigger an affirmation or revision of his course.

These questions suggest that the next phase of the planning process be preceded by an explicit accounting of capital *projections* by the EVC and of capital *needs* by the Divisions. Following the written suggestion of a former administrator, we, therefore, request of the EVC “a chart showing proposed square feet of various types of space (e.g., classroom and meeting, offices, wet labs, dry labs, support areas) in relation to requisite phasing for completion. . . . Divisional plans should include requests for specified amounts of each type of space, and the two should be consistent.” In addition we ask “for an accounting of **operating** funds spent on capital projects over the last ten years [due to cost overruns], a projection for the next ten, and accountability if the projection fails.” In particular, there needs to be some mechanism in place for programs that must, in effect, borrow from the operating budget to meet construction overruns to pay back the campus in subsequent years.

In addition, the EVC must inform the Deans before next Fall about the degree to which divisional and campus plans must depend upon extramural fundraising for capital projects. To the extent that academic plans rely on stated goals for capital fundraising, whether by University Relations or by the Divisions themselves, there must be clear checkpoints for reviewing our success in meeting these goals and revising plans accordingly.

ACADEMIC PLANS: GENERAL COMMENTS

In preparing their Executive Summaries, the Deans were being asked, in effect, to build a bridge between planning based on a zero-sum competition for enrollments and planning based on optimizing the relation between programmatic size and quality. The final versions of the divisional plans must show how this shift is to be accomplished between now and 2010. Although we expect that high enrollments will continue to be one significant measure of the success of an academic program in meeting student needs, we believe that the campus must now phase in other, perhaps offsetting, measures, such as the level of student achievement in the discipline, active involvements of students in research, admissions to graduate and professional school, and so forth. Final divisional plans should contemplate a point at which some departments might be asked to “manage” excess enrollments by making their curriculum more rigorous and demanding. For this to happen, there must be mechanisms to reward departments for demonstrable excellence (or improvement) in student achievement, both in individual courses and in the major.

As an essential part of planning for steady state, CPB asks that the Divisions articulate for each program (as some already have) an optimal student-faculty ratio base on the assumption that programs will no longer be pressured to show enrollment growth as a precondition for future FTE. We would expect these ratios to vary by department and field of specialization, but in programs with less faculty-intensive methods of instruction, there might be explicit provision for the introduction or reintroduction of paths of undergraduate concentration that would allow for what we may (or may not) choose to designate as honors-level work.. Looking forward to a time in which high enrollments are only one possible indicator of academic quality, the Deans should articulate forward-looking principles that would govern resource allocations so as to take other measures of quality into account. As stated above, the overarching aim of the ten-year plans should be to increase the excellence (and reputation for excellence) of core campus programs in the expectation that the campus will attract a larger proportion of students who value high academic standards.

The next stage of the planning process needs to provide all campus faculty with tangible measures first to limit and then to reverse the pressure to downgrade academic standards that has too-often been implicit in previous academic planning on our campus. UCSC must, above all, plan to position itself to attract a greater proportion of the most intellectually ambitious students in the system. Concretely, UCSC must find ways to accommodate enrollment growth while relieving some of the pressure on our liberal arts programs to absorb ever-increasing faculty workloads. If the campus were to develop, like other UC campuses, a greater variety of professional and applied programs, these must be accompanied by a reduction of the enrollment demands placed on the liberal arts divisions, and a promise to allow them to focus planning more directly on curricular and research excellence.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

The Faculty Resources section of this Report discussed the severe constraints on the development of new professional schools, assuming that the existing base of resources in the liberal arts divisions would not be raided for this purpose. CPB does not believe that a significant commitment to new, UC-quality, professional schools will be possible on this campus without curtailing the expected build-out size of the existing divisions by c. 20%, and we do not believe that this would be consistent with academic excellence in those divisions unless we were also to limit their workload expectations to c. 16.5 student FTE/faculty FTE. This possibility is, however, worth considering, especially if gradually relaxing enrollment pressures would allow the liberal arts divisions to focus their planning more directly on preserving and enhancing the quality of their core academic programs (both research and curricular).

In the Call for Executive Summaries, however, the Deans were not specifically invited to consider the possibility of new professional schools. Instead, they were made acutely aware of the position of Natural Sciences which, coincidentally or not, experienced a workload decline to the level of Humanities (c. 16.7 students/faculty) after spinning off its applied programs to Engineering, and which is predicted to decline from x% of campus FTE to y% [fill in] as Engineering grows. No Dean has subsequently supported the development of a new professional school on this campus. Rather, their Executive Summaries attempt to absorb the resulting unmet student demand through developing applied programs in the liberal arts divisions.

From a campus-wide perspective, this may or may not be a sound approach. What is certain, however, is that a mechanism needs to be created outside the existing Divisions to consider alternative approaches before the planning process proceeds further. CPB perceives several of the Executive Summaries now before us as, in effect, symptoms of a recognized student demand for more applied/professional programs in certain areas where we have already invested, and will invest, significant FTE resources. Internal evidence in the Divisional plans suggests, for example, that UCSC could have a large and successful Film School, with a faculty that would be eager to locate at the Silicon Valley site. Other emergent possibilities are an Education School, a Management School (with, perhaps, public-, private-, and non-profit sector tracks), and perhaps a School of Health Science and Policy. CPB is not, here, proposing the establishment of any such entities. Our role is, rather, to note that under the present proposals the campus plans to invest a substantial proportion of its existing and new resources in

these areas in order to follow perceived student demand. The question that *must* be asked is whether these FTE resources (and the consequent enrollments) are best located in existing divisions and/or departments, and, if not, whether the enrollment expectations on those divisions and/or departments might be appropriately relaxed.

The answers to this question must, ultimately, be driven by academic as well as resource considerations. Over the summer, the campus should seek outside advice about whether and how the quality and depth of professionally-oriented programs mounted under liberal arts divisions or departments compare with the MA and BA programs offered elsewhere in the UC system and in the better CSU's. Key administrators, perhaps the Graduate Dean and the VPAA, should be put in charge of this process, and they should bring in consultants from both the UC and the CSU system to advise them before the Fall. CPB has no preconceived view of the outcome of such consultation. Our point is merely that UCSC's custom of Division-based competition for resources has pre-empted necessary discussions of the desirability of expanding UCSC's professional offerings beyond Engineering. CPB recommends that the EVC reserve c. 20-30% of the out-year FTE he was proposing to allocate to Divisions until the question of professional schools has been responsibly addressed in the planning process.

CORE MISSION

We said at the outset of this Report that the campus planning process must weigh any expansion into new programs against the health and maintenance of existing ones. In the next stage of the process, the Deans should take pains to relate their interdisciplinary initiatives to the intellectual rationales of significant developments both in and out of the existing disciplines within their purview. CPB is concerned that some of the proposed interdisciplinary programs may have only a transient appeal to student constituencies, and may instead reflect the immediate priorities of potential funding sources, both public and private. To support their new proposals, the Deans should explain in what sense interdisciplinary proposals are desirably so, and why they would bring the campus greater intellectual distinction than the development of existing strengths and potentials in the disciplines.

Perhaps this question will answer itself as the Deans take steps to integrate the divisional and departmental components of their Executive Summaries: the initial phase of the planning process did not allow them either the time or space to do so. CPB is concerned, however, that the ten-year planning process may have also suffered from the inbuilt ambiguity, discussed above, between planning only for the use of surplus FTE, and planning to preserve and develop the base. It is not likely that all departments understood that their ten-year plans would be appropriate places to make restorative claims, or to point to internal opportunities in their disciplines that might not be consistent with divisional priorities, whether programmatic or enrollment-driven. There is no intrinsic reason why the campus should plan around the concept of strong divisions, rather than of strong departments, strong programs, or even, ultimately a strong faculty.

To identify possible misunderstandings or biases in the first phase of the planning process, CPB has asked every faculty member "whether the proposed academic plans for your department, division, or area of academic interest be different if you were asked for proposals that were driven by the most promising development in your area of scholarly expertise rather than workload or other enrollment-driven issues?" We have already received some very thoughtful answers, both confidential and signed, and would encourage faculty to keep responding, whether as individuals or in groups. Whenever they are received, these responses will be considered as part of CPB's ongoing participation in the ten-year planning process to its conclusion.

At the present stage of the process, CPB is particularly concerned that the Deans have solicited plans and proposals mainly from existing departmental units – a fact confirmed by several faculty in their written responses to our questions. There is little evidence in the summaries that existing faculty constituencies not presently organized as departments have been significantly involved in formulating proposals. Before divisional planning recommences in the Fall, the EVC should address the question of what further faculty constituencies need to be consulted. Because there has yet been no forum for individuals or groups to propose their own plans, the campus needs a process and timeline to receive and review such plans over the summer, and perhaps on an ongoing basis.

The Graduate Dean and/or the VPAA could play an important role in establishing and administering this process.

EXTERNAL FUNDING

Some of the resource elasticity presupposed by the present divisional plans is based on significant expectations of external funds. These expectations (which CPB certainly encourages) raise difficult questions for campus-wide planning which need to be addressed before divisional planning resumes.

One of the EVC's stated goals is to double the extramural funding for research as UCSC becomes decreasingly able to rely on state funds to support our core mission. In order to evaluate Divisional proposals based on this goal, CPB requires a hard analysis of the costs and benefits of investing campus resources in FTE that are likely to bring "opportunity funds" to UC. How would various scenarios for the return of these opportunity funds from UCOP to the campus affect the return that the campus would realize on startup funds? If, e.g., we invest \$1M in startup funds to hire four FTE, what level of funding from NIH, NSF, DOD, etc. would repay that \$1M to the campus in a form that could support otherwise underfunded elements of our core mission?

The divisional summaries had to assume that the method of distributing opportunity funds within the UC system and on the campus is settled. The final campus-wide plan, however, needs explicit discussion of the relative claims of all campus units on resources that are raised by a campus choice to invest in a particular unit. Part of that discussion should address the effect on the intellectual mission of that unit of redistributing some of the opportunity funds that result from its research.

Two respondents to CPB's May questionnaire have addressed this issue in some detail. The first suggests that the EVC gather data from departments (or Divisions by department) regarding both the sources and the uses of extramural funds. Regarding sources, he proposes that the EVC "ask departments (or Divisions, by department) to summarize their last five years [of extramural funding] and project the next five, with and without proposed growth, in each of four categories: private gifts of general benefit (e.g., endowments, fellowships, unrestricted); direct costs in grants and contracts from governmental agencies and foundations; direct costs in grants and contracts from for-profit sponsors; and total indirect costs." Regarding extramural fund uses, he suggests gathering data on "who benefits from the funds: is institutional investment self-reinforcing or does it raise all boats?" This would allow the campus to determine which units, if any, consume both their direct and their indirect costs, and whether there are units that continue to require more ongoing campus investment than the grants they generate. Beyond this, such a data-gathering enterprise might be difficult. At a minimum, however, it might be expected to produce a history (with projections) for of start-up expenditures that benefit the recipient unit directly and the institution indirectly (grad student support, post-docs, research staff, equipment, space).

A second respondent has, in effect, focused on what might be done with such data. The following is an excerpted version:

... We can't run the university like a business and allocate resources only according to some economic return-on-investment formula. Research activities and professional activities might be good sources of income, but I think it is perfectly proper that they "pay some tax" to support other areas of education. They should not form the habit of thinking that all the external money they bring in belongs to their area. The fact is that a large portion (perhaps most) externally funded research simply would not be funded for an organization unconnected to a university, and particularly would not be funded for a business. In this sense all faculty are co-PIs on these grants. At the same time, increasing the level of extramural funding for research is a good objective and doubling the level feels like the right amount of ambition.

... My opinion is that you are lucky to channel 5 percent of any funding into "underfunded elements of our core mission" and you'll have to drag some people kicking and screaming to get even that. ... Maybe a practical way to think of it is to imagine that the \$1M is loaned as 4 30-year mortgages. You can calculate the income stream from

that with a table. Well, a fairly young faculty member might be expected to produce grants for 30 years. That is a best case. More typically, they will go elsewhere, or not be that productive in some cases. So maybe you should think in terms of a 15-year mortgage. Also, you are justified in using rates for a 2nd or 3rd mortgage because after all, there are no assets to back up the “loan” of startup funds. I get \$144,020 per year for 15 years as the income stream of a 12-percent mortgage of \$1M. Assuming you can get 5 percent of a grant channeled into “underfunded elements of our core mission” you would want to see $20 * 144020 = 2,880,000$ as the AVERAGE annual funding level (over 15 years) of the startup faculty you are “loaning to” or “investing in”. That’s a pretty steep expectation ... [but it] needs to be tempered with other considerations. For example, an individual’s startup funds probably draw from several sources. Maybe only 20 percent would otherwise go to “underfunded elements of our core mission” and 80 percent would go to other programs. Then an average funding level of \$576,000 per year over 15 years would pay back the investment, STILL assuming you can channel 5 percent to “underfunded elements of our core mission”. If you think you can only channel 2 percent (and you are putting in 20 percent as in the above paragraph) then you are back up to something around \$1,500,000 per year as the break-even level. There are lots of ways to play with the numbers. I hope this gives the committee some ideas. But at the base we need to have a policy that clarifies that some of the external funding SHOULD be channeled into the core mission. I don’t think everyone agrees on that.

CPB does not necessarily endorse this suggestion, but we agree with the respondent that it represents the kind of thinking in which the campus as a whole needs to engage before the next phase of divisional planning gets underway.

GOALS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The initial efforts made by the Deans to fit their plans within the “campus goals” articulated in the EVC’s Call (<http://planning.ucsc.edu/budget/rsrceplan/docs/call-lr.pdf> pages 5-6) should now lead to an explicit reconsideration of those goals themselves. The next stage of the planning process should specifically identify the academic and resource models that UCSC should attempt to emulate, and those that it should explicitly avoid. As stated earlier, there should also be well-defined decision points at which the campus can determine whether it is on track toward its desired outcomes, or in danger of replicating the examples it seeks to avoid.

The process of refining goals could appropriately begin by asking the EVC to clarify his own goals by picking out some AAU universities with which we might realistically compare ourselves. Are there any role models? One former administrator thinks not:

Other universities with our current level of external grant support either have a similar size faculty but half the students to teach (the privates like Rice) or have twice the students and faculty (the publics like Oregon). UCSB is most like us within UC, being quite similar in Arts and Sciences but with much bigger engineering. This won’t change dramatically between 12 and 17K students...

Like this respondent, CPB is concerned about where the futile pursuit of AAU membership might lead our campus. Are the standards that must be met independently desirable for a campus like ours? Are they compatible with other stated campus goals under anticipated resource constraints? For example, AAU membership is based largely on the standing of campus departments in certain national rankings. Serious pursuit of this goal would, thus, hold the Deans accountable for taking measures to raise the national rankings of existing departments. This may in itself be desirable for our campus, but we must recognize that it means focusing more strengthening the core disciplines – the existing departments – rather than pursuing interdisciplinarity as an independent goal, as the EVC’s Call appears to do. (Of course, some departments are themselves interdisciplinary and innovative– the point is that their national ranking would depend upon their recognizability as departments that can be compared to the best in the nation.)

This is merely one example of how the goals that the EVC has stated now need to be prioritized, and possibly reconsidered. In a series of five reports to the campus, CPB has already commented on the feasibility of campus goals with respect to planning an undergraduate curriculum at the Silicon Valley Center, an idea that seems to

have been quietly dropped. We also have doubts with respect to the feasibility of year-round operation as a way to meet UCSC looming crisis of over-enrollment. In the course of the planning process the Natural Sciences Division has frequently pointed out that the campus cannot realistically expect to double its total extramural funding without giving it more FTE than are currently contemplated. This, however, is not necessarily compatible with promoting research excellence in other fields.

The campus as a whole needs to identify appropriate institutional models (or to more fully articulate its own model) in order to decide whether its present goals are more appropriate than others it might choose. Should our role models be in the UC system (UCD? UCSB?) or outside (Cornell? UVa? UMass?)? Should we, rather, aspire to steady-state to resemble one of the larger private universities (Brandeis? Emory? Rochester?)? The national ranking of our departments will matter differently depending on the model we choose. Each choice would require us to add some goals to the present list, and, perhaps, to remove others. The standards by which academic units should be held accountable will of course depend upon the campus choice of goals.

Over the past two years, however, CPB has been developing separate standards by which the Senate can hold the central administration responsible for its delivery of financial resources to serve the core campus mission of teaching and research. The quality of our core activities is, as we have said, in jeopardy during this period of accelerated growth to steady-state, and we believe that there must be explicit, and publicly visible, benchmarks for monitoring the effect of enrollment growth on the quality of the core. Working closely the VCPB Michaels, we have formulated and refined these benchmarks through the paired processes of *adjusting* out components of existing budgetary categories that are irrelevant or distorting and of *indexing* these adjusted categories to control for growth in students, faculty, and overall funding. It has become clear that such a methodology can lead to very useful comparisons between general categories of campus expenditure over time, and it can also be used to make useful comparisons between segments of the campus. Among the benchmarks that CPB has developed are the following:

- Adjusted expenditure² on I&R per student FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on I&R per filled faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on I&R per budgeted faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on I&R as a percentage of total adjusted expenditure
- Adjusted expenditure on Academic Administration³ per student FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on Academic Administration per filled faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on Academic Administration per budgeted faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on Academic Administration as a percentage of total adjusted expenditure
- Adjusted expenditure on IS⁴ per student FTE

² “Adjusted Expenditure” is here an expression in inflation-adjusted dollars of total campus expenditures minus housing, financial aid, auxiliaries, and sponsored research.

³ “Academic Administration” is here an expression in inflation adjusted dollars of the campus expenditure on “Central Administration” (the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors, and Provosts) plus the amount spent on Academic Support (Divisional Deans) minus administrative positions directly funded by contracts and sponsored research, and minus those administrative positions counted as IS (institutional support).

⁴ “IS” is here an expression in inflation adjusted dollars of the amounts spent on institutional support

- Adjusted expenditure on IS per filled faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on IS per budgeted faculty FTE
- Adjusted expenditure on IS as a percentage of total adjusted expenditure

We recognize that these purely budgetary benchmarks that have no *necessary* relation to academic quality: their purpose is merely to monitor the use of enrollment-generated revenue (essentially state allocations and student-paid education fees) for UCSC's core mission of instruction and research. If the budgetary benchmarks show a decline in indexed expenditure on I&R relative to other indexed categories, the burden is on the administration to show why academic quality has not been impaired in the units that have been asked to bear the greatest burden. Once this question is raised, however, it might be answered in several ways: (1) by further adjusting the benchmarks to eliminate any extraneous or misleading components; (2) by demonstrating that cheaper instruction in the adversely affected units is better, or at least no worse, by some measurable standard of student achievement; (3) by taking short-term corrective budgetary measures that are consistent with responsible academic planning over time.

ADMISSIONS CRITERIA AND GROWTH

Before analyzing the plans of the academic Divisions in detail, we must briefly raise an underlying issue for the campus that none of the plans thus far address: the question of declining admissions standards. President Atkinson has now begun to acknowledge publicly what many have long known: UC has not ratcheted up its eligibility standards to yield only the top 12.5% of high school graduates during the era of grade-inflation. As a consequence nearly 21% of high school graduates are now UC-eligible, a significant proportion of those who are also CSU-eligible, and UC has been working hard to raise this proportion in future years.

CPB plans to discuss the implications of these facts for the presently non-selective UC campuses at the workshop that we have planned for all Senate members on June 7, 2001 from 10am to 3pm. We understand that the issues are complex, particularly at a time when UC can no longer promote demographic diversity through affirmative action. Nevertheless, we believe that the problems faced by UCSC in competing more directly with the CSU's for the same population of high school graduates need to be addressed openly as part of the ten-year planning process. We hope in the early Fall to initiate a campus-wide dialogue on the question of whether and how the limited introduction of admissions selectivity might be used to slow projected enrollment growth in the event that adequate resources to maintain UC-quality instruction are not forthcoming from the state and/or extramural sources.

We now turn to our specific review the plans of the academic divisions, the graduate division, and the library.

ARTS

The Arts Division Executive Summary is exemplary in many respects. It persuasively grounds programmatic proposals in the intellectual evolution of its component disciplines, it thoughtfully addresses the space-dependencies and phasing of its plans, and it provides (at least in outline) a principled account of the way in which it will make a transition over the next ten years between workload-based planning and a time when planning will be primarily driven by incentives to maintain and upgrade programmatic quality. The written answers that the Arts Division has provided to CPB written questions are further evidence that Executive Summary provides a sound basis for moving forward toward a final plan. It is clear that the proposed expansion of the Arts Division is linked to transformative developments in arts technology, providing the Division with excellent opportunities for intellectual development. However, the ability of the Division to take advantage of these opportunities is only possible if the campus will commit significant capital resources to the Arts.

Two critical issues face the Arts Division: enrollment management and space needs. Up to this point, the Arts Division has grown responsibly, maintaining traditional courses while embracing new art production and instructional techniques. The Division currently serves 13% of the campus enrollment (comprising 1500 FTE); even at the fairly low growth ratio of 14% expected by the Division, Arts will serve 2,300 FTE by 2010. The primary barrier to growth is the limitation of available space. The Division's ability to expand programs and bring new faculty on board is hampered by the fact that all available space is already in use. Therefore, the fundamental question that precedes all of these plans is how and when will facilities come on board.

At the center of the Divisional plan is Digital Media, the fastest growing segment of the Division's enrollment, and enrollment management strategies incorporate a significantly higher student/faculty ratio for Digital Media than for studio/performance departments. Even so, Digital Media courses are already near maximum enrollment, and decisions must be made: will upper-division courses be restricted to majors, and will the major itself be restricted to top students? Or, will courses continue to be open to all students, which would mandate a rapid increase in faculty? In conjunction with the School of Engineering, programs in Film and Digital Media and Digital Arts/New Media have the opportunity to make a quick impact upon the field and attract a significant number of students to UCSC. However the growth of these departments must be carefully planned in terms of space needs and faculty workload issues.

The Division's case for expanding Film and Digital Media at the present historical juncture is so strong that CPB is led to wonder whether the campus should seriously consider establishing a professional Film School that would take advantage of the Silicon Valley site, and the potential availability support from the Northern California film and digital graphics industries. Clearly, the Arts Division has made a large investment of its own in this new department, and would have little interest in spinning off a separate school unless the Division were no longer under pressure to subsidize its faculty-intensive studio programs with a high-enrollment major in film. CPB believes, however, that the justification for a low faculty/student ratio of 16:1 in the studio arts is abundantly clear, and that the campus might appropriately consider the establishment of a separate Film School on terms that would be budgetarily advantageous to the remaining departments in the Arts. Such a school could have valuable joint programs with the Arts as well as other Divisions, especially Humanities, Social Sciences, and Engineering. We, therefore, recommend that the EVC bring in a consultant over the summer to consider this possibility before advising the Arts Division to go forward with its plan as it presently stands.

The Arts Division has articulated an ambitious proposal for graduate program development, including M.F.A. programs in Art, Theater Arts, Film and Digital Media, and DA/NM and doctoral programs in Film and Digital Media, Music, and Visual and Performance Studies. A key question that should be maintained through the planning process is the timing of the development and opening of this fairly large number of graduate programs and the difficulty of balancing theory/criticism against art practice programs. Although the Division has made the growth of graduate instruction a major priority, its response to CPB's written questions acknowledges that none of its proposed graduate programs have been externally vetted. Reviewing the viability and quality of proposed

graduate programs lies outside CPB's purview. We must point out, however, that a small campus cannot afford to proliferate graduate programs that are not recognizably excellent, and that resource requests based on unvetted proposals must be viewed, not as placeholders for future graduate programs that may be approved, but as *contingent* on the approval of the proposals presently before us. Future iterations of the Arts plan must present timelines for the campus decision-making about the use of resources provisionally committed to the graduate programs that are currently under development.

The Arts Division Executive Summary has been exemplary in its approach to the questions of summer session, the SVC, and the search for extramural funding. Impressive divisional plans to develop a summer program in studio arts as one approach to the problem of enrollment-impacted majors should also be pursued. Proposals such as this, however, bring to the forefront the infrastructure problems of mounting programs of any size at UCSC in the summer. Finally, public arts programs such as Shakespeare Santa Cruz and the possibilities other performance and gallery events should be developed in light of both the contribution of the university to the community and as opportunities to raise funds for Arts facilities. The campus should pursue Fund Development Planning for the Arts alongside larger plans to build out the Arts Center.

ENGINEERING

The Executive Summary for the Engineering Division lays out guidelines for a large expansion of the Division over the next ten years to a "mid-range" estimate of 140 FTE. In his presentation to CPB, the Dean made a strong case that, on a comparative, this is a reasonable size for a top-flight engineering school, and that his proposal to hire senior faculty early follows established models for building distinction. The Division's desire to reach 140 FTE at a campus size of 16,900 students does not take into account the EVC's stated intention to hold back 20% of enrollment-generated resources for new opportunities, unforeseen expenses, and so forth. Neither, does this target provide clear goals for extramural funding that the Dean believes to be necessary to support a student/faculty ratio (16:1) without a permanent campus subsidy from the other Divisions. CPB believes that, unless these extramural funding targets are defined and met, that Engineering could reasonably expect c. 100-125 permanent FTE supported by state funds.

Even at this, more modest, level of funding the Engineering ten-year plan warrants particularly careful review as a consequence of its large scope and impact on campus. A built-up Engineering division of the type described in the executive summary will be one of the dominant programs on campus, and its presence will be felt physically and budgetarily through ambitious faculty hiring, student enrollment, and major construction for office space. The resources that will need to be invested in this build-up will be great, and CPB is concerned that it be accomplished without causing undue stresses on the resource base of the other Divisions.

CPB advises the Division of Engineering to pay particular attention to the faculty resources that will be necessary to mount their program. Considerable discussion should be devoted in the final plan to the implications of the table entitled "Target Areas of Excellence by Department." In particular, we are interested in the number of faculty that must be projected in each Engineering department to provide strength for each target area. For example the envisioned size of the Bioengineering department appears to be 8. It seems that many of the faculty in this department will need to have recognized expertise in several areas and we wonder how this will be possible. Close attention must also be paid to the list of 13 academic degree programs on page 4 of the executive summary. For an Engineering Division with 140 faculty (and quite likely fewer) there will be an average of less than 11 faculty in each program. Is it reasonable to mount so many programs?

In general, CPB finds the overall academic goals of the Engineering Division to be well thought out. Much of the Executive Summary is devoted to explaining how the Division plans to expand around three broad disciplines: information technology, biotechnology, and nanotechnology. These seem very timely and well-chosen directions, particularly in view of our proximity to the industries of Silicon Valley. Their apparent timeliness, however, raises a further question. Five years ago (or ten) an equally timely list would have looked quite different.

CPB would like to know, in the next iteration of Engineering's plan, to what degree it is sensitive to the phase-in of proposed programs and appointments. Would they seem less desirable if the hirings were made in year one or ten of the planned-for period? There is no doubt that Engineering has proposed a vigorous basic plan for its rapid development over the next ten years. The challenge, as CPB sees it, is to manage the phase-in of a strong Engineering School within our particular campus-wide context of likely overcrowding in many established programs. .

However, the expansion of the Engineering Division carries with it more than just material concerns. This program could also change the intellectual tone of the campus, particularly by placing a new emphasis on high-tech research and development. CPB feels that it is desirable to bring about the expansion of Engineering in a manner that has a positive effect on the existing academic culture of UCSC. In his response to CPB's initial questions about the ten-year plan, Dean Kang wrote that from "the beginning of its conception, the School of Engineering at UCSC was envisioned to fill a specific niche, rather than duplicate programs already in existence." CPB recommends, therefore, that further iterations of the ten-year plan more explicitly address the issue of how the expansion of Engineering will bring about a program unique to UCSC, and readily identifiable with the distinctiveness of our campus. The following elements of the present Executive Summary could be refined and elaborated to accomplish this objective.

- (i) Accentuating the interdisciplinary programs within the ten-year plan. As stated in the early part of the plan, Engineering has a "commitment to building bridges to other parts of the academic community" including Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. CPB recommends such interdisciplinary efforts be given an even greater prominence in the ten-year plan, particularly where they can lead to atypical programs.
- (ii) The Pacific Rim Roundtable could be very significant if followed up vigorously. It has the added advantage that its development could be tied into the Silicon Valley Center. CPB highly recommends this initiative.
- (iii) Santa Cruz would be an ideal campus for an environmental engineering program. This is noted within the ten-year, but its development is rather obscured by being relegated to just one part of an Interdisciplinary Engineering Department. CPB recommends that considerations for environmental engineering be further developed and given some place of importance in the ten-year plan.

Finally, CPB feels that Engineering is one Division whose expansion ties in very naturally with the Silicon Valley Center, and it would be wise to see how much of this expansion could be accommodated at SVC. The Pacific Rim Roundtable is a particularly good example in the current plan. In addition, the Executive Summary notes that in principle Engineering could mount a significant summer program at the SVC if it can tap into students returning to Silicon Valley for summer break. In his Executive Summary, the Engineering Dean expresses confidence that his Division can significantly increase its summer offerings, but CPB has received contrary advice from senior members of the Engineering faculty. We, therefore, request a frank and full analysis of the likelihood that regular faculty would willingly participate in summer instruction in the next iteration of the Division's ten-year plan.

HUMANITIES

The Executive Summary of the Humanities Ten-year Plan does not, in its current version, lay a firm foundation for going forward. In his oral presentation to CPB, indicated that he viewed the present document as a work-in-progress. While awaiting a revised version of his Executive Summary, we must here state our concerns about the document before us.

1. First, the document is not grounded in an account of positive intellectual developments in the academic disciplines presently comprising the Humanities. It focuses, rather, on the ways in which Humanities, as a Division, can reclaim some of the ethical appeal (and enrollments) of programs currently housed in other divisions, including Natural Sciences and Engineering. The question, however, is what Humanities brings to the table in such collaboration. In his oral presentation to CPB, the Dean mentioned his interest in encouraging attention to issues of textuality and to methods of critical reading, but his plan provides no explicit program for instruction in these particular areas.
2. A second, and related, concern is that the Humanities Ten-year plan does not take advantage of a notable strength of the Division – its distinction in the area of cultural studies and literary theory. There is disappointment among faculty commentators on the Divisional plan that efforts to build upon these strengths are largely left to departmental plans, which are, admittedly, yet to be integrated into the Deans articulation of the divisional mission. Most notably, we are troubled by the minimal discussion of the nationally known Center for Cultural Studies, one long-time focus of intellectual activity in the Division.
3. Our third concern is with the Dean's overarching argument that "societal *demand* [emphasis added] for what the Humanities can provide" is not presently being satisfied by academic humanists, implying that Humanities low enrollments are mostly deserved, whether the department sees itself as traditional or avant-garde. To remedy this problem he proposes that the Division redefine (or reclaim) as "Humanities" issues and literatures that are now mainly addressed in other campus divisions such as the languages of science and technology, arts management, human health, programming languages. This Divisional reorientation will, implicitly, require faculty with different competencies than departments now seek, risking the undermining of existing disciplinary strengths. If departments are not receptive to such future appointments, the burden will be on them to create service courses that will bring them up to divisional enrollment quotas. The general message to existing departments is that they will get more graduate student support if they offer more service courses to undergraduates with no apparent, parallel concern for maintaining quality. The divisional component of the plan before us is, thus, largely, if not entirely, enrollment-driven.
4. Our fourth concern is that the enrollment-driven aspects of the Dean's plan do not directly support the core campus mission. To reverse the long-term decline in enrollments and morale, he believes that the Division, as such, must take a proactive role. That role will have two major components: (a), to impose large productivity gains on the existing departments by requiring them to teach very large service courses (with or without no TA's) in order offset the necessarily small classes that must be offered in such fields as Languages and Writing; (b) to use these imposed productivity gains to retain an increasing number of enrollment-generated FTE in the Division. These centrally-held FTE will be used in three ways: (1) to provide support for an increased number of graduate students (and to eventually double GS enrollment); (2) to hire staff; and (3) to give divisional appointments to future faculty leaders for whom there may be no departmental affiliation.
5. Our fifth concern is that the enrollment-driven aspects of the Dean's plan are not internally coherent. On the one hand, innovative programs to satisfy "societal demand" for humanists do not promise to meet divisional enrollment quotas, but rather would be subsidized by departmental service courses that are presumably less specialized than the current curriculum. On the other hand, the Executive Summary does not specify what these courses would be, or explain why they would successfully draw larger enrollments.

We can summarize our concerns as follows: 1) What does it mean for a department to "plan" to increase its enrollment? Do departments plan to have low enrollment? Or are they merely setting standards that they may now be expected to lower? 2) Why does the divisional plan present itself as overtly non-responsive to departmental plans? (The Exec. Sum. says [p. 10] that the division will respond to departmental plans in April,

and ask the departments to submit revisions by June.) 3) Why should the campus be more interested in having a strong Humanities Division that focuses on collaboration with other divisions, than on strengthening departments and programs in history, philosophy, literature, etc.? 4) Why is there no explicit concern with the impact on departmental quality of the growing pressure for high enrollments? Should Humanities (like Engineering) consider defending its current workload ratios based on the demanding nature of required coursework?

The following are specific comments on specific programs proposed in the Humanities Ten-year Plan.

- **SCIENCE, MEDICINE, AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES.** This is to be “an interdivisional program housed in Humanities.” There is, however, no evidence that anyone in currently in Humanities (with the exception of D. Haraway, who has a Ph.D. in Biology, and perhaps one or two junior faculty), would have an interest or competence in this area. Why reserve 5 divisional FTE for a program with only 40 projected majors that might be more effectively “housed” in another Division?
- **MASTER IN PUBLIC HUMANITIES.** This is, essentially, an Arts and Cultural Management program. (Northwestern’s Drama School offers a combined Theatre/Business degree of this kind.) What does Humanities bring to the table here? The Humanities Division is, essentially, proposing to use two of its FTE to provide a director and staffing. The courses would, presumably, come from other divisions. Such a proposal might be feasible and attractive if UCSC had a School of Management with which departments such as History and Art History might offer joint degree programs in areas such as curatorship.
- **MAJOR AND MA IN LIBERAL ARTS.** The idea here is to create a default major in Humanities that would, presumably, recoup for the Division a certain number of students who now enroll in other default majors, especially those in Social Sciences. It would even allow students to take “significant course work in other divisions.” The obvious question is why students who want to “major in Gen. Ed.” should be in UC under the Master Plan. The MA component (for BA’s who want more undergraduate course work) makes more sense. There are students who stay on or do a second BA who would be better off doing something like this.
- **DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN GLOBAL STUDIES.** This is a program with which the Dean is affiliated offered by a consortium of major Universities on various continents. Based on the Divisional Plan, it is not clear that UCSC could have more than a marginal role in it
- **HUMAN HEALTH MAJOR.** Once again, it is not clear what resources Humanities brings to the table beyond a scattering of potentially relevant courses. The Divisional plan offers only to provide one FTE (generated by productivity gains in existing Humanities departments) for an administrator what would be campus-wide program. The unaddressed question is whether more faculty with this interest (especially in women’s health issues) should be hired in existing departments, and, if so, whether these should be Humanities departments.
- **CENTER FOR MIND AND LANGUAGE.** This appears to be the only substantive proposal generated from below, and the only proposal in which there is existing divisional strength arising out of a longstanding connection between Philosophy and Linguistics.
- **RELIGIOUS STUDIES.** The Dean here “takes note of the desire of several faculty across the campus to consider the creation of a program for the study of religion.” There is as yet, however, no indication that these faculty have been asked to submit a proposal. The Dean says that he is prepared to “inject at least one FTE in its support.” Is this enough to do anything significant?

- **SOUTH ASIAN STUDIES CENTER.** UCSC has in fact accumulated a large number of faculty in this area, and funds would be relatively easy to raise. Assessing the viability of such a Center, however, requires the relevant faculty to submit a substantive proposal.

As described thus far, few of the new programs proposed in Humanities draw on existing strengths, their potential intellectual distinction has yet to be demonstrated. They are market driven, and, yet, they may have to be subsidized in the foreseeable future by watering down the quality of existing programs and/or by default majors.. A bright spot is the Dean's recognition that new directions in the Humanities should be driven by the work of the Institute for Humanities Research (IHR). Future versions of the Division's Ten-year Plan should attempt to more fully reflect that work, as well as to prioritize whatever new programs are proposed.

NATURAL SCIENCES

Evaluation of the Natural Sciences Ten-year plan must begin with the premise that we are now already in the third year of the ten-year period for which we are planning. During the first two years the Dean of Natural Sciences wisely based his proposals for curricular Initiatives on ten-year plans, and deservedly received the lion's share of the non-workload based FTE given out in the Initiatives Process of 1998-2000. Without in any way begrudging Natural Sciences that success, CPB believes that it should be counted to a significant extent as forward-funding of the divisional ten-year plan that is now before us, and that some of the resources now requested should be debited against those already filled or promised under the Initiatives Process. Its present plans cannot be fully evaluated until such an accounting is made.

In evaluating the longstanding resource requests of Natural Sciences, the biggest campus-wide issue will be to balance growth in Natural Sciences with its heavier start-up costs and lower enrollments against growth in other Divisions that will be more impacted by accelerated campus growth. If the campus chooses to reap the greater rewards in extramural funding, will a significant share of our thus-augmented resources be assured to the waiting divisions/departments? If not, can it be said that Natural Sciences has already received its fair share of forward funding through the Initiatives Process of the past two years?

The Dean's Executive Summary takes seriously the goal of doubling extramural funding and the number of graduate students, and attempts to outline a plan for meeting these goals. He explicitly recognizes that these goals require appropriate resources, especially in terms of space and staffing, and has responded thoughtfully to CPB's written queries about the implications for his proposals of a lag in the construction of necessary space. The strategy of the Divisional plan is to emphasize specific areas in which extramural funding is most likely to be available: health sciences, environment, and technology. Natural Sciences, in effect, requests significant resources, in turn for the promise of doubling their extra mural funding from roughly \$30 million now, to \$60 million. The implicit point is that the requested resources represent a campus investment that will yield the greatest return if it is made in the near term. The Dean does a good job in outlining how and why the proposed thematic programs of research would be unique to UCSC and bring immediate funding opportunities to the campus. He does not, however, set benchmarks for the attainment of extra-mural funds that would allow for a continuing reassessment of Divisional plans.

This leads us to a more fundamental issue: has the development in Natural Sciences of thematically-based interdepartmental Initiatives produced greater success in raising extramural funds than might have been expected through a strategy of developing core departments? CPB's question is based on the perception that academic Divisions are somewhat arbitrary administrative units that do not, as a general rule, need to have "themes." We believe that universities are judged and ranked by the strength of their core departments and faculty, and not by the thematic coherence of their divisional plans. From this perspective, we would request the next stage of Natural Sciences planning to consider the possibility that, if its funding expectations were lower, a more effective immediate use of resources might be to promote key appointments in its core departments (Chemistry, Math, Physics, Biology) that would allow them to benefit in the way Earth Sciences, Ocean Sciences and Astronomy

have benefited under IGPP. Whatever the merits of this alternative approach to divisional planning, a more sweeping confrontation of the Division's instructional mission and declining enrollments would be helpful in the next phase of planning. In the present Executive Summary makes it is difficult to reconcile the lack of student appeal of the Division's most recently favored programs with the promise greater funding availability (and, essentially, greater marketability of our knowledge) in expanding them.

As is the case with Engineering, there is no question about the timeliness of these priorities. The next version of the Divisional plan, however, should address the extent to which the desirability of any or all of the proposed programs will diminish if their funding is delayed until the out-years of the present planning period.

CPB must also note that the specifics of what space resources are required and how they tie in to the plan are somewhat unclear. For example, the faculty FTE requirements appear in attachment A, but it is difficult to correlate that information with the rest of the plan. Very few details are provided on the required space and other resources. This should be corrected in future versions of the Divisional Plan.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

The Social Sciences Executive Summary, like that of the Humanities, does not yet provide a solid foundation on which to build a ten-year plan. It is too little grounded in intellectual developments in its component fields, and too focused on techniques of enrollment management that are more relevant for a transitional period of accelerated growth than they will be for the kind of quality-driven planning that the campus will need at steady-state. The difference between Humanities and Social Sciences is that, while the former is under-enrolled, the latter suffers from excess enrollment.

From CPB's perspective, the major issue facing the Social Sciences is not, whether but how and when, to scale down its workload/FTE ratios. Currently, the Division seeks to offset its high workload/FTE ratio by planning for growth in the impacted areas, a strategy repeatedly characterized as building on market-measures of academic quality while extending its reach to new student populations. Psychology and Sociology are "popular," high-enrollment majors that will be maintained as such, along with Economics ("the popular new major in business and management economics" is "home to large numbers of minority students"). The remainder of the growth will be managed in several graduate programs, including Education (by far the largest), new Ph.D. programs in physical anthropology and archaeology, and a proposed master's program in social documentation within Community Studies. The proposed program in social policy and public advocacy is intended to focus on 'solving' social problems rather than merely 'managing' them, in presumed contradistinction to other public policy programs in the state. All of these proposals are based on the assumption that current campus ranges will remain relatively stable, but it is not clear (even to the Social Sciences Dean) that the campus is best served intellectually, or in terms of its present and future mission, by a 34.3% allocation to Social Sciences. Before the next iteration of its plan, the EVC should give the Division specific guidance as to how the (implicitly) workload-based demands Social Sciences should be integrated with and balanced against the articulated needs of other campus divisions and departments. CPB believes that there should be measures of academic quality and success other than popularity and societal demand, and that the Division should actively seek to phase in these measures over the course of its ten-year plan. A Social Sciences Division with a somewhat more faculty-intensive curriculum and a smaller proportion of campus enrollments would, presumably, need less space than is required by the plan currently before us.

In this regard, the most fundamental question to be asked is whether the Division's workload could be brought closer to the campus norm if it had fewer, rather than more, applied programs. To what extent are enrollment levels in social sciences symptomatic of the lack on our campus of professional schools in areas such as education, management, social policy, etc.? Before the campus as a whole commits itself to *not* developing such professional programs, it should seek outside professional assessments of how the existing and proposed programs in Social Sciences compare in quality with comparable degree programs at other UC campuses that have

professional schools. Similar comparative assessments should be made of programs catering to students with similar applied interests at the top few CSU's. The relevant question is not whether UCSC's applied programs will be relatively popular – they will be – but, rather, whether their popularity is symptomatic of the lack of professional programs on our campus that could free the liberal arts departments in the Social Sciences to pursue their scholarly mission at lower enrollment levels. If such professional programs are more likely to be of UC-quality outside the liberal arts departments (or in joint programs with those departments), then the option of spinning off new schools ought to be seriously considered. The Division might, then, usefully consider the relation of its various departments to, for example, a School of Management with tracks in private sector, public sector, and non-profit management – or to a School of Education which might have a greater focus on teaching disciplinary subject areas than the present Education Department which focuses on more basic studies of early language acquisition.

A related concern of CPB is the imbalance of Social Sciences proposals in favor of applied, rather than more critical and theoretical, pursuits. The Dean's written reponse, that his programs will, of course, be as theoretical as they need to be, is insubstantial. We believe, however, that it is problematic for a UC campus to commit itself to the "application" of a set of value orientations (however commendable) that may be evolving and contestable. A more stable approach might be to develop programs stressing the dynamic links between work that problematizes and/or reinterprets these value orientations and work that applies them. Our campus would be short-sighted to specialize in the one kind of work at the expense of the other.

The Dean's proposed Division-wide programs illustrate our concerns. His Executive Summary asserts that Colleges Nine and Ten (which are under his jurisdiction) will have what is alternatively described as curricula and/or themes. These are, respectively, "International and Global Perspectives" and "Social Justice and Community." It is not clear, however, that the Dean is committing divisional resources or FTE (beyond the college core course) to funding these themes as curricula, or that, indeed, they represent anything more than a value orientation that is to be promoted. The only clear sense in which these Colleges will have a "curriculum" is that they will require students to leave campus for a "service learning requirement." There is no doubt that such an opportunity could benefit who are prepared for it by their academic majors, but there is no intrinsic reason to believe that all students would benefit from such a requirement regardless of major unless the College itself provided a curriculum that would prepare them for the actual experiences to which they will be exposed. In the absence of a genuine co-curricular program (such as exists at colleges like Antioch and Berea), it is difficult not to conclude that the requirement is motivated in part by the prospective overcrowding of our campus, and the consequent need to get students to leave while still collecting state funds for their enrollment. The Division's proposed Honors Minor in Global Studies may provide some academic content to the experience of students who enroll in order to take time off. In the Executive Summary, however, this appears to be only a small program requiring no additional resources, and it is, thus, unclear how significant its on-campus curricular component would be.

CPB has similar misgivings about the Division's proposed M.A. in Social Policy and Public Advocacy. The description is very vague, and the required core courses do not appear to ground the program in any specific intellectual location. In response to CPB's written questions the Dean concedes that this program is insufficiently related to other public policy proposals that cropped up in departmental plans. He alludes to previously commissioned faculty studies of the feasibility of and market for a public policy MA in our service area. In the next iteration of his plan, CPB would like to see whether his proposal adequately meets the concerns laid out in those studies.

The contrast between this proposal and the well-formulated plans for graduate programs in Education could not be more striking. The task of teaching teachers seems to represent the best and brightest of the planning in the Division. We must note, however, that, like Natural Sciences, the Social Science Division must account for the interim FTE that it has already received based on successful Initiatives and workload, and that it must and to incorporate those forward-funded faculty positions in the intellectual justifications for future hires. This exercise is essential to the phasing of the Division's resource requests over the six years that will be left when the ten-year

planning process is complete. (For example, the second hire authorized in Community Studies for 2000—2001 that resulted in only one acceptance, now appears to have been relegated to a position quite far down the line, in tandem with the eventual approval and growth of the MA program in Social Documentation.)

Finally, CPB must ask that in the next phase of planning the Social Sciences Division explicitly address the tension between preserving core strengths under conditions of overcrowding and pursuing new initiatives. With such a plethora of programs and research centers (seven of the latter), the Division must prioritize and assess interconnections, synergies in hiring/curriculum/space among them. The Dean has in fact incorporated all its academic units, including Colleges Nine and Ten, into the Division's overarching themes adumbrated in the Introduction (including diversity and justice, international and global issues, and public education). From CPB's perspective, however, it is not clear that academic divisions in a liberal arts university need to have "themes," rather than strong departments and faculty. It is not clear from these preliminary results that requiring thematic consistency across the departments serves them, or the Division, well. The time could not be more auspicious for a reappraisal, from without and within, of the core mission of the Social Sciences Division.

LIBRARY AND MEDIA SERVICES

The summary of the Library makes an extremely strong case for its having done a remarkably good job with far too few resources. Based on an analysis internal to UCSC and also on external comparisons with institutions ranging CSU libraries to members of the Association of Research Libraries (from which UCSC is the only UC main campus library excluded), the summary concludes: "the library finds itself at confluence of two opposing events: the flowering of the campus academic program, and the obsolescence of the library facilities to support it." CPB believes that this is the only unit of which this could be unequivocally said. It is clear that whatever planning processes have been in force up to the present have failed the library in this particular regard. The Library's summary therefore deserves particularly careful attention.

The Executive Summary seeks to specify its needs with some precision within a limited set of assumptions. The needs are in the following categories: media services, collection staffing, space, and collections.

Media services were a problematic issue throughout the Initiatives process, not because they are not essential but because of the way their immediacy overlays the library's other budgetary problems. Putting aside the question of expanding the services, the summary suggests that their cycle of obsolescence be taken care of as an annual infrastructural cost of approximately \$240,000. In view of the interest taken in instructional technology by other units, CPB strongly approves of this suggestion.

The staffing of the collection clearly represents one of the library's strongest contributions in an area which it can control. Its record suggests that its estimate of 51-54 FTE to meet the demands that are already being placed upon it is reasonable. But CPB notes that 4 of these FTE are projected for the SVC and 11 for Year-Round operation. In light of the complete uncertainty at present of the bottom-line budgetary benefit, CPB reaffirms its concern about their indirect impact on the campus.

The summary estimates an additional 20 FTE for the expansion of library space. The project at the core of its plan finally achieve the status of campus library for a research university. Other committees and CPB have already expressed themselves strongly on this need. We re-emphasize here that the present lack of this space, and the possible future timetable of its availability, should be factored as constraints into present planning of academic programs.

The collections, both print and electronic, which remain the central *raison d'être* of both UCSC libraries, are also the substance of a future that cannot yet be planned. This substance will be hypothetically determined by the

campus's academic planning. It will be materially determined by the priorities in intellectual and pedagogic values that the campus chooses in fact. Succinctly, its quality will go where its money is directed. There are many academic enterprises in the world today that do not match their claims with their resources. UCSC should not foster these. CPB recommends a stronger role for the procedures that tie programmatic development to the ability of library resources to support them. The lack of resources should be factored in as constraints even more fundamental than those of space.

To this extent, the summary of the library's plans are acceptable, but the condition is (as the library itself makes perfectly clear) that the parameters of their plans are set by responsible academic policies.

GRADUATE DIVISION

The Graduate Division's plan is ambitious, and sets goals that most of the campus would support, namely a significant increase in graduate enrollments and support for graduate students. Some of the attractive elements of the plan are the proposals to promote "graduate groups" and to pursue external funding more aggressively. The idea of providing services to post-docs is interesting, and is likely to become more important in the future.

However, the feasibility of the major elements of the plan needs to be examined more closely. Neither the Graduate Division, nor the other Academic Divisions offer feasible plans to double the number of graduate students, i.e. to increase grad enrollments by 100 students each year. One possibility is to increase significantly the number of students in Masters Degree programs. The Graduate Division may be the best unit to lead this effort. If the campus falls short of the goal of doubling graduate enrollments, then the plans of Graduate Division need to be scaled back.

The programs outlined in the Executive Summaries appear to be insufficient to meet one of the major campus goals, a doubling of the number of graduate students. To have exciting and productive research programs, to attract the best faculty, and to have excellent teaching assistants for support of undergraduate instruction we need at least 2000 graduate students. One idea that should be explored more thoroughly in the next round of planning is the feasibility and desirability of additional Master's Degree programs. Another idea, in the same vein, is a Masters in subject program for teachers already teaching in jr/sr high school. These programs would respond to the state's mandate to educate teachers, but the responsibility for such programs would lie in the departments. Either type of program could provide UC-quality advanced training for future teachers, often using the existing curriculum, and it may be possible to attract a large number of motivated graduate students without incurring the costs of establishing whole new programs.

The possible creation of new Master's programs is consistent with the approach to developing professional schools suggested above. A free standing Education School, for example, might offer joint programs with departments that combine graduate work in the disciplines with teaching certification; similar joint programs might be developed with a management school. Still other Master's programs, offered by single departments, could prepare students for careers in the computing or biotechnology areas. CPB would like to see all academic divisions evaluate the possibility of expanding the number of Master's degree students, and encourages the Graduate Division to take a lead in promoting this development.

Many of the plans of the Graduate Division are centered on the idea that one of the new colleges will be a residential and administrative center for graduate students. This is an idea worth pursuing but it may be in conflict with campus commitments to provide housing for undergrads. It also seems unlikely that 50% of graduate students would choose to live on campus. The next round of planning should also consider scenarios with a smaller role of the graduate division in the new colleges.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

The Office for Research makes a simple request (1-page) for additional personnel. The increased staff would include 17.5 professional staff, 3 staff for funding dissemination, 1 computer support persons 1 compliance officer, 1 human subjects administrator and 1 associate director.

The simple justification for this request is that the OSR will be processing more grants, so it needs more people. There is, however, no justification for the various positions - why the distribution was decided along the lines projected. While it may obvious that more personnel will be needed, the exact configuration proposed is unsupported. This issue must be addressed in the next phase of planning.

In addition, CPB would like the answers to two specific questions: (1) what technological changes are anticipated and how they will affect operations at OR? (2) What regulatory changes are anticipated (such as greatly expanded need for human subjects clearance in social sciences) and what will those effects be?

More generally, CPB is concerned that the drive to expand non-state-derived funding sources is apparent at all levels of UC, and that our campus OR needs to be positioned to maximize not only the application of grant proposals and assist, when requested, in the utilization of these funds once they are awarded. In addition, OR needs to serve as the lynchpin for coordinating the regulatory oversight of grants. From the current planning document, we do not get a sense that there has been a critical evaluation of OR, where it is positioned now, and the directions in which it needs to grow. We hope that the yet-to-be appointed permanent Vice Chancellor of Research will address these broader questions.