CPB REPORT ON EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES OF 10-YEAR CAMPUS SUPPORT UNIT PLANS

MAY 21, 2001

INTRODUCTION

The functions of campus support units are very heterogeneous. Some support units, notably the Library, are a *sine qua non* for an intellectual and pedagogic community. Some are a *sine qua non* of institutional structure and function (e.g., BAS). Some support units exist to facilitate academic activities, but also take on a variety of quasi-autonomous tasks (e.g., Undergraduate Education). Some support units exist almost exclusively to facilitate intellectual and pedagogic activities (e.g., the Office of Research and the Graduate Division). Some exist primarily to provide institutional support for the student body (e.g., Student Affairs). More fundamentally, the academic divisions include many support functions, and some support units have pedagogically-related components. Support units also have to support themselves, and not in a trivial sense. A functional distinction between academic units and campus support units is, thus, quite difficult to draw in practice.

Partly due to their heterogeneity and partly to their variable relation to academic planning, the Executive Summaries of the campus support units represent a wide range of assumptions as to what is required of them at this stage in the ten-year planning process. Some of the "plans" produced are simple requests for additional resources with little or no attention paid to the evolving mission of the units making the requests; some the support units submitting plans have provided partly overlapping accounts of their respective 'turf,' with little apparent coordination; at least one is essentially a descriptions of the unit's overall mission, with little, if anything, resembling a plan.

CPB does not consider the presently submitted support unit plans, when taken together, to be sufficiently clear and focused for adequate consultation to take place. In part, the complexity of planning for campus support is systemic, an inevitable product of development and growth in a context where major academic decisions are yet to be made. We believe, however, that the complexity has also come to mask contradictions and confusions that could be greatly reduced by a more rational administrative structure.

We believe that, before the next stage of the planning process gets underway, the campus support units need clearer directives from the EVC. They have not, for example, been asked to take their base budget into account for planning purposes, and none adequately account for the recent augmentations that they requested and received during the Initiatives Process of the last two years.

More fundamentally, however, we believe that the EVC must review the form and manner in which academic support is organized before long-term plans are laid down. The creation of the Campus Provost title, itself, occurred two years ago, as part of a broad reorganization of the campus administration that involved expanding four administrative positions into full-time appointments under the title of Vice Provost. The stated reason for creating four full-time Vice Provosts was to forward-fund the administrative structure necessary to plan for rapid campus growth. After two years, the effectiveness and rationale of the new administrative structure needs to be evaluated. Have the newly created Vice Provosts been given the staffing and responsibilities commensurate with full-time, high level, appointments? Have their roles been central or peripheral to the planning process currently in place? To what extent has their added time been taken up by interacting with each other? To what extent has their time been spent trying to define, or redefine, their respective jobs? Has the addition of these newly full-time positions allowed for the elimination of the part-time positions that preceded them, or has it, rather, required the unanticipated proliferation of new part-time or temporary appointments?

Although CPB could offer its own observations in response to these questions, it would prefer that the EVC, in the course of holding all campus units accountable for the recent augmentation to their base budgets, account himself for the benefits, if any, produced thus far by the centralization of functions under the title of Campus Provost over the past two years.

Although the distinction between academic and general support units is, as we have said, difficult to draw we have, purely for reasons of convenience, considered the issues raised by the Library, the Graduate Division and the Office of Research as part of our Report on the Academic Divisions. In the present Report, we deal with the remainder of the support units, which in general – present issues that, at this stage, relate most closely to the plans of the academic divisions, and they are serve a much broader and more generalized set of institutional needs. They are discussed below.

For immediate purposes, however, CPB will focus on two issues. The first is a general categorization of campus support units in relation to each other, and the second is the extent to which their individual Executive Summaries, as submitted, can be seen as useful precursors to viable plans.

CAMPUS PROVOST UNITS

PLANNING AND BUDGET

Among the campus support units, P&B is the most compact in organization and the widest in its functions. While at lower levels there is an important distinction between it and the academic side of the administration, at the highest level P&B seems to sit at the right hand of the Campus Provost in his final review of academic plans. Outside the academic sphere, the structure of responsibilities among the Vice Chancellors' of P&B, BAS and SA seems unclear, or perhaps, fluid. To evaluate the plans presented CPB would like an account from the EVC of what parts of financial planning and management are centralized and why – and, also, of what parts are not centralized and why not. Is the relative leanness of P&B a direct reflection of its centrality in the highest level of decision-making, or is it rather the result of the imperviousness of certain elements of campus management to centralized planning?

P&B's proposals do not directly address the larger issue of how they will manage overall campus expansion, but are, rather, focused on the immediate needs of their office. Nevertheless, their proposals are also rather vague, focusing heavily on the future prospects of conversion to electronic forms of data manipulation. In principle, this emphasis on electronic forms of data storage seems worthwhile. To have these data electronically available could prove beneficial, but only if units across campus know they are there and have some ability to do things with the data. Storage of data when it is not needed or used does not seem a prudent use of effort. Future versions of the P&B plan should, thus, consider the following questions: How do we train staff across the campus to access and use the data being made available? How do we cope with overload? What manpower will be needed? CPB would also be interested in what plans we can make to facilitate better communication and understanding with OP, and with other campuses in the system.

HUMAN RESOURCES

An effective department of Academic Human Resources, specifically designed for academic functions, is obviously essential for a successful campus and now is, equally obviously, the right time to plan for it. The Provost's Executive Summary provides a generalized description of services that will be required for a large increase in faculty, with a number of desirable aims for 2001-05 and a short list of proposals for 2005-10. These proposals, however, do not make clear their relationship to the self-review in which HR was previously engaged, are not constructed systematically on a current budgetary base, and are too fragmented to constitute a plan. The present document, thus, seems best viewed as a place-holder until the time that Academic HR is in a position to respond to more clearly demarcated campus needs (it is not, for example, just the total increase of faculty at build-out, but the pattern of increase that HR will need to know).

The administration needs to determine whether the resources of HR are adequate to meet the demands for 2001-02 In general, however, CPB defers comment on immediate resource proposals until there is a coherent plan that convincingly lays out both the best-practice use of present resources, and the administrative methodology for their appropriate increase.

There are two exceptions. The first, a major one, is the reference to housing, one of many throughout the Executive Summaries. This points to the need for a coherent and perhaps, a centralized approach, to this absolutely crucial problem. The second is a proposal for a "floater" force of administrative support. Although this is proposed for implementation in 2005-10, it deserves much more immediate consideration, and maybe implementation, as a supple resource in the resolution of conflicts between centralizing and decentralizing practices. CPB's immediate question is where and how such a resource should be developed.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Inasmuch as the discussion of IT by the Campus Provost explicitly presents itself as a "placeholder" in the planning process, CPB will withhold comment until administrative responsibility for IT is fixed, and and there is a real plan to consider.

BUSINESS AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

In reviewing the BAS Executive Summary it is unclear where, so to speak, "planning central" for the campus infrastructure is located this year, as between BAS and P&B. In last year's Initiatives Process, BAS assumed this role, producing a report of well over 200 pages that, in effect, informed the campus of the massive funds required to do the infrastructural planning necessary to qualify for capital projects. In this year's plan there is no comparable financial analysis. The approach of BAS is, rather, to tell the campus what it needs to know (what decisions need to be made by other units) in order to construct its ten-year plan. Following this approach, the BAS Executive Summary provides a long list of campus decisions that have not been made (p. 9), and asks, in effect, how BAS can be expected to say what resources it will need to implement those decisions.

Rather than justifying specific proposals, the BAS Executive Summary merely lists the proposed projects for which there are available funds and those for which there are none. CPB does not, however, find in the BAS Report a basis for confidence in the campus's ability to plan and build the space required for growth. The BAS Executive Summary is frankly pessimistic in its projection of available resources: "BAS is not well positioned to effectively support the campus' long range plans." (p. 13) With respect to the SVC and MBEST, the Executive Summary says, "These activities come at an increased and often underestimated cost and currently, the level of resources provided to BAS to support these efforts is insufficient to cover new activities of this kind." CPB reads such statements as indications that what we have been calling the "gap" and the "lag" between enrollments and capital resources are increasing because basic planning has not been done, and could not be funded if it were to be done.

We agree, however, with BAS's general complaint that it cannot responsibly produce a final capital and construction plan until it knows the campus academic plan but we would find it helpful if future versions of its interim planning would address the following questions. What funds were provided for capital planning in the Initiatives Process? How were they spent? What funded planning remains to be done? Where are the bottlenecks? Is the "lag" increasing? Does BAS presently have money for planning, or only for "projects?" These questions can and should be answered by BAS before the next stage in the planning process. At that point, the EVC will need to decide whether to give BAS the decisions it needs to begin planning now, or to delay final decisions on the plans submitted by other campus units until their costs have been evaluated by BAS.

As matters now stand, CPB does not view the BAS document as ten-year plan, but, rather, as a mission statement combined with a plea for the decisions it regards as necessary in order to produce a ten-year plan.

There is, at present, little here for us to approve or disapprove, and we await a more substantial document from BAS that will tell us whether the campus learned anything about mid-range capital planning from last year's Initiatives Process, and whether the problems confronting BAS in coping with campus growth are more or less dire than they seemed a year ago.

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

The Executive Summary submitted by University Relations is a ten-year plan in name only. In substance, it is, rather, a description of UR's basic mission of raising funds for all other campus activities. Insofar as that mission is, as we all know, vital to the success of the campus, we suppose that resources for UR are justifiable *prima facie.* To state this *prima facie* argument, however, is not to give a plan. We understand from the VCUR that he is working on a plan which will be based, in part, on the report of an outside consultant. Apparently, a preliminary report has now been submitted, but we have been unable to obtain it. Based on what we have seen thus far, the ten-year planning of University Relations is not a satisfactory basis on which to proceed with confidence.

The essence of the present document lies in the a claim that UR is "seriously underfunded for its vital mission. There is, however, no demonstration that it cannot use its existing resources (c. 41 FTE, before last year's augmentation) to do what is herein described. Instead, there is the promise of a plan for a "comprehensive ... fundraising campaign" that will "generate from $150 to 250 million in private gifts over a seven-year campaign period" and that it is expected to exceed even this high goal. The major fundraising campaign (which is now in the "planning phase") would, presumably, take up almost all of the period ending in 2010, which is to be covered by the ten-year plans.

If the presumption is correct, then what is required in the Executive Summary is an outline of a 7-year fund-raising campaign, and an assessment of the additional resources it would require. There is, however, nothing of the kind provided. Instead, there is a broad assertion that the UR plan, once produced, would involve the whole campus (administrators and faculty alike) in "building a culture of philanthropy."

Insofar as CPB understands this notion, it must ask why some or all of the resources that UR will request should not be distributed over the academic and administrative units that are expected to be increasingly involve in fundraising. Why should we assume otherwise, until we see a plan? And why should we invest in it without some accounting of how successfully the initiatives money that UR got last year has been spent?

The most basic question to be answered in any major fundraising is what role UR would play in implementing it *vis a vis* the Chancellor's Office, the divisional development offices, college development offices, and so forth. We will not know whether UR is "seriously underfunded" until we know whether it is the best entity to bear the burden of large-scale capital fundraising. The assertion that this is, in fact, its job is not a sufficient reason to support its desire for a major increase in staffing over the presently high level.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

UCSC prides itself on being a campus where undergraduates are served exceptionally well. The responsibility of the Division of Undergraduate Education is to ensure that this commitment is sustained. The Executive Summary enacts this responsibility with a focus almost entirely on revising and expanding its own organizational chart. It proposes a wide-ranging administrative structure for undergraduate education, broadly considered, that would incorporate six directorates: Instructional Support, Learning Support Services, International Education, Research, Advising, and College Provosts.

While this elaborate structure represents the functions most critical to undergraduate students, it is based primarily on the principle of centralization. The document does not examine whether these functions are actually

adequately sustained by the system as it now operates. Neither does the document address the many implications of such centralization for other units on campus that currently carry out these functions. How will the Office of Undergraduate Education share responsibility for writing instruction and advising, both of which are now undertaken in the colleges as well as the departments? How will the "coordination" of these services improve them? It is not clear that adding to the current student-support units a new and sizeable administrative structure within Undergraduate Education is either necessary or desirable.

The summary has the great merit of clearly calling attention to the broad issue of campus centralization. It underlies the current discussion of the relations between colleges and divisions, as summarized in the Report on Colleges. In its comments on that report, CPB recommended that a flexible range of solutions be preserved for each college, a recommendation at odds with the high degree of centralization, and even standardization, that is implied in the Executive Summary. The summary also raises, by implication, the question of relations between proliferating, and potentially competing, student-support units, most notably Student Affairs and Undergraduate Studies. The possibility should be considered that we do not need a full-time Vice Provost if Undergraduate unless that office were to assume some of the functions presently performed by Student Affairs and the departments. These and other issues need to be resolved before the final version of the ten-year plans for Undergraduate Education.

Finally, relations between the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Graduate Division must be considered in the ten-year plans. Because the responsibilities of these units are not analogous, they will be differently affected by centralization.

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Student Affairs is an exceptionally broad-ranging enterprise with three identified foci of planning: student and staff development, practice/process efficiencies, and facilities/work space improvement. The identified constituencies of this unit are not only students but also staff and faculty. The "Student Affairs" unit has thus become an umbrella unit responsible for much more than its name suggests. This development ought to be reconsidered in light of the pressures generated by campus growth.

The Executive Summary aims usefully to assess its programs (including development of "student-citizen," the "self-service" model of delivering student services, and increasing faculty/staff housing) in terms of measures currently being taken (in part as a result of the Initiatives Process) as well as future needs. It does not prioritize the needs of the programs but rather presents them in parallel with one another. Such prioritization will be essential to the final ten-years plan.

The third area of focus in the Executive Summary, the issue of space, is especially significant, given the pressing space needs of the campus at large and the number of overlapping constituencies involved. The plan to expand childcare services includes a new campus center that will serve the children of students, staff, and faculty as well as serve unspecified "research needs" of the faculty. Such a range of participants and needs appears to require more than a single building and a single program designed for them all. In addition, how will the plan to refurbish the quarry as a campus venue for university-wide activities affect the related need for a campus auditorium (see Humanities Division summary of facilities needs, p. 10)?

Student Affairs, as currently organized, has the capacity to affect virtually all segments of the campus, from quality-of-life issues for students, staff, and faculty to the delivery of instruction. The latter is especially critical in the context of the "non-traditional methods of delivering service" designed for SVC and "Year-Round Operation." These long-distance learning options appear to be the product of premature planning, since (as the summary itself indicates), the nature of the academic programs at these centers have yet to be specified.

Finally, several critical questions are raised by the apparent trend toward overlapping functions of Student Affairs with other campus support units. First, how will the proposal of the Office of Undergraduate Education to coordinate student advising intersect with the advising services of Student Affairs? The twin dangers of duplication and competition among units must clearly be avoided. Second, should faculty and staff housing continue to be folded under the purview of Student Affairs? Aside from reflecting past campus practice, is this the best (most efficient and responsive) administrative structure in which to consider such an increasingly pressing issue as housing? Wouldn't Student Affairs be better able to manage the consequences of enrollment growth— a daunting task in itself – if it were not also responsible for ameliorating the housing crisis of staff and faculty?