March 1, 2002

DEANS
VICE CHANCELLORS
VICE PROVOSTS
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN

Dear Colleagues –

I began my July 31, 2001 planning update by reviewing the campus' pledge to two important goals—retaining UCSC's uncommon commitment among public research universities to undergraduate education, while expanding its top-tier research and introducing a significant cohort of graduate students. As Chancellor Greenwood and I studied the planning documents submitted by principal officers in December 2001, we were encouraged by their thoughtfulness and by the variety of pathways toward these dual goals while maintaining and enhancing academic excellence.

I will provide feedback to each of your plans through a series of consultations and deliberations during the next several months (and beyond). Initial feedback begins publicly today in this open letter to principal officers, and will continue privately in one-on-one conversations with principal officers and in consultations with the Senate. Feedback also will be sought in other forums such as divisional meetings. I encourage your constructive comments and alternative viewpoints that can be incorporated into our final plan.

My comments put forward in the attached document are framed by the campus mission and eight priorities stated in previous phases of the planning process. In this document, my goal is to put forward some ideas and directions intended to provoke the campus to think broadly and strategically about its future. Specifically, this document serves as the first of three communications during the next several months. It will:

▶ provide an overall framework for moving forward, provide feedback to deans and principal officers on their comprehensive plans, and pose questions; and

▶ identify a number of issues that require more thought and discussion as we move forward toward the publication of an integrated campus plan.

The second document, which will be a draft resource plan, will be completed in March; the third document, a long-term blueprint for the campus, will be completed in late spring.

This document reinforces my belief that program planning and development is best done closest to the level where the expertise and leadership exists—whether that is in an individual department or in a group representing cross-divisional interests. This document represents a crucial next step as we design a path to a future in which UC Santa Cruz will focus on both research and teaching excellence and will further define its unique characteristics among the very highest quality institutions of higher education.

Sincerely,

John B. Simpson
Campus Provost and
Executive Vice Chancellor

Cc: Chancellor Greenwood
       Senate Chair Blumenthal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

W ith the submission and review of the divisional plans, we are progressing towards the completion of a long-term blueprint for this campus. In the future, UC Santa Cruz will focus on excellence in both research and teaching and will further define its unique niche among the very highest quality institutions of higher education. UC Santa Cruz will pursue its definition mindful of its unique characteristics, capacities, areas of excellence, and values. We are not simply another Research I university. Rather, the very aspects that make UC Santa Cruz unique now among the University of California campuses should be celebrated and very much guide our pursuit of our own goals and aspirations.

As a near final step in the planning process, we need—as a campus—to understand how each divisional plan contributes to local as well as campuswide goals. We then need a shared understanding of actions that will address strategic crosscutting issues. We must also recognize that building excellence is an ongoing effort that transcends the current planning process, so we must develop a culture of strategic thinking, of ongoing planning and assessment, and of building academic program and academic support leadership throughout the campus. I must emphasize though, that plans and buildings, laboratories and books, do not make a great university. It is the people—the faculty, students, and staff—who use these things to create a great university.

This communication is intended to accomplish several objectives. In my role as Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, it has been and continues to be through this planning process my intent to:

▶ Create the framework, environment, and opportunity for programs within academic divisions and departments—where the majority of planning and decision-making does and must occur—to contribute more strategically to the mission and future of the campus;

▶ Encourage, promote, and facilitate creative new ideas and constant renewal while also strengthening the programs that form the foundation of our academic and academic support core;

▶ Assume overall campus responsibility to ensure quality in leadership, faculty, and graduates;

▶ Align the campus' resources with our campuswide strategies and, in collaboration with Chancellor Greenwood, principal officers, and the Academic Senate, make some difficult decisions of priority, tradeoff, and organizational alignment. *Similarly, principal officers must align their resource bases and make difficult choices within the purview of their own areas of responsibilities*; and

▶ Ensure that the campus makes the appropriate core investments now that will position it for academic excellence and for emerging opportunities well beyond 2010.

This document, therefore, represents a next step towards creating that blueprint for the future. It begins to paint a portrait of what UC Santa Cruz will be in 2010, both its characteristics and the distribution of its academic disciplines. It comments briefly on the comprehensive plans submitted by each academic and academic support divisions (in-depth comments will be provided to principal officers in private consultations), describes

a plan for moving forward on a number of issues for which consensus on their resolution is not yet evident, and introduces strategies that will guide our resource decisions over the next decade. As such, it is intended to provoke the entire campus to think broadly and strategically about its future. This document will not direct priorities and strategies at the divisional level. Instead, it builds upon the comprehensive plans submitted by the divisions, which already constitute the detail about how we will realize the enormous institutional potential of UC Santa Cruz as its own unique research university. This document will, however, address a number of crosscutting topics. In addition, I have outlined a number of tasks that my office needs to complete and issues about which I will seek advice from the Academic Senate and others.

Between now and June 2002, we will pursue these issues, refine the principles and processes in our resource plan (which will be completed later this spring), and develop a shared understanding of the components of our integrated plan.

A PORTRAIT OF THE UC SANTA CRUZ OF 2010

I n our journey to build UC Santa Cruz into an outstanding public research university with an uncommon commitment to education at all levels, the campus has developed a number of academic plans, resource strategies, and vision documents. The *Millennium Committee[1]* report in 1998 began our current planning efforts. Last July, I reiterated the eight priorities for shaping the UC Santa Cruz of 2010 (see sidebar), and the divisional plans submitted in December 2001 were the most recent step in that two-year planning process. The submitted plans create a vision for the UC Santa Cruz of 2010 with the following characteristics:

▶ The finest public research university in the nation for undergraduate education, with top ranking graduate programs;

▶ Where a dynamic intellectual environment attracts and inspires the best faculty and where faculty, through their training of graduate students, develop the next generation of academic leaders; and

▶ That is characterized by a culture of diversity, creativity, and discovery that is even stronger than before.

Our ability to realize the enormous institutional potential of UC Santa Cruz is intimately linked to our role as a research university, and therefore our need to build our graduate programs. Accordingly, I am working closely with the Academic Senate to affirm our goal that at the conclusion of this planning horizon graduate programs will represent fifteen percent of total enrollments. I am pleased that the Senate has endorsed the campus goals

Eight priorities for shaping the UC Santa Cruz of 2010:

o Strengthen research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction;

o Markedly increase graduate programs and enrollments;

o Develop interdisciplinary programs at all academic levels;

o Enhance faculty, staff and student diversity;

o Markedly increase external support, from grant/contract as well as private fundraising;

o Creatively combine present resources with new resources;

o Develop innovative programming in non-traditional areas, including the Silicon Valley Center (SVC), state-supported summer instruction, and other off-campus enterprises (for example, distance learning, EAP, UCDC, others);

o Propose accountability measures.

for graduate growth and I am looking forward to working together with the Senate to develop a specific plan to achieve this goal within a reasonable timeframe.

I begin with the premise that academic plans and programs determine the direction of the campus, thus the portrait of the campus in 2010 starts with our academic programs. I have reviewed each of the divisional academic plans as well as similar programs across UC and our comparison institutions and I have discussed the plans with principal officers, the Senate leadership, and the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB). In light of those reviews, I envision a disciplinary distribution of faculty resources at the time the campus enrolls 16,900 FTE students[1] similar to the following:

	Base Year 2000-01		Projected Resources 2010-11		Division Plans 2010-11
	Size	Faculty[2]	Size	Faculty	Faculty
Arts	12.1 %	71 FTE	**13.0 %**	**94 – 110 FTE**	120 FTE
Humanities	24.9 %	146 FTE	**23.0 %**	**173 – 189 FTE**	190 FTE
Natural Sciences	26.6 %	156 FTE	**24.5 %**	**185 – 201 FTE**	213 FTE
School of Engineering	10.2 %	60 FTE	**14.5 %**	**106 – 122 FTE**	129 FTE
Social Sciences	26.2 %	154 FTE	**25.0 %**	**189 – 216 FTE**	259 FTE
		587 FTE		**797 FTE**	911 FTE
Other FTE uses:					
College-based & other curriculum		14 FTE		15 FTE	
Instructional workload reserve				18 FTE	
Reserve for Academic Senate and other comparable service				6 FTE	
Campus programmatic resource				41 FTE	
Total		601 FTE		877 FTE	

These ranges are very similar to those I provided to the deans last year and represent the critical mass necessary to sustain vitality both in existing programs and to support new programs that will be added in the next decade. These figures also define a resource strategy where fewer resources are held centrally and the deans are delegated responsibility for managing open faculty provisions (including compliance with UC policies such as the requirement to keep ten percent of the faculty positions flexible—i.e., invested in non-ladder appointments[3]). *This greater divisional responsibility as well as accountability is necessary now that the campus (and each individual academic division) is reaching a size that enables deans to take primary responsibility for their division's temporary workload staffing, turnover savings/upgrade costs, startup costs, graduate student support, and leave/sabbatical/research buyout costs.*

---

[1] Projected resources associated with 16,900 student FTEs assume that the campus accommodates approximately 1,900 FTE (101 faculty FTE) in other than the traditional fall, winter, and spring terms (e.g., via State-support summer instruction and off-campus programs—such as internships, EAP, and programs in Silicon Valley).
[2] Divisional FTE counts include the positions associated with temporary academic staffing funding as well as appointments associated with academic administrative positions.
[3] In that the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor will maintain an instructional workload reserve equivalent to 2% of total faculty FTE, academic divisions will need to keep flexible not less than 8% of their faculty resources.

In this broad academic blueprint, there are four categories of centrally held resources:

▶ Instructional funding for college-based curriculum (plus an FTE for physical education curriculum);

▶ An instructional workload reserve (representing about two percent of the total faculty FTE) that can be used to mitigate short-term workload imbalances due to unanticipated enrollment increases or decreases in a division;

▶ A reserve to provide course relief for Academic Senate or other comparable service; and

▶ A campus programmatic FTE pool held by the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor to provide forward funding for academic programs and to move forward mature plans; to provide seed funding of interdisciplinary programs that have tremendous promise and a tangible campus benefit; and to provide core funding for new program proposals such as a professional school near the end of the decade. In the early part of the decade, balances accumulated through this reserve will be used to partially fund one-time costs associated with strategic infrastructure needs.

Achieving these program levels will take place over the next decade, perhaps longer, and our ability to implement these plans will be affected by external factors—most specifically the timing and amount of resources that become available to us.

Note that the full plans developed by the divisions require more faculty FTEs than are now anticipated from the State, given our enrollment targets for 2010-11. However, as emphasized throughout this two-year planning process, State enrollment-driven resources represent only one of the sources available to us. I expect the campus as a whole as well as each division to think creatively about ways to develop the resources needed to achieve their broader vision that are not constrained directly by FTE resources contributed by the State. In other words, while the State resources are not adequate to fund the current plans in their entirety, we should be able to realize our goals completely through alternative funding mechanisms.

The academic profile described above represents a goal. It is not an entitlement. I have defined a resource envelope (i.e., a "midpoint" percentage and a faculty FTE range) to provide deans with some predictability on which to continue to refine and implement their plans while the campus completes its overall institutional plan this spring. This concept of defining a 2010-11 resource envelope signals my desire to move away from an annual piecemeal budget process that requires divisions to focus on new funding each year, and to assign responsibility and accountability to the divisional level. *This will require developing an "agreement" between the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor and each academic dean outlining agreed-upon goals for undergraduate and graduate instruction (in the fall-winter-spring terms, during summer, and off-campus), research and program objectives, extramural support including fundraising, contributions to campuswide goals and objectives, as well as specific measures of quality on which divisional progress will be evaluated. The pace at which resources are allocated will depend on progress in meeting these divisional goals.* This concept of an agreement is discussed more fully in the section, "Accountability and Assessment."

DIVISIONAL PLANS

Academic Divisions

I n reviewing the academic plans, I focused on their contributions to the eight priorities articulated at the onset of this planning process as well as their treatment of the crosscutting issues outlined in my July 31, 2001 update. Chancellor Greenwood and I were pleased to see in the plans an emphasis on building our existing strengths while developing new strengths through the introduction of new academic programs—particularly those that foster interdisciplinary inquiry and collaboration. *Whether related to the continued maturation and evolution of our existing programs or the pursuit of new academic programs and research initiatives, the plans that stood out were those that have in place now the key faculty leadership that would guide and provide the energy to make these plans succeed.* Indeed, we need only look at our most successful efforts to date to recognize the critical nature of faculty as well as divisional leadership in forging programmatic innovation.

Explicit in our campus goals is a renewed focus on graduate education and research. As Chancellor Greenwood remarked in her autumn convocation, "Vigorous research activities are integral to developing a quality graduate program. A mature graduate program is essential to the quality of undergraduate education, which is enhanced by the work of inspiring young scholars in the undergraduate classrooms and laboratories." The academic programs in the divisional plans articulate a basis for achieving graduate growth and my office is working closely with the Academic Senate to chart the course for increasing our graduate enrollments to fifteen percent of total campus FTE.

Based upon these observations, I propose that we assess the readiness for further investment in our academic programs based upon whether there is clear evidence of the following:

► *Core programs built around research institutes/centers of excellence* should exhibit the following characteristics prior to investment by the dean or CP/EVC:

o It builds around a research agenda that will attract quality faculty appointments, that is responsive to societal needs, and that can attract extramural support. It is relevant to campus strategic goals (i.e., program's contribution to the goals of other campus departments and/or programs, to the campus' distinctiveness and visibility);

o It contributes to the campus' ability to accommodate first-rate graduate students and postdoctoral fellows;

o It builds new constituencies (e.g., relevance to new undergraduate and/or graduate student populations or to the campus'/division's enrollment management strategies); and

o It has evidence of clear and sustained faculty leadership/commitment (i.e., consensus on desired goals, faculty leadership driving the research agenda; program has identified existing leadership or has a specific, feasible plan to develop/attract external leadership; leadership that is distinguished, energetic, characterized by "program builder" qualities) with a vision (i.e., a plan to build, cross-division collaboration, vision for cluster appointments, etc.).

▶ *Core programs that form the foundations of a liberal arts and sciences education* should exhibit the following characteristics prior to investment by the dean or CP/EVC:

- o It supports fundamental academic programs that enable interdisciplinary endeavors and that are core to the undergraduate curriculum;

- o It provides clear evidence of articulation with departments or programs served (e.g., service courses must be designed specifically to meet the objectives of the majors and disciplines they serve);

- o It addresses student interest, both present and future, based upon articulated campus themes;

- o It enhances the campus distinction (e.g., produces graduates that enhance institutional distinctiveness through visibility or which place students both professionally and in distinctive graduate programs); and

- o It identifies program leadership (i.e., program has identified existing leadership or has a specific, feasible plan to develop/attract external leadership; leadership that is distinguished, energetic, characterized by "program builder" qualities) with a vision.

To build and reinforce this capacity, deans and participating faculty can and should avail themselves of the expertise of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Vice Provost/ Dean of Undergraduate Education, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Vice Chancellor for Research to act in a facilitating role whenever programs span divisional lines.

The following public comments on the academic plans are not comprehensive but expand on the observations above and are intended to provoke thought.

▶ **Arts Division.** The plan was responsive to the goals and major campus issues, including a particularly thorough treatment of the potential for State-supported summer instruction and the Silicon Valley Center. It is comprehensive and aggressive in its projection of new graduate programs across the division. The interdisciplinary Digital Arts/New Media (DANM) program is promising and could ultimately become one of the campus' signature programs. The undergraduate arts pathway towards a California teaching credential is noteworthy for meeting critical State needs and identifying a strong career path for majors.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o A clear resource plan that encompasses all fund sources to support its graduate program ambitions.

- o Is there a potential collaboration between the arts, particularly DANM, and other areas such as IT engineering and science communication?

- o How might the proposed arts graduate programs leverage the opportunities associated with summer activities? What is the internship potential for arts majors?

- Given the potential capital resource requirements, in what ways can programs be phased? How realistic are the capital campaign goals and how can the campus help?

▶ **Humanities Division.** Notable is the division's discussion of how its core disciplines, described as "pillars," will be strengthened and leveraged to pursue new interdisciplinary themes and programs of national distinction focused around research institutes. Public humanities, human health and science, and technology studies have the potential for excellence and cross-divisional collaboration.

The campus needs to understand better:

- The specific enrollment management goals, strategies, and milestones for serving new student populations and making a significantly greater contribution to the campus' enrollment goals. Examples of programs that might contribute to that objective, e.g., is there value in pursuing a pathway to a teaching credential for humanities majors in order to simultaneously identify new career paths for students and to address State needs?

- Whether further linkages between humanities and the arts and between the humanities and the social sciences would be productive (e.g., in area and cultural studies?). Also, linkages between the division academic programs and the myriad of cultural events throughout the region, particularly during the summer.

- Faculty and divisional priorities with respect to the phasing of investment in the basic core disciplines as well as the many proposed articulated interdisciplinary programs and research initiatives. Faculty priorities for consideration of new administrative and pedagogical approaches to the teaching of languages and writing.

▶ **Natural Sciences Division.** The plan is comprehensive, identifies external opportunities and exigencies, and shows the clear involvement of faculty in the long-range visioning and planning process. This plan reflects an on-going strategic planning process and has already resulted in several programs of national distinction and a clear foundation for interdisciplinary pursuits. The division's stated goal, "We must find ways to preserve the existing strengths of our programs while at the same time extending or leveraging these enterprises to support our instructional and enrollment management objectives," is appropriate and should be affirmed through their hiring and support allocations. The division's academic support activities indicate a strong commitment to student success and educational outreach.

The campus needs to understand better:

- The return on the campus' investment in the sciences—including specific quantitative goals where appropriate—in terms of extramural support, access to external partners that benefit disciplines campuswide, new opportunities for interdisciplinary pursuits and private support.

- The prospects for student interest in the sciences at UCSC, given that enrollments and teaching workload, as a fraction of the campus totals, have declined steadily over the past decade.

- Whether State-supported summer instruction (at both the undergraduate and graduate levels), as envisioned by the State and UC system, can play a more prominent role in the division's plans.

o The divisional strategy and phasing to continue to support the already extant excellence in the departments and programs now present.

▶ **School of Engineering.** With a clear view of the future potential of engineering at Santa Cruz and a pathway to achieve that vision, the plan is particularly exemplary in its balanced emphasis on research institutes (as well as traditional departments) that involve faculty from other disciplines. The campus has invested heavily in the school and expects to see substantial return in terms of the opportunities for undergraduates and graduate students (both in the School and campuswide), prestige afforded to the campus, opportunities for interdisciplinary endeavors, and increases in external support.

The campus needs to understand better:

o The full realization of the division's plan will require substantial support from sources well beyond what the campus can invest from enrollment growth funding, and must be pursued with vigor if the School is to achieve its full range of goals.

o The interdivisional proposals from Engineering are good examples of planning beyond usual boundaries. Is there strong commitment by the School and its faculty, along with their counterparts in other divisions, to these enterprises, such as the Information Systems Management degree program?

o The JBSOE has aggressive plans for nanotechnology. This thrust appears to be the least well-developed of the three major areas. Is there a clear plan with faculty involvement and support to achieve this? Should there be a corresponding plan for materials science?

▶ **Social Sciences Division.** The division's four vectors of scholarly interest expand on fundamental faculty strengths, respond to society's needs, and offer great potential of cross-division collaboration. The Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community is but one example of an interdisciplinary initiative with signature campus program potential. The education program provides an excellent model for how State-supported summer instruction can be fully integrated into the pedagogy of an academic program. The partnership with Colleges Nine and Ten demonstrates clear commitment to the undergraduate experience.

The campus needs to understand better:

o The division's active role in management of the intense student pressures it has faced in the past few years.

o Given the division's clear understanding of its enrollment management issues, how it will participate in campuswide enrollment strategies to the benefit of all divisions? To what extent interdisciplinary collaborations can be of mutual benefit to the social sciences and its partner programs?

o The division's specific quantitative goals for extramural support and how these resources will be leveraged to build the division's programs as well as contribute to campus targets.

o How the important themes/research interests common to departments within and external to the division can be leveraged so as not to create redundancies.

o Whether State-supported summer instruction (at both the undergraduate and graduate levels) can address some of the division's enrollment management issues

while simultaneously contributing to the campus' enrollment goals. The division's summer quarter plans are not fully articulated.

▶ **University Extension.** The plan provides a broad overview of the mission, organization and funding, and continuing-education focus of University Extension (UNEX) up to this time, which provides a starting point for campus discussions on how to leverage UNEX programmatic and administrative strengths toward achieving our campus goals to address the life-long learning needs of our graduates and make us the partner of choice in education and research—in part through our programs and facilities in Monterey and in Silicon Valley. The plan also outlines a number of productive collaborations between other UC extension programs and their campuses.

The campus needs to understand better:

o The masters program for working engineers now offered by the School of Engineering in partnership with UNEX might act as a model for additional masters program for working professionals. What other collaborations with campus academic units are possible?

o The management, technology, and job skills developed by UNEX appear directly relevant to the needs of a growing campus. How might the UNEX training services model developed for private and governmental agencies be applied more aggressively toward meeting the training and development needs of the campus?

The UNEX plan also provides a broad overview of the mission, organization and funding for Summer Session (SS) at the present time. This provides a starting point for campus discussions on how to continue to leverage SS administrative strengths as we embark on State-supported instruction.

Academic Support Divisions

The campus is the beneficiary of the exceptional commitment, talent and professionalism of the members of the academic support divisions. In this way, we are indeed fortunate because in every case, the functions these divisions provide in support of the campus' mission are critical to our overall success.

In reviewing the academic support plans, I considered evidence for how well the plans were aligned with the needs articulated by academic divisions, and the process of consultation that produced that alignment. In addition, I considered how focused they were in addressing the responsibilities defined by their mission. As noted later in this document, I am concerned that the required resources identified in the academic support plans, especially those anticipated from central sources or via recharge mechanisms, far exceed those that will be generated from enrollment growth. Accordingly, focus and alignment with academic objectives will be key factors in decisions to invest resources.

This document does not define a resource range for the academic support programs as it does for the academic programs. That profile will emerge from discussions of the campus resource plan to be released in draft form later this month. Comparable to the agreements with academic deans, I envision developing analogous agreements between the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor and each principal officer outlining agreed-upon goals for academic support services, contributions to campus

goals and objectives, funding strategies, including expectations for extramural support and new revenue sources, as well as specific measures of quality and cost-effectiveness on which progress will be measured. As part of demonstrating leadership in managing their divisional resources, academic support units will be encouraged to think strategically and long-term how they use their resources, reserving flexibility to fund internally many of the one-time investments associated with the projects outlined in their plans.

That said, I was particularly impressed with the thoughtfulness and creativity embodied in most of the plans and the willingness of the academic support units to reinvent themselves using models at other universities or from the private sector. This is further evidence of the excellence and professionalism of our staff and their dedication to ensuring the success of our students and faculty.

The following public comments on the academic support plans are intended to provoke thought.

▶ **Office of Research.** The comprehensive plan articulates a clear role for helping the campus achieve its research objectives. This includes a clear focus and vision for addressing important issues of compliance, promotion, and the management of intellectual property. The plan for a Technology Enterprise Center (TEC) should be phased carefully in partnership with one or more of the academic divisions and with a clear plan for its leadership and assessment. With appropriate faculty leadership and support, this proposal could develop into one of the campus' signature programs, perhaps even a component of a future professional school.

The campus needs to understand better:

- The Office's strategy for generating the resources it needs to accomplish its goals entirely from extramural sources is particularly laudable. I would like to see a plan that is fully articulated with the academic division plans that can be incorporated into the campus' resource plan.

- As grants increase, new staff will be needed. Does the indirect cost formula take this need into account?

- More information about how our assets and investments at the MBEST Center will be leveraged into productive regional partnerships fully articulated with our academic programs.

▶ **Undergraduate Education.** The plan lays out clearly key issues at UC Santa Cruz (e.g., residential colleges, advising, co-curricular engagement, instructional support, learning support) that affect the quality of the undergraduate experience and calls for new ways of working to address these issues. One of the strengths of the plan is the fact that it views alternative solutions from a number of perspectives drawn from research and best practices nationwide.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o The next steps in building consensus for an action plan for addressing the issues associated with undergraduate academic advising and for enhancing the options for co-curricular academic engagement, particularly through internships.

- o How issues of undergraduate academic advising, co-curricular academic engagement, etc., will be coordinated with Student Affairs and the academic divisions.

- o The timetable for coming to resolution on an approach (drawn from the alternatives in the plan) for addressing the important curricular issues associated with the core course, writing instruction, and Subject A.

▶ **Graduate Division.** The plan provides an overview of the key issues the campus must address as it grows its graduate enrollments to fifteen percent of total campus FTE (e.g., outreach and recruitment, diversity, student financial support, housing, support services—including support of postdoctoral scholars) as well as the coordinative role that the graduate dean can play in the development of interdisciplinary graduate programs.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o The productive and collaborative ways the Graduate Division will work with departments/programs to foster the expansion of graduate education on the campus.

- o How the Graduate Division will work with deans, faculty, and external agencies to bridge the substantial gap in needed graduate student financial support by identifying new extramural sources of support (e.g., research fellowships, private sector collaboration/support, new ways for graduate students to participate in campus instruction and research)—including developing specific divisional goals for raising financial support.

- o The proposal, including a timetable for implementation, for a graduate college.

- o The specific strategies for proactively getting information to potential graduate students about the strengths of UC Santa Cruz and the research opportunities available here.

▶ **University Library.** The University Library provides an excellent example of how, through extensive consultation, its acquisition plans are fully articulated with academic programs. Evidence for this also appears in the statements supporting the Library's acquisitions plan that appear in the academic division plans. Furthermore, the plan demonstrates clearly how the unit will address campus needs under alternative funding scenarios associated with its expansion.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o Are there additional ways we can better leverage the library resources of UC to support the campus' I&R programs? What can my office do to help ensure that the resources of UC are part of our consideration for ARL membership?

- o What specific steps the campus needs to take in order to ensure that UCOP allocation methodologies recognize the needs at Santa Cruz.

- o To what extent Library strategies will change if the campus places more emphasis on web-based and distance-education instructional technologies?

▶ **Academic Senate.** The important and necessary role of the Academic Senate, as outlined in the *Standing Orders of the Regents*, has brought and continues to bring many benefits to the planning for the growth and renewal of UCSC over the next decade. The Divisional Senate plan suggests numerous strategies for engaging faculty in this responsibility. Furthermore, their proposals to expand the faculty research lecture and revive the professor's inaugural lectures will enrich the scholarly environment of the campus.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o Whether, in light of changes in the campus over time and the growth and changes projected over the next decade, a careful review of the Senate by-laws is warranted at this time.

▶ **Business and Administrative Services.** The plan comprehensively describes the nature of BAS services in developing the infrastructure foundations for the campus' future and the services necessary for growth. The division's vision and leadership in implementing the principles of UC's "New Business Architecture" are critical to the operational effectiveness of campus processes. As acknowledged later in this document, BAS is also proactively responding to issues raised in my July 31, 2001 update with respect to the campus' recharge economy.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o In that the BAS plan is quite comprehensive and beyond the likely campus' resource capabilities, how will the division's existing resources in combination with new campus resources be prioritized and reinvested toward the realization of the plan, as well as how will each of the proposals in the plan fit into a single prioritized list that is fully articulated with academic priorities?

- o The campus clearly needs to make additional investments in physical planning and development costs in order to complete and build consensus on a physical master plan for the twenty-first century—including an analysis of the long-term financial implications of that plan. What are the required campus investments in this planning effort, their priority and outcomes, and alternative ways to accomplish the campus' planning objectives?

- o A number of the division's services, such as purchased utilities, may be perceived by the campus as a "free good" because they are provided from the BAS budget without built-in incentives to save, beyond the campus' conservation initiatives. I would like to see some specific proposals on how to restructure this aspect of the campus' economy.

▶ **Student Affairs.** The division's general overall thrust to implementing responsive, student-centered ways of providing services based upon a best-practices 70/20/10 service model appears to be forward-looking and appropriate. I urge the division to pursue this strategy aggressively and to engage fully both faculty and the other divisions in this pursuit. The division's investment in strategic planning has had clear results in moving it forward with a consistent and widely held vision. The division's leadership role in the development of AIS is to be commended.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o The on-going division strategies for ensuring that their admissions and enrollment management plans and services are aligned with the needs articulated by academic divisions and with the Academic Senate (e.g., CAFA) policy directions (and the process of consultation that produced that alignment).

- o How the division's leadership with respect to outreach and service activities can be leveraged and broadly coordinated internally as well as externally. Its leadership and innovation associated with the UC College Prep Initiative, to cite one example, might be leveraged to the benefit of the campus' goals with respect to distance- and web-based learning.

- o Are there ways in which the division's leadership and success in fostering diversity can serve as a model for achieving the campus goal of diversity throughout the campus?

▶ **University Relations.** The plan's focus on development is crucial to the campus' resource strategy. Furthermore, the division's partnership strategy with academic departments and divisions is key to creating a culture of understanding philanthropy and fundraising throughout the campus and to ensuring that the campus' message is clearly driven by academic goals.

The campus needs to understand better:

- o The alignment of comprehensive campaign goals with campus priorities and goals, and how advertently to involve not only principal officers but other campus constituencies, especially the faculty.

- o While recognizing that investments in both resources and time are needed to build the campus' fundraising capacity, how will we measure the success of University Relations as one of the campus' very important assets?

- o While we are making tremendous strides in improving the clarity of the campus' communication with respect to its external constituents, I would like to explore further ways to ensure that our message is aligned with the campus academic program.

A STRATEGY FOR MOVING FORWARD

Although we have come a long way toward producing an integrated institutional plan, we need to build consensus on a strategy to move forward on a number of issues that remain unresolved by the comprehensive divisional plans. Below, I list several of these issues and offer the following ideas and directions to provoke thought concerning appropriate courses of action. These actions are organized into four categories: the student experience; strengthening core instruction and research programs; crosscutting issues; and setting priorities for academic and institutional support.

The Student Experience

U C Santa Cruz is a superb example of a great research university in this new century. We now typify a new model—relatively small, diverse, excellent in disciplines, but also multidisciplinary in our approach to teaching and research. In building this extraordinary intellectual environment in which our students will reach their full potential, we need to address a number of issues that have been raised in the course of our long-range planning process.

▶ **Leveraging the college asset.** The residential colleges are one of the signature features of UC Santa Cruz and were a critical part of the original vision for the campus. As an integral part of our identity and a tremendous conceptual and physical asset, they should be leveraged. In the words of the *Millennium Committee*, we must commit to maintaining and strengthening the integrated learning communities provided by the colleges. But that commitment does not necessarily imply that they should have the role originally established by the campus, nor does it mean that a uniform model should apply to all colleges.

The *Taskforce on the Colleges*[4] and the comprehensive plan of the Vice Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) discussed the issue of the potential academic and service roles our colleges could play in the future, and how these roles will be synergistic with the academic missions of our divisions and departments.

Given the importance of these issues, I propose working closely with the Senate to define something along the lines of:

i. a Senate/administrative task force to work quickly to identify specific college-related issues that need to be resolved and develop hypotheses that will frame the discussion of those issues, as well as suggest a timetable and an appropriate committee membership to make specific recommendations. By identifying and reaffirming those issues for which there is already sufficient consensus on an approach, this task force will focus the discussion and thereby simplify and streamline the work to be accomplished in the second stage, which is,

ii. a major Senate/administrative committee charged with coming to grips with the issues identified by the task force and to recommend a coherent academic role for our colleges that is consistent with the campus objectives for the undergraduate student experience.

I am pleased that the Senate is considering a special committee on the colleges. One possibility would be that this committee's work could complement the work of the possible task forces described above, just as our current Senate and Administrative Committees complement each other. It is important that the campus now address the instructional, faculty affiliation, and academic governance issues outlined in the Undergraduate Education comprehensive plan.[5]

---

[4] *Report of the Advisory Group on the Colleges*, Fall 2000 (http://www.ucsc.edu/planbudg/vpdue/colleges/CollegeRpt.pdf).
[5] See pages 8-9 of the undergraduate education long-range plan, http://planning.ucsc.edu/plans2001/Final/UGeduc.pdf.

This is an opportunity for us to think in unconventional ways about these issues, and to experiment with a number of approaches for leveraging the strength of our colleges. The divisional affiliation model of Colleges Nine and Ten is one approach. *I encourage our other colleges to propose and experiment with alternative ways to achieve the pedagogical objectives for the first year experience that is currently defined almost entirely by the core course*—for example, via VPDUE Goff's proposal for "undergraduate college seminars."

▶ **Other aspects of the undergraduate experience.** In addition to how the learning communities represented by the colleges contribute to the first year experience, the Undergraduate Education plan has identified a number of other key issues relevant to the undergraduate experience—including alternative ways to address Subject A and other writing course requirements; undergraduate advising strategies (e.g., advising clusters that link college advising to departmental advising); co-curricular student academic engagement such as international education and research and academic internships; support services for transfer and reentry students; and the rationalization/ improvement of instructional support services.

I have asked VPDUE Goff to continue to refine appropriate strategies to address these issues so that I may announce, concurrent with the release of the institutional plan, specific proposals and appropriate administrative realignments, as necessary, to comprehensively address these important issues—in particular: (i) an integrated and comprehensive approach for undergraduate academic advising; (ii) ways to substantially enhance the options for undergraduate research and academic internships, as well as for international education; and (iii) comprehensive approaches for instructional and learning support.

In my meetings with principal officers and with the Senate I will also pursue resolution of these issues.

▶ **Applying the college vision to supporting graduate growth.** In her autumn convocation remarks,[6] Chancellor Greenwood reiterated the campus' vision for increasing our graduate enrollment. To achieve that goal, we need to address a number of issues associated with academic department- and division-based as well as campuswide graduate student training and support services.

   o **The graduate college.** Both Chancellor Greenwood and I endorse the concept of providing and/or coordinating those services within the context of a graduate college.

Therefore, my staff is preparing a specific plan for moving forward with a graduate college and is identifying the approval and process issues that need to be addressed. That plan assumes that the graduate college will be closely affiliated with the Graduate Division, and that the Division will play a key role in providing the support infrastructure and graduate student services needed to accommodate graduate enrollments of up to 15% by 2010-11.

---

[6] UC Santa Cruz—Leading in the New Millennium, October 2, 2001 (http://www.ucsc.edu/administration/mrc/speeches/01.10.02-leading_millennium.pdf).

▶ **Other aspects of the graduate experience.** In addition to the issues of graduate student support services, training, and community addressed by the graduate college, the campus must attend to other key concerns of our graduate students, including issues of outreach and recruitment, diversity, student financial support, and affordable housing. I have asked Dean Talamantes to work with principal officers, faculty, and external foundations to develop appropriate strategies to address these issues so that I may announce—concurrent with the release of the institutional plan—the support of specific proposals to address these important issues comprehensively.

I observed earlier that a mature graduate program is essential to the quality of our undergraduate education. The *Millennium Committee* suggested two important ways that graduate students contribute to the undergraduate experience: as teachers and writing tutors, which would include developing and teaching their own courses; and as role models through their involvement in the colleges. Some of these approaches are included in the comprehensive plans, but in order to ensure that we are actively providing an environment that fosters the productive contributions envisioned by the *Millennium Committee*, I have asked Dean Talamantes and VPDUE Goff to monitor and coordinate these activities campuswide.

Strengthening Core I&R Programs

T he campus must continue to provide an extraordinary intellectual environment and scholarly enterprise, from which will emerge the next generation of great ideas, scholars and leaders. To fully realize this future, we must simultaneously strengthen our core programs, build new programs, develop our faculty leadership, develop the requisite external resources and partnerships, and ensure that our administrative structures facilitate collaboration and program development. *In particular, I am interested in hearing more about productive ways to strengthen the leadership role of our department chairs.*

The campus will hire a substantial number of faculty in this decade—because of enrollment growth and expected faculty separations over this period, less than half of the faculty who will be here in 2010 are here now. This means that the searches and hires that we contemplate must clearly be viewed with an eye to the future—with primary consideration both in the ways the positions are defined and in the actual selection of new faculty, and with an understanding of where the disciplines and the academic world are headed in the future, not where they are now.

Analysis of the comprehensive divisional plans suggest that the campus should undertake the following actions, in addition to those already outlined in my comments concerning the divisional plans.

▶ **Interdisciplinary programs.** Many of the most promising ideas in the plans shared common characteristics—programs and research institutes at the intersection of new scholarly directions and new technologies, public service/knowledge and/or public policy issues; interdisciplinary programs and programs that address local issues, global/international issues, or both. *The divisional plans, while mentioning a variety of interdisciplinary programs, in many cases stopped short of demonstrating the necessary faculty commitment to ensure the success of these programs.*

In order to create the environment and opportunity for interdisciplinary programs to emerge and thrive, administrative mechanisms must exist to support interdivisional collaboration where faculty commitment is strong and sustained. I propose the following actions to address these issues:

- o **Research centers and institutes.** I have asked the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) to take an oversight role in the development of interdisciplinary research centers and institutes, and perhaps focused research activities. Specifically, the VCR will chair a committee of representative deans whenever the center or institute involves faculty from more than one academic division.[7]

- o **Graduate Groups.** Using a similar model, I have asked the Dean of Graduate Studies to convene a committee of cognizant deans to oversee and to provide administrative support to the development of interdivisional graduate degree programs, or "graduate groups."

- o **Undergraduate Groups.** I have asked the Vice Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Education to develop an analogous mechanism for "undergraduate groups" that transcend a division.

- o **Program Development.** I have asked the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs to oversee and supervise the development of new academic programs.

Central administrative involvement signals the value placed on trans-divisional programs and is not intended to bypass the responsibility and authority of the academic divisions. The academic deans have the primary resources to support interdisciplinary pursuits— the faculty, instruction and research space, and operating budgets. Central oversight and support services are intended to complement the work of the deans by providing administrative support to emerging interdisciplinary ideas so that they can compete effectively with purely divisional programs, such as departments, for resources.

Any interdisciplinary degree or research program must be subject to the same initial approval processes as disciplinary programs and should be reviewed regularly on the cycle that all programs are reviewed.

▶ **Future professional school(s).** One of my responsibilities is to ensure that the campus plans for its signature programs of the future. Just as planning for the *Jack Baskin School of Engineering* (JBSOE) began well over a decade before its inception, our planning for potential future schools needs to start now. On the other hand, it is not the role of the Campus Provost to put forward a school where there is no faculty interest and support.

While the divisional plans proposed no specific professional schools, there were several programs in which broader-than-departmental interest was evident, such as: education; policy, broadly conceived, perhaps dealing with the environment; and applied programs, perhaps related to management with relevance to Silicon Valley. Furthermore, there are a number of creative ways to conceive of professional schools at UC Santa Cruz.

In order to sustain the conversation, I will be discussing with the Senate leadership a role that a CPB/GC/administrative task force might take to examine regional and State

---

[7] If, on the other hand, all of the faculty are from a single academic division, then that dean should be responsible for the development, finances, and activities of that center/institute.

needs, explore the possibilities for UCSC professional schools, and recommend to the campus an appropriate course of action.

As was the case in the exploration associated with JBSOE, the central administration will provide administrative support to such a task force.

▶ **State-supported summer instruction.** As we grow from our 2001-02 budgeted enrollment of 12,500 FTE to an enrollment of 16,900 FTE in 2010-11, fully 43% of our new resources will be generated through enrollments in other than the traditional fall, winter, and spring terms—such as in State-supported summer instruction or in off-campus programs, and such as internships, EAP, and programs in Silicon Valley. Possibly due, in part, to the State's uncertain financial situation, most divisional plans did not indicate evidence of concrete planning for summer instruction that would allow students to enroll for a full course of study in the summer.

Such planning is critical to funding the academic profile of the campus outlined earlier in this document. Furthermore, State-supported summer instruction provides a venue to showcase the distinctive programs at UC Santa Cruz and an opportunity for the campus to encourage and facilitate summer enrollment of students from other campuses. It also allows creativity and experimentation in the curriculum that is far more difficult during the traditional academic year.

Dean Sandeen has been working with academic divisions and departments to design their summer 2002 and 2003 curriculum. In order to ensure that the campus is positioned to achieve the State and UC goal that by 2010 the campus' instructional workload off-campus and during the summer will be equivalent to 40% of the average workload during fall, winter, and spring,[8] I have asked Vice Provost Brown and Dean Sandeen to re-institute their administrative summer planning and implementation steering committee and to work closely with deans to define a summer program that achieves these goals.

▶ **Tighter integration of campus and University Extension instruction**.
University Extension and Summer Session have already played a critical role in helping the campus realize its near-term summer enrollment goals in preparation for State-supported summer instruction.

As the need for our graduates to continually refresh their knowledge and skills becomes increasingly important, the campus must articulate its strategy for addressing life-long learning. I believe that such a strategy will involve tighter integration of traditional campus and University Extension instruction. In addition to serving our graduates and our region (e.g., our existing masters program for working engineers in Silicon Valley), such collaboration provides the potential to generate new resources for our academic departments. I intend to work with principal officers and Senate leadership to consider

---

[8] State-supported summer instruction has already been implemented at UC Berkeley, UC Santa Barbara, and UCLA; funding for UC Davis is proposed in the Governor's 2002-03 budget. Our plans should begin with the assumption that funding for UC Santa Cruz will be proposed in the Governor's 2003-04 budget for summer 2003. As with these other campuses, once the State funds summer instruction at Santa Cruz, funding to "buy out" our existing summer enrollment (representing 315 FTE in the base year) will be provided. Thus, while not representing an actual increase the enrollment capacity of the campus in 2010-11, the enrollment that determines State funding in 2010-11 will be 17,215 FTE rather than 16,900 FTE.

what next steps we need to take to clarify our vision for life-long learning and to integrate that vision into our plans.

▶ **Enrollment management.** Several aspects of enrollment management need to be addressed explicitly in our long-term institutional plan. The first deals with admissions selectivity—at the point that more UC-eligible students apply to Santa Cruz than can be accommodated, how should the campus select among them? And how should we partner with UCOP to ensure that State goals are met? This is a policy issue for the Academic Senate that provides the campus with an opportunity to "shape" its incoming class to match the programmatic aspirations articulated in the comprehensive plans as it defines how comprehensive admissions review will be articulated at UC Santa Cruz. For example, should the campus restrict entry to certain oversubscribed majors? Should the campus adjust its recruitment efforts to attract undergraduate students with interest in specific academic disciplines, as we do for graduate programs? Other aspects of enrollment management deal with the environment we create for students once they arrive—factors that affect student retention and time-to-degree such as the quality and timeliness of academic advising, activities intended for assisting undeclared majors, services that enhance student success (including services to transfer and re-entry students), and whether the campus promotes linkages between a student and a faculty member.

The principles that underlie shifting resource authority and responsibility to the divisional and department levels also require that active enrollment management take place at these levels. To realize the academic profile envisioned for the UC Santa Cruz of 2010, each academic dean and department, moreover, must actively engage in enrollment management—with considerations of both oversubscription and undersubscription in courses, departments, and majors. Such management will involve actively partnering with Student Affairs to present their programs whether they are in the venue of an admissions event or in the quality of their web pages; actively partnering with other departments/divisions to create relevant curriculum that will engage student interest in under-subscribed programs; manage majors and the general education courses—so that the size of their academic programs is driven by the factors that build excellence and balance, and less by student interest alone.

Crosscutting Issues

A number of crosscutting issues identified in my July 31, 2001 update and in the comprehensive divisional plans require more discussion and resolution.

▶ **Diversity**. On many occasions, Chancellor Greenwood and I have emphasized our commitment to diversity at all levels of campus life. At the onset of this planning process, I reaffirmed that commitment as one of the campus' eight priorities, and I have pursued that priority with concrete actions. For example, in May 1999, I set aside eight new faculty FTE, within the framework of a Campus Curriculum Initiative (CCI), to

position the campus to better meet the challenges presented by an increasingly diverse campus and state. These FTE, which leveraged additional FTE contributed by three academic divisions, are being deployed by those divisions as one component of their effort to develop a more socially and culturally responsive curriculum and research agenda and have already yielded several first-rate faculty appointments.

Although not all of the divisional plans submitted in December 2001 gave sufficient attention to diversification strategies, several plans embodied an important premise: The diversification of our faculty, staff, and students follows from UC's tripartite mission of research, teaching and service. Our excellence as an academic institution depends, among other things, on research and teaching focused on the richly various ways in which the human condition has manifested itself in the past and present, and on the challenges such often-contentious diversity presents to us as members of local, national, and global communities. Our excellence also depends, in all aspects of our academic and support work, on drawing on the diverse skills and perspectives of members from all social and cultural backgrounds.

While I know that all principal officers are committed to enhancing such diversity within their administrative spheres, I will expect all units' ten-year plans to incorporate effective strategies for achieving that goal. That expectation will be reflected in the agreements I develop with all principal officers.

▶ **Coordination of information and instructional technologies**. Information technology plays a central role in fulfilling our mission to create and transmit knowledge and will be a factor in maintaining excellence as a research institution. *The campus must plan and budget for campuswide projects that involve basic infrastructure, such as networks, and support business processes, such as financial systems, as well as provide appropriate oversight to ensure that we are getting the most for our investments in technology.*

In order to assure that issues of policy, strategy, coordination, and funding are addressed at the highest campus levels, I plan to create the position of Vice Provost for Information Technology (VP-IT), reporting directly to me.

In reviewing similar positions elsewhere, there are two basic models. In the first, the VP-IT takes the role of an independent policy consultant to the Campus Provost guiding the campus as it addresses issues related to IT infrastructure, the application of IT to the instruction and research program as well as campus business processes, planning for the future, and coordination of IT issues across organizational boundaries, including helping the campus set standards for technology that will best leverage our resources. In an alternative model, the VP-IT also has organizational and operational responsibility for a portfolio as comprehensive as to include instructional computing labs, media services, and even library technologies. I seek the campus' advice on which model is appropriate to UC Santa Cruz, and to what extent, if any, an administrative realignment of existing IT service providers is appropriate. As you provide advice, consider the role that the VP-IT could play in helping the campus face challenges such as its IT infrastructure funding issues, major new systems (such as AIS), and the potential of using information technologies to transform appropriate elements of the curriculum—including web-based and distance learning.

Clark Kerr once observed that a modern university is "a series of individual faculty entrepreneurs held together by a common grievance over parking."[9] Perhaps in the public research university of the twenty-first century, information technology resources that are in short supply will be the issue that will unite faculty, staff, and students. Ensuring that UC Santa Cruz has invested appropriately in information technology and is optimally leveraging those expenditures will be a key emphasis of the VP-IT position. This task is a difficult one and will require making tough tradeoffs and building close partnerships across campus.

I would like the VP-IT to address a number of campuswide policy issues. For example,

- The more standardized an information technology environment is, the lower its costs of support. Yet standardization is often seen as antithetical to the entrepreneurial spirit that characterizes the research university. The VP-IT can, however, help the campus build consensus about the appropriate platform-, protocol-, and software-support services that will serve as the focus for resources in our campuswide service organizations. As Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, I will invest in projects that promote standards, so the extent to which departments will benefit from those investments will be a function of the degree to which they adopt campus standards.

In some cases, departments will have requirements that are beyond those that can be provided effectively on a shared basis or through using standard software tools. Other departments or clusters of departments may partner to organize their technology support services in alternate ways that more cost-effectively address the specific needs of their units. However, ensuring that ubiquity rather than scarcity characterizes our deployment of information and instructional technology will require careful choices by units and campuswide partnerships. I will continue to place emphasis on this latter model.

▶ **Infrastructure**. This document focuses on the desired academic portrait of the UC Santa Cruz of 2010 and presupposes that academic and institutional support divisions prioritize the deployment of their resources in support of those goals. The divisional plans, however, identified a number of expensive and critical infrastructure projects that are beyond their capacity to fund from their existing resource base. These include

- Planning for campus academic and academic support space, including the rental of temporary off-campus space necessitated by present space demands;

- Information technology, such as the Academic Information System and the campus cabling infrastructure upgrades;

- Physical and land use planning costs, such as developing a new campus master plan that supports not only the campus of 2010, but also that makes provision for the campus of 2050 and beyond; and undertaking campus area studies such as the Arts area study that will inform the development of a new campus master plan;

- Planning for affordable housing options, whether located on- or off-campus, which are needed not only to address the goals of our LRDP but also to make it possible the campus to attract/hire high quality faculty, staff, and recruit the best students over the next decade; and

---

[9] Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), p. 20.

- Other infrastructure and mitigation measures, such as those that address the impacts of campus growth.

The campus must take a broad view that ensures that resources for these fundamental costs are identified. Accordingly, the upcoming resource plan will identify, from the resources anticipated by the campus over the next decade, specific allocations, funding strategies, and expectations for infrastructure projects. These campuswide requirements only re-emphasize the need for all academic and academic support units to identify new resources beyond the state enrollment funding to support the aspirations articulated in their plans.

▶ **Communications**. As a campus we've made a significant investment in articulating our values and vision, in setting goals and priorities, and in developing plans and strategies consistent with our strengths and State/societal needs. Chancellor Greenwood and I believe that the agenda for the UC Santa Cruz of 2010 that has emerged from our planning investment is ambitious yet decidedly achievable.

A sound communications strategy is absolutely critical for UCSC's future. Both internally and externally, our constituents need to know that this campus is an extraordinary place—one that is a model for the great research university of this new century. Prospective students, faculty, and staff, research partners, and potential private supporters need to know how what the campus offers coincides with their values and priorities. Our existing campus community should understand how their efforts contribute to the campus vision. From each constituency we need ways of understanding the perspectives from which they view the campus and incorporating them into our future communications.

As we craft this message, our academic priorities must constantly guide the focus of our communications. Vice Chancellor Suduiko is constituting a Campus Communications Council to focus on the tactical aspects of communicating the campus' message(s). Their efforts must support the broader communications priorities of the campus. I am considering constituting a small academic advisory group from the Provost's Advisory Council (PAC) that, working closely with the Chancellor, will provide the Campus Communication Council with direction.

In that web technologies and content creation tools are fundamental to cost-effective communications, a web services committee has been convened, under the auspices of the Information Technology Committee (ITC), to prepare a written report (due at the beginning of spring quarter) recommending tools and support models appropriate to the campus' communication objectives.

▶ **Regional opportunities, including Silicon Valley and Monterey**. Productive partnerships between UCSC units (including those in Silicon Valley and Monterey) and other regional institutions provide the campus with the opportunity to take advantage of new talent and external resources and to leverage our own internal resources. Such UCSC programs situated at regional facilities can provide additional venues to explore new instruction, internship and research directions. In addition, our partnerships are one way of fulfilling our service mission—among the significant contributions of UC Santa Cruz is leadership in initiatives aimed at improving K-12 education and enhancing teacher training and retention.

Academic divisions articulated a number of very innovative instruction and research ideas for the proposed Silicon Valley Center, including ways in which collaborations in the region might enhance student experiences or expand the resources available to implement their academic visions. These plans illustrate ways in which we can have an impact in our Silicon Valley service area as well as the opportunities available to the campus, to departments, and to individual researchers through participation in a Center. The campus is committed to developing the Silicon Valley Center. Planning for the proposed Center, however, will take time given the complex issues associated with the preferred site at NASA and with the necessary due diligence with respect to financial feasibility, master planning, and environmental mitigation. With the departure of Interim Director Tanner[10] in June 2002, Vice Chancellor for Research Miller will assume interim responsibility for leading the Silicon Valley Center planning. Under the leadership of Drs. Tanner and Miller, the campus continues to explore research opportunities—including the potential for long-term, high-value research contracts—and the types of instructional programs that could best complement our core programs

Setting Priorities for Academic and Institutional Support

T he plans submitted by academic support divisions were responsive to the needs of their constituencies and articulated a number of important service goals. For example, the Division of Student Affairs committed to implementing responsive, student-centered ways of providing services based upon a best-practices 70/20/10 service model. Business and Administrative Services outlined how the principles embodied in UC's "new business architecture" informed their strategies for providing support services to a growing campus.

The required resources identified in the academic support plans, especially those anticipated from central sources or via recharge mechanisms, far exceed those that will be generated through State-funded enrollment growth. *Thus, part of our planning process over the next few months will need to focus on identifying those services and service levels that are most critical in achieving our academic plans.* I will work closely with the principal officers and the Senate leadership to consider tradeoffs and suggest ways to focus the mission of these units in ways that will enable us to provide critical services, address risks, and lay the academic support foundation needed to achieve our academic goals.

▶ **Internal economy issues.** It is the nature of the internal UC economy that some activities derive their funding through line-item budgets and others sustain their activities through recharges. Recharges, as a mechanism for funding academic support services, will not disappear. We are committed to quality services at fair prices. In order to ensure that the campus is receiving the most cost-effective service, especially for services for which there are few or no alternative providers, Vice Chancellor Vani is undertaking a review of several key recharges to achieve the following objectives.

   o *Understanding recharge rates*—what is included in the recharge rate, how does that rate compare with other UC campuses, and how are the services being delivered?

---

[10] See http://www.ucsc.edu/news_events/press_releases/01-02/02-12.tanner.html for additional information.

o *Performance analysis*—how satisfied are users with the services in terms of cost, quality, and responsiveness?

o *Policy issues*—are there policy issues that merit campuswide attention?

I am hopeful that this model of reviewing some recharges will enable us to look at other recharges across campus.

▶ **Business process redesign**. A centerpiece of the BAS comprehensive plan is a significant investment in UC's "New Business Architecture" (NBA) strategy that includes decentralizing and streamlining campus business processes and electronic commerce.[11] As noted in my July 31, 2001 update, that implementation is proceeding under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor—BAS with the advice of the Academic Support Planning Committee (ASPC). I would like to acknowledge the efforts to date and widely publicize the NBA Steering Committee that seeks campuswide advice on priorities for process redesign.

o **New Business Architecture (NBA) Steering Committee**. Chaired by the Vice Chancellor—Business and Administrative Services, the NBA Steering Committee will assess the feasibility of and recommend for implementation two to four process redesign projects each year. These recommendations will consider the advice of the users of business services, the Provost's Advisory Committee (PAC) and its subcommittees, and the Academic Senate.

Pursuing process redesign more aggressively will be one of the important activities that enables the campus to reach its enrollment targets over this next decade while controlling costs, improving the work environment, and supporting academic programs.

NEXT STEPS

The academic and administrative planning process thus far has produced very thoughtful visions for the future, as well as specific plans and strategies for getting there. As noted in my remarks thus far, my office, principal officers, faculty, the Academic Senate, and the UC Santa Cruz community at large have additional work to do in crafting the elements that will become our institutional plan. There are, however, two additional components of this planning process that are part of my responsibilities to create the framework, environment, and opportunity for moving forward.

The first component is to articulate how the campus will align our resources with our plans. This will involve the development of a resource plan that projects the resources we might anticipate as well as the principles on which these resources will be allocated.

▶ **Comprehensive resource planning, starting with your base**. Central to our planning is the need to consider potential resources beyond the anticipated annual incremental increases in support from the State. It is absolutely essential that

---

[11] See http://uc2010.ucsd.edu for an overview of the UC2010 NBA strategy and http://bas.ucsc.edu/nba for an overview of the implementation progress at UC Santa Cruz.

academic and academic support divisions explicitly consider their current resource base, for example, faculty and staff resources including projected turnover, administrative and operations support, space, fund balances and external resources. This base combined with anticipated new resources, such as State funds, contracts and grants, private funding, and self-sustaining financial strategies, that will enable us to achieve our goals.

Most of the plans depended too heavily on receiving allocations from new enrollment-driven resources without adequately considering reallocation of their current resources and identifying ways to expand the resources available to the campus. In my private meetings with principal officers, I will ask that they consider seriously ways in which to re-deploy or leverage their current base in support of the priorities they articulated as well as discuss with them actions I can take to help them aggressively pursue alternative means of funding, phase their programs, or re-conceptualize their plans.

The second component is as important as the first—to create an environment of accountability and assessment that will ensure that, as we move steadily forward, we continually measure our progress and adjust our plans to reflect the most effective means of achieving our vision and of taking advantage of opportunities. Over the next few months, I expect to consult with principal officers and with the Academic Senate about the principles and strategies embodied in our resource plan and the components of accountability and assessment.

Resource Strategy

Over the next several years, we expect the State's fiscal situation and the anticipated slowness of the economic recovery to translate into, at best, little or no growth in the University's budget. Because of the nature of economic cycles, however, the State's financial difficulties will affect the timing, but not the eventual implementation, of our plans. Therefore, we must continue to plan for the State resources associated with 16,900 student FTEs in 2010-11 and will vigorously pursue extramural sources of support.

In March 2002, I will release an initial draft of the campus resource plan through 2010-11 for concurrent discussion with the ideas presented here. This resource plan will discuss the mechanics of how UC is funded, project the resources we might anticipate from both State and extramural fund sources, and outline my vision for how the long-term resource strategies will be used by the campus to guide this development, help units realize their plans, and invest in the infrastructure and programs that will position us for excellence in 2010 and beyond.

The resource plan will set out a predictable resource allocation strategy that supports the campus' academic objectives as well as the academic support necessitated by those plans, and is based upon the following principles.

▶ Academic priorities guide resource decisions, and our allocation formulae reflect faculty activities in instruction and research. Our resource planning and allocation principles are designed to enhance quality and promote innovation while maintaining balance across all campus units.

▶ The resource plan will be multi-year to provide divisions and units the predictability and flexibility they need to plan and manage the programs for which they are

responsible. The plan will provide clarity and a framework for continued collaboration with the Academic Senate. It will be responsive to the principles of shared governance.

▶ The process should be economical, simple, balanced, and transparent. It will seek to balance decentralization of funding and authority to the deans and vice chancellors with the need to preserve critical campus flexibility at the center to make strategic resource allocations in support of exciting new program directions or unforeseen expenses.

▶ Policies will encourage activities that lead to the generation of new or enhanced revenues.

▶ The resource plan will seek to leverage resources and will take an "all funds" approach to allocating and managing resources. This will require that principal officers reallocate and redirect existing resources within a unit's base to achieve success.

▶ Accountability will focus on understanding how funds were used programmatically, and what results have been achieved with campus support.

In our planning thus far, I have emphasized the need to look beyond the funding associated with enrollment growth to new forms of extramural support such as contracts and grants, private gifts and support, and regional partnerships. In taking an "all funds" approach we also need to examine the campus policies associated with the fund sources the campus now receives. These are, for example,

▶ *Enrollment-driven funds*. These include allocations from the State and student fees (i.e., "Ed Fees"). As suggested earlier in the academic portrait of the campus in 2010, I plan to reserve a portion of the State/Ed Fee funds centrally and define with the remaining resources a range for each of our academic and academic support divisions that will permit those principal officers to predict the enrollment-driven resources available to them and my expectations for the use of those resources.

▶ *Other enrollment- and workload-driven funds*. The campus receives other types of enrollment-driven (e.g., "Reg Fees," "campus fees") and workload (e.g., "OMP" for the operation and maintenance of the campus physical plant) funding. These funds are now allocated directly to the appropriate principal officer. I would like to view these funds more broadly, influencing their use (within UC policy) toward achieving the goals included in our plans.

▶ *Fixed costs and salary increases*. This State source provides funding for merits, COLAs, and benefit costs which are applied directly to faculty and staff salary provisions. The State also provides modest funding for price increases on supplies and expense categories associated with the University's instructional mission.

▶ *Special items*. As part of the compact with the State, the University also has received special (one-time and on-going) allocations targeted for specific purposes, such as maintenance and outreach. Given the State's fiscal situation, it is unlikely that we will receive incremental special allocations in the near term, but we expect that such allocations will again be made in a few years. At that time, we should also consider how we might leverage those funds, while expending them for the designated purposes.

▶ *Extramural support*. Support from contracts and grants, private gifts, partnerships, intellectual property and other non-State or campus sources are critical to the campus future. Contracts and grants represent the primary source of funding for our research mission and private support makes important contributions to enriching the student educational experience, to creating excellence in our programs, and to funding capital program. To realize our vision, we must find ways to increase our contracts and grants activity substantially, and we must create a culture of fundraising throughout the campus that results in substantial increases in private support.

▶ *Funds generated by the campus' contract and grant activity and private support.* A portion of the extramural funding generated by the campus is retained centrally. After passing along a portion of these funds to the units whose extramural funding generated them, I plan to provide the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Academic Senate Committee on Research with an allocation to seed research initiatives and hold the remainder centrally to address campus needs. These funds represent one of the campus' most flexible forms of support; not only can they be used for current operations but they are a source of ongoing support that can be invested in constructing the campus' infrastructure and buildings.

▶ *Student fees.* Fees such as course materials fees and miscellaneous fees represent external revenue sources to provide the services envisioned by our long-range plans. Course materials, for example, allow departments to provide services or access to materials that directly enrich the student educational experience.

▶ *Self-supporting and auxiliary enterprises.* Self-supporting and auxiliary enterprises provide goods or services to students, faculty, staff, and campus departments on a self-supporting basis. In that recharge entities (e.g., such as printing services and the photo lab) derive their income from other campus departments without increasing the overall budget of the campus, it is important to develop principles that govern the development of their rates. For "sole source" services (e.g., network services, physical plant), it is important that advisory committees provide input into the nature of the services provided. Auxiliary enterprises (e.g., bookstore, college coffee shops) and, in some cases (e.g., housing services, transportation services) also serve non-departmental constituencies. These auxiliary enterprises are responsible for helping the campus fulfill its obligations under the 1988 LRDP. They must do so while being responsive to market conditions and ensuring that their financial strategies do not negatively affect their individual and the campus' overall debt capacity.

While the resource plan will predict the resources available to each division in 2010-11, these resources will not flow uniformly over the next decade. For example, divisions in the process of building new programs, such as JBSOE, may have some of their resources forward funded to enable them to execute strategies for cluster hiring. Over the decade, however, such actions will be self-correcting and, ultimately, the resource allocations will be dependent upon how well each division meets its accountability objectives.

Accountability and Assessment

I can not nor do I wish to direct the details of decisions made at the divisional or departmental levels. There is, however, a need to pay close attention to how we assess progress toward both divisional and campuswide goals. Such performance assessment is an effective means of improving decision-making at both the departmental and institutional levels and will help Chancellor Greenwood and me determine how to make differential investments over the course of the next decade.

I envision this accountability and assessment to become tangible in an individual agreement between each principal officer and the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. It will identify the measures and metrics that are important for the healthy management toward our goals while delineating the types of measures that will be monitored by my office and those that are expected to be monitored by the principal officer.

During the next few months, I will seek advice about the most appropriate components of such an agreement, but to illustrate the concept, I note below some of the types of measures that have been suggested to date for academic divisions.

▶ *How is the division contributing toward campus goals?* Such measures relate directly to the goals we have set as a campus as well as those the division has set for itself:

- o Basic quantitative instructional goals would include targets for undergraduate and graduate FTE (including specific targets for summer and off-campus instruction) to enable the campus to meet its enrollment responsibilities under the *California Master Plan for Higher Education* and to generate the State resources needed to achieve the desired academic profile in 2010.

- o Qualitative goals related to instruction should assess the quality of student learning as well as outcome measures related to their success and distinction after graduation.

- o Quantitative goals related to the eight priorities that have guided our planning would include, for example, divisional targets toward the campus vision of markedly increasing the number of graduate programs and enrollments, and toward campus goals for external support from contracts and grants as well as private fundraising.

- o Qualitative goals related to those priorities would include progress toward strengthening the research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction of the campus (perhaps as measured by the number of Ph.D. programs ranked in top quartile nationally, contributions to the metrics that determine membership in AAU), toward enhancing diversity, toward the development of distinctive interdivisional/interdisciplinary programs and innovative programming off-campus or via distance- or web-based learning.

- o Measures of progress toward each of the academic program/research goals articulated in their plan.[12]

▶ *Is the division engaged in ongoing internal planning, assessment, and resource re-allocation, as needed, to meet campus as well as its goals?* Each division would be expected to develop its own measures appropriate to its organizational objectives.

- o Evidence of on-going local internal planning, assessment, and resource reallocation toward articulated goals within the unit would be a topic of discussion as part of the agreement, but such measures would not be monitored directly by the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor.

- o Academic divisions may, for example, wish to develop evidence that they have identified and cultivated the faculty leadership in each of their academic programs and research institutes to maximize their contribution to enhancing further the campus' intellectual and scholarly environment.

These agreements would supplement, not replace, the qualitative assessment that already occurs routinely within academic departments, such as five-year external reviews, and external to the institution (e.g., NRC rankings). In addition, quantitiative measurements, such as ladder faculty contact hours, student graduation rates, and instructional courseload analyses, are used by divisions on a regular basis to manage their curriculum and internally allocate resources.

---

[12] See the Division of Arts comprehensive plan (http://planning.ucsc.edu/plans2001/Final/Arts.pdf) for examples of measures specific to their plan goals.

Similar agreements need to be developed for academic support divisions and, because of the clear interdependency/connectedness of all our programs and our principle that academic priorities guide resource decisions, I will be seeking the advice from all divisional leadership as well as the Academic Senate, on the types of indicators that should be a part of those agreements.

One characteristic of the agreements will be the recognition that each program contributes in different ways to the UC Santa Cruz of 2010 and that every program is subsidized in some way by the campus. In developing these agreements, it is important that every program contributes to campus goals and that every program understands how it is supported by the campus. To the extent that a program requires subsidization (e.g., via a lower student/faculty ratio, capital investment, seed funding to increase intramural research or forward funding to develop a new program, etc.)—whether on an interim or permanent basis, it is important to understand how that investment strengthens the campus (e.g., generates realistic expectations for new extramural support, centers of research excellence, visibility/prestige, access to new markets/facilities, etc.).

CLOSING THOUGHTS

Continuing the planning process

Between now and June 2002, principal officers and their divisional colleagues will need to address the issues identified in this document. They also will need to continue to build consensus among their constituencies and colleagues about the elements of their plans—particularly those that involve interdivisional collaboration/cooperation. In addition, I have outlined a number of tasks that I need to complete and issues about which I will seek advice from the Academic Senate and others.

In a very significant way, however, the planning efforts to date have accomplished much in achieving our original objectives. Principal officers, faculty, and staff are thinking comprehensively about the future of their divisions and how their decisions now contribute to the campus' future. They have identified some exciting directions that will add to the campus' signature programs over the next decade. We are building consensus concerning the need to invest in a number of important campus infrastructure needs. And, we are developing the indicators that will help us answer the question, "How do we know we have succeeded?"

Over the course of the next few months, we will pursue the issues and proposals outlined in this document, will refine the principles and processes in our resource plan, and will develop a shared understanding of the components of our integrated plan. This document is the next step towards creating our blueprint for the campus' future.

Creating *our* UC Santa Cruz of 2010

The divisional comprehensive plans detail an exciting decade to come for UC Santa Cruz. That planning has taken—and will take—substantial effort at a time when the campus already is feeling the workload pressures associated with growth. For this planning effort to have real effect on the campus, it must become *our* plan, not merely the next iteration of a succession of campus ten-year plans.

I appreciate the collective team spirit that has been evident throughout this process. Chancellor Greenwood and I believe that overall the effort has been a good investment of time, resources and creative thinking. The pace of change in the State and nation is so great that it is necessary to take the time both to look ahead strategically and to look around us to assess our current strengths and weaknesses.

Our plan will provide us with a very strong internal compass—a strong sense of what we will be, what we need to do to get there, and what are the less important things that could blow us off course.