

ACADEMIC SENATE

Long Range Plan

December 14, 2001

INTRODUCTION.....	2
ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE (ASO)	4
Operations	
Staffing	
Growth	
Technology	
SPACE AND SCHEDULING	7
Office Space	
Conference Rooms	
Senate Meetings	
SENATE COMMITTEE FUNDING	9
Committee on Committees	9
Committee on Privilege and Tenure	11
Committee on Research	12
Committee on Teaching	19
Committee on Faculty Research Lecture	22
SPECIAL SENATE EVENTS	23
Orientation for Senate Committee	
Joint Administration-Senate Retreat	
Senate Forum	

**Academic Senate
Long Range Plan
December 14, 2001**

INTRODUCTION

The Standing Orders of the Regents established the Academic Senate, its charges and its plenary authority over certain matters. Consistent with this, the operation of the University of California is based upon the principle of Shared Governance and the co-operative relationship between the Administration and the Academic Senate in pursuit of common educational and research goals. Indeed, the Millennium Report recognized that “shared governance has brought many benefits to the university, and it is a tradition we are eager to see passed down and strengthened in the next generation of faculty at UCSC.”

To most effectively serve these goals, the Divisional Senate anticipates numerous changes as it prepares for growth and renewal at UCSC over the next ten years. During the next five years the Senate will be conducting a self-review of all its organizational and operational activities to increase its effectiveness. Two areas with broad implications for Senate functions will be explored and implemented appropriately: first, the role of information technology and second, methods of operation (e.g. possible changes to committee structure and possible alternative ways of conducting Senate business such as a representative assembly). Temporary resources are likely to be needed to fund consultants and data collection during this review. The review will also help planning in the following other areas discussed in this report: Academic Senate Office staffing and operations; Academic Senate Standing Committees; and optimal methods for conducting Senate business.

The **prioritized objectives** of the Senate over the next ten years are to:

- Obtain adequate staffing to cover the operational needs of the Senate at a classification level appropriate to the responsibilities of the positions.
- Increase the use of information technology to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of Senate Committees, reduce dependence on paper printing, and to provide more effective communication with the Senate members and Administrative Offices.
- Obtain suitable guaranteed space for the Divisional Senate meetings.
- Substantially increase Committee on Research funding for research grants to bring UCSC up to a more appropriate level for a premier research institution.
- Obtain adequate Senate service compensation, including: committee course compensation; compensation for University-wide service; compensation for service by new faculty; compensation for student representation on Senate Committee; and Senate Chair summer compensation.
- Increase the level of Instructional Improvement Program grants.
- Increase the level of Excellence in Teaching Awards from \$500 to \$1000.
- Obtain adequate Senate office and Senate conferencing space.
- Expand the Faculty Research Lecture Series.
- Reinstitute the Professor's Inaugural Lecture series on a limited scale.
- Obtain funding for the Fall Orientation for Senate Committees.
- Obtain funding for the annual Joint Administration-Senate Retreat.
- Obtain contingency funding for Privilege and Tenure hearings.
- Establish Committee on Teaching teaching awards for departments. **Continued** →

In addition to the itemized priorities above, the Academic Senate strongly advocates adequate support for the Center for Teaching Excellence to carry out its functions. Although this unit does not reside within the Senate, it is closely tied to Senate interests and activities through its relationship with the Committee on Teaching.

ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE

Operations: As part of planning for this 10 year growth period, the Secretary and Chair of the Senate met with the Senate Director to assess the functioning of the Academic Senate Office (ASO), including such matters as budget, technology needs, accommodating growth staffing for AS Committees and other functions, and communications with the Administration.

Staffing: All staff positions in the ASO must be classified at the level appropriate to their responsibilities. Key positions are currently under-classified (compared to other UC campuses), with the result that retention problems, which are costly in both money and in staff time to rectify, have become worrisome. This problem needs to be addressed in the near future. If current staff positions were vacated, they could not be filled at the same level of competency with their current classifications. Due to the rotating nature of Senate committee and officer appointments, and especially with the increasing volume and diversity of activity due to campus growth, consistency in staffing is critical for Senate operations.

Growth: Besides the reclassification of Senate office staff discussed in the section above, we anticipate that increases in the number of Senate staff will be needed to ensure that Senate business proceeds smoothly. Some of these increases in staff will be motivated by campus growth, while others will be justified by changes in the campus, (e.g. SVC, state funded summer session) by changes in technology, and by a need to replicate the services provided by academic senate offices at other UC campuses. In particular, the following factors will lead to growth in the staffing needs of the senate office:

a. Campus Growth -- As the campus grows to 15,000 students, the demands on the Senate office will also increase. However, assuming that the current size of the ASO staff is appropriate [but see point b, below], then the size of the Senate staff should not increase as fast as the size of the campus. The majority of ASO staff time is used to support Senate committees. For the most part, the number of Senate committees (and corresponding workload) do not necessarily scale directly with the number of faculty at UCSC. There are exceptions such as CAP (the Committee on Academic Personnel), where the workload of the committee scales directly with campus size.

However, other mechanisms leading to growth will have significant effects on Senate staffing. If the Silicon Valley Campus has resident faculty who are members of the UCSC Division of the Senate, then we would anticipate a need for significant additional staffing to deal with the 'split' Academic Senate. Another example would be year-round operation. The current staffing structure assumes a three month release from regular committee work and other academic year tasks. If the Academic Senate needs to operate at full speed for twelve months, we will need additional staffing to accommodate this change.

b. Level of Service -- Even in the absence of any campus growth, ASO is currently understaffed and there is a legitimate need for additional ASO staffing to deal with Senate business. For the most part, Senate staffing needs do not scale with campus size, as discussed above. However, given the fixed number of Senate committees, it is noteworthy that UCSC's Senate staff is the smallest in the UC system. On this campus, the Senate Director acts as staff to more committees than on any other campus, and is consequently less available to perform managerial and administrative functions.

In addition, several UCSC Senate committees have traditionally received no staffing at all, even though their business has become quite intensive during the past year or two, requiring a substantial commitment of Senate staff. Two examples are the Committee on Computing and Telecommunications and the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA). As UCSC approaches selectivity, CAFA's workload has increased dramatically, and we anticipate that its role in designing and overseeing comprehensive review at UCSC will be extremely staff intensive. Other committees, such as Privilege and Tenure, have traditionally had low workloads, but during the past three years have been very busy indeed. While we hope that P&T returns to its historical low workloads, any continuation of its current caseload will require additional staffing. Overall, we anticipate that an additional staff analyst position will be needed to deal with planning, budgetary, and grants issues as the work of the existing committees becomes more complex.

Over the past few years UCSC has had more impact at UC system-wide than ever before. Recently UCSC has seen representation in key positions such as Academic Council Chair, and Chairs of important committees such as UCORP, UCAP, UCP&T, and UCEAP. It is anticipated that two more UCSC faculty, serving as vice chairs this year will Chair UCFW and UCORP in 2002-03. It will be difficult to get UCSC faculty to agree to this important system-wide service without some support. For example, the current Division Chair is requiring staff support on issues of system-wide concern such as providing better monitoring of requests for comments from both the system-wide senate and from the UCSC central administration as these requests are channeled to the several committees and as their responses come in. Responsiveness at the system-wide level puts UCSC on the map as a "player" in this arena. The importance of this for the campus has unfortunately been neglected in the past.

c. Technology -- As the Senate office becomes less dependent on paper and more dependent on web pages, computer forms, electronic distributions, and web-based voting, there will be a need for additional staffing to deal with these issues.

Currently, our Division of the Academic Senate is largely dependent on paper and snail mail in its dealings with the faculty. Our Senate meeting calls are distributed in paper form, we vote by snail mail ballots, and we submit Committee on Research grant proposals on typed paper forms. Our Senate website contains considerable information, and in terms of quality and usefulness, it is currently much better than the system-wide Senate web site and probably at about the median of the web sites for the other campuses.

In the near future, it is imperative that the Senate move more toward web based interactions with faculty and with the administration. Senate committees will be doing more and more of their business on the web, as will administrative committees. This means that we will need fast turnaround in getting material onto the committee web pages. Committee on Research and Committee on Teaching grants will be submitted by faculty through web based forms, with the information flowing directly into a database program, which will aid in managing these grants. Committees will edit documents on the web. We envision that in the next few years, all communications with the faculty (including calls and minutes of Senate meetings) will be electronic or web based. We would also like to institute web based nominations and voting (to replace snail mail ballots).

Doing business electronically will undoubtedly save money currently used for printing and paper. Nine hundred copies of hundred-page calls to Senate meetings will not be necessary. But the Senate office will need additional hardware and software to accomplish these goals. The current web server used by the Senate is inadequate, and we will need addition storage space, speed of operation, and commercially available software. We will attempt to emulate our successful sister Divisions by adopting the successful software they use.

By far the most expensive aspect of the conversion to electronic communications will be the cost of technical support to install and operate the needed software and to keep our Senate and committee web pages constantly updated. In this regard, the whole campus has an important decision to make regarding the best and most cost effective way to provide technical and web support to units like the ASO. Possible choices include (1) hiring staff within the office to handle technical support and information transfer, (2) using a central facility on campus to provide these services or (3) to outsource to commercial firms. Hiring staff within each office keeps the service close to home, but any interruption in staffing can be disastrous. Central services on campus are probably cost effective, but many offices (including the ASO) will need fast, reliable service managing web sites and developing interactive sites. The question of which option to pursue is a campus, rather than a Senate issue.

SPACE and SCHEDULING

Introduction

Currently, the Academic Senate office functions quite well in the space it occupies within Kerr Hall, but several factors, including campus growth, new technology issues, future relocation of AHR, and increasing levels of service will require planning for expanded space. By the year 2010, we anticipate the following needs.

Office Space: There are three factors which either lead to need for additional office space. (1) As additional staff is hired, appropriate office space is necessary. (2) An office for the Senate Chair with a phone and a computer in close proximity to ASO will be needed. Other UC campuses have found a chair's office in the ASO to be essential for providing support for the chair and the efficient operation of their divisions. When the chair visits the ASO, (s)he needs a location to review and edit documents, read and write senate email, etc. (3) Finally, in the event that AHR moves into Kerr Hall or another location, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will need a large office (seats 10 comfortably around a table) in close proximity to AHR. Due to the highly confidential nature of CAP's work, it must have a dedicated space. Other requirements are at least one computer with printer, xerox machine, and capacity to store and read current CAP files.

Conference Rooms: The Senate needs two conference rooms located near the ASO. With 22 standing committees and usually a couple of special committees at any time, these rooms are needed as committee meeting places. The senate needs a small conference room holding at least eight people and a large conference room with a capacity of 25-30 people. Both rooms must have teleconferencing capability and the larger conference room will also need videoconferencing capability in order to hold joint meetings with system-wide committees and to hold UCSC senate committee meetings with remote members (located, for example, at a Silicon Valley campus).

Senate meetings: Finding appropriate space to hold Senate meetings has become a nightmare at UCSC, especially since regular divisional senate meetings are now scheduled twice per quarter. The Senate receives very low priority for the assignment of lecture halls, and the locations of Senate meetings have often been uncomfortable, inadequately sized, and acoustically poor. Locations are always announced at the last minute. In the long run, the Senate needs guaranteed access to a lecture hall to hold regular meetings. In the event that the Senate (which holds "town hall" Senate meetings) morphs into a representative assembly, then our space needs would be considerably lessened in terms of size, but equally urgent in the need for access. In the interim, the Senate can certainly bounce around among various locations, but it still needs to have higher priority access to lecture halls. It is imperative that the Senate establish a regular location for its meetings. Attracting the best, most committed (and usually the busiest!) faculty members to Senate meetings requires that these meetings be held in a consistent, centrally located, accessible location.

Scheduling Issues: The scheduling of Academic Senate committee meetings has become a very labor-intensive task, and sometimes it is not even possible to find a time when all committee members can meet regularly. Indeed, divisional senate meetings often conflict with other events such as departmental colloquia, department meetings, and administrative meetings. In response to

this problem, we have been considering several alternative ways in which class scheduling and campus event scheduling can better mesh with Senate activities. We mention two possible examples here. (1) The classroom schedule might be modified to leave a regular time for Senate meetings. During weeks when the Senate does not meet, that time could be used for department meetings, colloquia, or other activities. A variation on this idea would allow only those classes taught by non-Senate faculty and TAs at the times of Senate meetings. (2) The Senate is considering the establishment of regular, predictable times for most Senate committee meetings that do not conflict with Administrative committees. Faculty with a desire or a commitment to serve on a given committee will know well in advance not to schedule their classes in conflict with their Senate committee.

SENATE COMMITTEE FUNDING

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Introduction

It is evident that the maturation of the campus is impacting the activity of Academic Senate Committees. The smooth functioning of the senate and cooperative and productive relations between the Administration and the Senate come down to having the best people in key positions. The very best faculty for Senate service are frequently over-committed so some incentives for service are needed. Factors unique to this growth phase play into individual's ability to do senate service. Some of these factors include; faculty are teaching more students, retiring faculty are replaced by individuals still in career-building phase, faculty are being asked to create new entities (grad groups, professional schools, college programs, research institutes), faculty have more service obligations (professional, raising extramural support, fundraising).

Committee course compensation: is approximately \$6,200 for non-Engineering faculty. The current block allocation of 35 course compensation for on-campus senate service should in the future go into the Senate budget so that any annual workload allocation is accrued to the Senate office budget. Current compensation is approximately:

\$217,000

University-wide Service: One Course Compensation for major service on University-wide committees (Chair or Vice Chair). Assuming there is no support forthcoming from Office of the President for this service, COC will have up to five available per year for this purpose. This will enable COC to confidently negotiate with faculty for these important appointments. This amount reflects the maximum and should be allocated as needed.

31,000

Service Scholars Program: This program, to compensate new faculty for one quarter of service will increase incrementally so that by 2010 there will be a total of 5 scholars.

31,000

Student Representation: In order to obtain meaningful student participation in the senate, student compensation for service on senate committees must be regularized. The difficulty of obtaining student representation can be overcome by offering stipends similar to the practice for some Administrative committees. Students will be compensated on those committees that faculty receive compensation (with the exception of Graduate Council. The stipends for students can be introduced incrementally so that by 2010 there will be a total of 8 full year compensations as follows:

Undergraduate	\$333 per quarter X 3 = 1,000 X 4 = 4,000
Graduate	\$666 per quarter X 3 = 2,000 X 4 = <u>8,000</u>

12,000

Summer Compensation: Summer salary for the Senate Chair (2 months) is salary driven and therefore the expense will vary with each appointment. In the future, to attract outstanding faculty to Senate leadership, the Vice Chair will be compensated (1 month) as well. These funds should continue to be allocated from the EVC/Provosts budget (rather than the Senate budget). Based on a conservative Professor III salary, 3 months salary is approximately:

20,000

In addition, increasingly, senate activity is necessary over the summer (e.g. BOARS in 2001). It is expected this trend will continue so at least one course compensation should be allocated as needed.

6,000

Type of Service	As Needed	Permanent
Committee course compensation		\$217,000
University-wide Service:	31,000	
Service Scholars Program		31,000
Student Representation		12,000
Summer Compensation	6,000	20,000
	\$37,000	\$280,000

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Contingency fund for P&T hearings

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure performs an essential function for the campus in dealing with issues of faculty discipline and grievance. Fortunately, in most years, this committee has not been obliged to hold formal hearings. However, in recent years, there has been a notable increase in the number of formal hearings schedule. Such hearings are adversarial proceedings between the administration and a faculty member, with P&T being the adjudicator. Our current practice is for P&T to request funds from the administration for each expense involving the conduct of such hearings (such as court reporter services). Since the administration is a party to the hearing, we propose instead to request a contingency budget to be used only in the event of a formal P&T hearing to be allocated as needed.

\$6,000

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Introduction

As UCSC expands the scope and size of its educational program to serve its growing undergraduate and graduate student bodies, it is essential that we also move aggressively to lift the breadth and quality of our research enterprise. UCSC will reach the top ranks of public research universities only through hard work by the faculty with consistent, thoughtful support by the administration. Faculty provide leadership for this effort through program definition and departmental hiring, as well as through their daily work in libraries, laboratories, and studios. Several Senate committees play an important part, including the Committee on Planning and Budget through its consultative role in budget planning. The Committee on Research (COR) is assigned an advisory role on research policy issues and budgetary needs, and administers a peer-reviewed program of faculty research and travel grants.

These individual COR grants are small but often vitally important. If, as NASA administrator Daniel Golden has stated, research universities are the furnace of innovation, then small grants for exploratory, high-risk research are the matches that light the fire. The UCSC Millennium Plan has emphasized that "research is essential to the creation of a vibrant intellectual community," and that COR "is essential for developing a culture of research on the campus."

Unfortunately, funding for COR has withered over the last decade. The permanent funding for COR is smaller now than it was in 1989, even without the effects of inflation or faculty growth. Although the problem has been partially (and temporarily) ameliorated through special initiative funding from the Executive Vice Chancellor, the current situation is untenable and the deficiencies will be greatly magnified over the next decade unless action is taken soon.

Year	Proposal
2002-03	\$630,996
2003-04	\$698,995
2004-05	\$766,944
2005-06	\$839,849
2006-07	\$917,991
2007-08	\$1,001,666
2008-09	\$1,091,183
2009-10	\$1,185,815
2010-11	\$1,250,939
2011-12	\$1,318,904

The Senate plan calls for a substantial, phased increase of COR funding, to \$1.3 million in 2011.

This increase would, first of all, make permanent the temporary allocations of the last two years. Over half of the additional funding is a straightforward increase mandated by campus and faculty growth over the decade. But it is not enough to simply inflate from the status quo, the weaknesses of which were described in a 1998 report on the research environment at UCSC as "very serious" and threatening "increasingly ominous consequences." The Senate plan aims instead to raise intramural research funding to a level appropriate to a nationally ranked research university, addressing a number of the priorities in the EVC's planning framework, including a strengthening of research and scholarly accomplishment and distinction, seed money for new research programs attractive to graduate students and for interdisciplinary research programs, and opportunity funding to start programs that will attract external funding from government, foundation, and private sources.

We recognize that the COR plan may appear expensive, especially when compared to recent COR budgets. In fact, COR funding represents a very minor part of the overall expense of supporting each UCSC faculty member but has outsized impact on faculty research, which the Millennium Plan reminds us is a "fundamental component of what faculty members do" in a major research university. Research motivates our faculty, inspires our students, and drives our economy. An investment in research is an investment in the future of UCSC.

The status quo

By the time the Santa Cruz campus was founded, the University of California was the most distinguished system of public research universities in the world. In this environment, UCSC made extraordinary progress in building its own research programs; it certainly ranks among the best research campuses founded in the last half century. But despite some top ranked programs, UCSC has not reached the stature of, for example, the Association of American Universities members, which include most of its UC siblings.

After years of improvement, there are signs that our forward progress has stalled. In 1996, UCORP published the results of a survey of UC faculty, titled "The Deteriorating Environment for Conducting Research at the University of California." A study of the UCSC-specific data was published Harrington and Haber, with the assistance of COR, in 1998: "Faculty Perceptions of a UCSC Research Environment in Need of Restoration and Improvement." They reported that "a majority of UCSC Academic Senate members surveyed in 1996 ... indicated that the research environment had deteriorated during the preceding five years" and that they "believe the deteriorations and weaknesses in the UCSC research environment identified by UCSC faculty ... are very serious and will have increasingly ominous consequences if not dealt with quickly and effectively." The problems, caused in part by the dismal economy of the early 1990's, are deep, and include issues of space and staffing, and also problems external to the University such as availability of external funds. These problems need not be permanent, but we must take special care that in this era of rapid growth we do not lock in conditions that will prevent us from ever reaching our potential as a research university.

For a young faculty aggressively moving into new research areas and exploring new interdisciplinary connections, the availability of opportunity and seed funding is especially crucial. At UCSC, as at other UC campuses, much of such funds are dispersed by the faculty, acting through the Senate Committee on Research. This peer-review system ensures that funding decisions are made by those close to the performance of the research activities, and forms an important part of the consultative relationship between the faculty and administration. Unfortunately, COR funding atrophied for a decade (at all UC campuses, but particularly UCSC). During the 1990s, inflation inexorably chipped away at COR funding. Controlling for inflation when estimating the cost of research is complex, and certainly varies by field. For lack of a better statistic, the GDP implicit price deflator is often used; by this measure, the value of a dollar declined 27% from 1989 to 1999, causing the apparently flat COR budget to fall from \$320k to \$245k in constant 1989 dollars. During the same period, the number of full time ladder faculty at UCSC grew from 354 to 394, for an overall effective drop in the per faculty level of COR funding of nearly one third. In the last two years, the situation has been partially ameliorated by temporary,

initiative-based funding through the office of the Executive Vice Chancellor, pending completion of the current planning process.

Finding the "right" funding level

What is the "right" intramural funding level for COR funding? Estimating an optimal level directly is extremely difficult. However, we can use historical norms and comparisons with similar institutions to make a reasonable estimate. Our sister UC campuses form a particularly useful comparison set, as they have been remarkably successful in the last half century at developing research programs.

By this measure, UCSC COR is greatly underfunded. A study by the UCLA COR found that in fiscal year 1999-2000, the last year for which data were available, UCSC ranked eighth of the nine UC campuses in Faculty Grants Program funds available per Senate faculty member. At that time, the per capita funding level at UCSC was \$543—well behind the \$635 median campus funding level and at just over half the Berkeley funding level of \$1000 per faculty member (1999 dollars).

Campus	Senate total	Emeriti	Total FGP+travel	Total FGP only	FGP per faculty	Total per faculty
UCSF	1071	201	\$1,213,572	\$1,155,058	\$1,078	\$1,133
UCB	2200	800	\$2,200,000	\$1,859,000	\$845	\$1,000
UCSD	1399	324	\$1,232,175	\$1,009,776	\$722	\$881
UCR	700	179	\$528,622	\$418,004	\$597	\$755
UCLA	3215	747	\$2,040,680	\$1,741,680	\$542	\$635
UCSB	1126	317	\$685,141	\$562,943	\$500	\$608
UCD	1504	571	\$947,771	\$711,010	\$473	\$630
UCSC	571	120	\$310,000	\$240,712	\$422	\$543
UCI	1166	230	\$467,181	\$286,315	\$246	\$401

Table 1: data compiled and tabulated by the UCLA COR for their year 2000 COR annual report. The table itself will be dropped from the final report.

When considering comparative numbers, there are two things which must be kept in mind. First, the survey was done at a time when all campus CORs had suffered from a decade of neglect. The 1996 UCORP report found that twelve times as many longtime faculty reported a decrease in their own funding through COR as reported an increase. But UCSC has suffered more than most. Across all sources of intramural funding (CORs, ORUs and research groups, and deans and department chairs) the UCORP report found that the Riverside, Santa Cruz, and Davis campuses were most affected. As the report concluded, "Campus administration decisions about how to absorb their declining income can make a big difference in how much of an impact is felt by faculty in their opportunities for conducting research."

Year	Enrollment	Faculty	COR funding required, constant dollars			COR funding required, 3% inflation			COR funding required, 3% inflation, 1989 base			Proposal \$800/FTE 1989 base w/ adjustments
			UCB rate \$1000 /FTE	UC median rate \$635/ FTE	inflation factor	UCB rate \$1000 /FTE	UC median rate \$635/ FTE	Restoration factor	UCB rate \$1000 /FTE	UC median rate \$635/ FTE		
1999-00	11,279	594	\$593,632	\$376,956	100.0%	\$593,632	\$376,956	100%	\$593,632	\$376,956	\$474,905	
2000-01	12,124	638	\$638,105	\$405,197	103.0%	\$657,248	\$417,353	100%	\$657,248	\$417,353	\$525,799	
2001-02	12,500	658	\$657,895	\$417,763	106.1%	\$697,961	\$443,205	100%	\$697,961	\$443,205	\$558,368	
2002-03	13,315	701	\$700,789	\$445,001	109.3%	\$765,772	\$486,265	103%	\$788,745	\$500,853	\$630,996	
2003-04	13,915	732	\$732,368	\$465,054	112.6%	\$824,287	\$523,422	106%	\$873,744	\$554,828	\$698,995	
2004-05	14,415	759	\$758,684	\$481,764	115.9%	\$879,523	\$558,497	109%	\$958,680	\$608,762	\$766,944	
2005-06	14,915	785	\$785,000	\$498,475	119.4%	\$937,331	\$595,205	112%	\$1,049,811	\$666,630	\$839,849	
2006-07	15,415	811	\$811,316	\$515,186	123.0%	\$997,816	\$633,613	115%	\$1,147,488	\$728,655	\$917,991	
2007-08	15,915	838	\$837,632	\$531,896	126.7%	\$1,061,087	\$673,790	118%	\$1,252,082	\$795,072	\$1,001,666	
2008-09	16,415	864	\$863,947	\$548,607	130.5%	\$1,127,255	\$715,807	121%	\$1,363,979	\$866,127	\$1,091,183	
2009-10	16,900	889	\$889,474	\$564,816	134.4%	\$1,195,378	\$759,065	124%	\$1,482,269	\$941,241	\$1,185,815	
2010-11	16,900	889	\$889,474	\$564,816	138.4%	\$1,231,240	\$781,837	127%	\$1,563,674	\$992,933	\$1,250,939	
2011-12	16,900	889	\$889,474	\$564,816	142.6%	\$1,268,177	\$805,292	130%	\$1,648,630	\$1,046,880	\$1,318,904	

Table 1: COR funding proposal, in real year dollars, assuming the same 3% inflation rate assumed in University indirect cost reimbursement models. Model assumes UCOP projections of UCSC enrollment growth, and faculty growth to hold an average faculty/student ratio of 19. Model assumes initial target funding of \$800 per faculty FTE, slightly above the current \$635 UC median funding level but below the current UCB funding level, and additionally includes a phased restoration of funding lost to inflation between 1989 and 2001.

When comparing figures, it is important to remember the UCSC faces a number of challenges in the next decade that are not shared by the UC campuses that are already near their enrollment limits. Two-thirds of our faculty of 2010 have not yet been hired. As all UC campus CORs recognize, faculty at the beginning of their careers require more access to opportunity funding. Furthermore, the development of research programs associated with new graduate programs and the campus's desire to foster new interdisciplinary research efforts will both increase short term research costs at UCSC. Although we are optimistic that the development of exciting new research programs will eventually lead to increases in external funding levels, realistically we believe that in the short term research development costs at UCSC will be above the median cost at other UC campuses. Much of the expense will come in the form of new faculty start-up packages, but COR funding will also be important, particularly in funding interdisciplinary research.

The COR 10 year plan is therefore based on three principles. First, the temporary funding of the last two years must be made permanent, and the funding per faculty should be brought to at least the UC average of \$635. Second, to avoid downward spirals such as that seen in the 1990's, COR funding should be increased at a rate at least equal to that of inflation. Finally, UCSC should take the lead in returning COR funding to the real-dollar levels that existed before 1990—a period when we and our sister campuses made rapid progress up through the ranks of America's research universities.

During the next decade, COR's grant priorities will continue to evolve in response to the growing and changing campus needs. COR's seed funding of relatively high-risk projects will certainly continue. As the campus builds on its interdisciplinary strengths, COR's cross-divisional membership gives it unique standing to evaluate and support new research efforts that extend across divisional boundaries. COR also has a growing redistributive role, as divisional opportunity fund resources are increasingly tied to federal indirect cost recovery. Recognizing that even "non-sponsored" research can contribute in important ways to the intellectual climate at UCSC, COR will continue to recognize and fund high quality research in fields where external funding sources are scant. In particular, COR intends to:

- Continue and expand the new Special Research Grants program, begun through initiative funding provided by EVC Simpson. These relatively large (\$10,000) grants primarily support projects where COR funding can leverage external support, though they may also support other initiatives that promise to substantially enhance faculty productivity.
- Continue to use standard Faculty Research Grants to seed new research efforts, especially for untenured faculty, and to support excellent research in under-funded fields.
- Explore the use of COR funds to directly encourage external proposals, probably by tying some portion of COR grants to matching of external proposals (as at UCSB).
- Encourage interdisciplinary research by emphasizing COR's policy of welcoming collaborative grant proposals.
- Expand the scholarly meeting travel program to meet the needs of the growing faculty. The travel program is an investment in the scholarly development of individual faculty members, and is also crucial for raising the visibility of UCSC faculty nationally and internationally among their colleagues and among prospective graduate students.

COR-funded research is currently a tiny fraction of the total UCSC research effort. Typically, federal agencies devote a much larger fraction of their budgets to high-risk research. For example, NSF directorates can allocate up to 5% of their budgets to small grants for exploratory research. Assuming even modest growth ahead of inflation of external funding levels, the requested COR budget will remain near 1% of external funding.

Accountability measures

The assessment of research success is complex, and perhaps nowhere is it more challenging than when evaluating the type of exploratory and high-risk proposals that we wish to encourage through COR grants. Many projects will never lead to large external contracts or to book contracts or to commissions, much less to final results that will change the world or the way we perceive it. Too high a success rate for COR-funded research would suggest that we are supporting the sort of safe project that could probably find external support already. But the nature of research is that side paths can open into exciting, unforeseen areas, and chance contacts at meetings can lead to productive collaborations.

Indeed, the very strength of the university research model depends in large part on its rejection of a predefined metric for evaluating research success, and its willingness to keep its focus on long-term goals. Instead, university bodies such as COR achieve accountability through a peer review model, in which relatively knowledgeable colleagues weigh the details of a current proposal together with past success and future promise to determine how to allocate funds. Peer review is extremely effective, and is used by nearly all government agencies and many private foundations when distributing funds. At UCSC, accepting peer-reviewed distribution of research funds is a basic statement of trust in faculty knowledge, insight, and good will. Although (for various reasons) some particular research support decisions as well as general budgetary decisions will continue to be made at the system-wide or campus-wide level, we strongly believe that the campus research enterprise will be strengthened by devolving as many decisions as possible about research directions to faculty in departments, divisions, and COR peer review panels.

COR does plan to improve communication both with the faculty and the administration about COR-funded research. By annually highlighting outstanding research proposals, as is done by UCLA COR, we would like to present a cross-section of some of the most exciting research work currently being done on campus to an audience including all members of the campus community, prospective students, and friends of UCSC.

Diversity

The COR 10 year plan serves both campus and University diversity goals. First, as noted above research opportunity funds are of greatest importance to faculty near the beginning of their research careers. On average, these younger faculty are drawn from a broader range of racial, cultural, and economic backgrounds than their older colleagues, so increasing their research and travel support helps establish the careers of a more diverse faculty. But there is a more important reason to raise the stature of UCSC research. The UCSC faculty is now the most diverse in the UC system. It is vital that this campus not be marginalized as a second-class research university. COR has its part to play in ensuring that UCSC leads the University of California with an active research faculty that reflects the diversity of California.

Summary for Committee on Research

UCSC supports faculty research in a variety of ways, including grant administration, direct support to divisions, start-up funds to new faculty, and a variety of opportunity funds directed by the EVC, the VCR, and COR. The setting of budgets is an administrative responsibility, but in the shared governance system the Academic Senate, through its Committee on Planning and Budget and Committee on Research, is charged with consulting on the budget and research policy. COR's oversight of the Faculty Research Grant and Scholarly Travel programs is one aspect of that consultative relationship, but only a part of a broader-based discussion that must continue throughout the next decade.

Because the COR grant program is just one of several areas where research support has stagnated at UCSC, it is crucial that an increase in COR funding not simply divert funds from, for example, divisional support. It will be a significant challenge to identify a source of the needed funds. One possibility is to use indirect cost recovery funds for part of the increase. In 1996, the University's Task Force on the Research Climate (chaired by Judson King and Sandra Weiss) recommended that each campus "assure consultation with the Senate on the use of [these] funds," and recommended that the priorities guiding their use be reconsidered, with each campus finding "alternate funding for non-research uses currently supported by [these] funds." Such redirection, together with the growth in external funds expected during the next decade, will provide at least part of the money needed, but we recommend that the administration actively consider other sources of research funds, including the upcoming capital campaign. (We caution against tying COR funding too closely to indirect cost returns, as the resulting incentive structure then acts against the Committee's redistributive role as a source of funds for excellent research in fields without direct federal or industrial support.)

The next decade will be both an exciting and challenging time for research at UCSC, with the arrival of hundreds of new faculty colleagues, the establishment of new graduate programs, and growth in old programs. We must match this growth with institutional support and resources, with administrative leadership, and with Senate consultation, working together towards our goal of truly becoming "*an outstanding research university* with an uncommon commitment to undergraduate education."

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

Introduction

The Senate's Committee on Teaching (COT) has a charge to work with departments to improve teaching, to formulate policies regarding instructional support on campus, and to propose programs fostering excellence in teaching. It also selects faculty to receive excellence in teaching awards, and the committee also receives and evaluates proposals for Instructional Improvement Grants, making recommendations regarding their funding to the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), which controls these funds. This committee charge furthers the goal enumerated in the report of the Millennium Committee that "UCSC will be an outstanding research university with an uncommon commitment to high quality undergraduate education."

The COT does not control the funds awarded for either Excellence in Teaching Awards or for Instructional Improvement Grants. Its role is to make recommendations for these awards to the CTE, which reports to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education. This role is somewhat different from the Senate Committee on Research, which actually makes award decisions.

Because of the very close traditional relationship between the COT and the CTE, we include here a discussion of future funding plans for teaching grants and awards. However, because this funding does not come to the senate per se, we shall not prioritize this funding in our portion of the planning process. This is not meant to suggest that the Senate regards these activities as unimportant -- we regard them as extremely important funding sources that happen to reside in another unit.

The reporting structure of the CTE is somewhat unusual, since it doesn't have a "natural" home. Although it reports to the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, the mission of CTE includes training teaching assistants and more generally, fostering improvement in graduate as well as undergraduate education. We note that the planning document for the Graduate Division proposes that the CTE be moved to the Graduate Division to better support teaching issues related to graduate students. It could be argued that the CTE should be located in a unit whose purview extends to both graduate and undergraduate instruction. Two such choices would be the Academic Senate and the office of the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

With this in mind, and with due regard to the impending growth of faculty FTE as well as graduate and undergraduate enrollment, COT's requests fall into three categories: continuation and augmentation of funds for the award of Instructional Improvement Program grants; continuation and augmentation of funds for Excellence in Teaching Awards; and permanent augmentation of staff for the Center for Teaching Excellence.

The Instructional Improvement Program (IIP)

COT requests a permanent annual augmentation of \$100,000, specifically devoted to technology in instruction, to the Instructional Improvement Program. This would bring the budget for the support of instructional innovation to \$220,000 per year. In addition, COT requests that this baseline budget be increased by \$15,000 per year for the next seven years, bringing the budget to \$325,000 by the end of the period. This level of funding is justified in light of the proposed growth of the campus, in particular the expected recruitment of 600 new faculty (including 300 new FTE).

The Instructional Improvement Program, which dates back some thirty years in the University of California, provides seed money to encourage experimentation with new ideas in teaching and learning. For at least a decade UCSC has earmarked \$120K annually for grants to UCSC faculty and staff. Last year this funding increased with the temporary allocation of an additional \$125K to fund classroom innovations involving instructional technology. New Technologies in Teaching Grants support a wide variety of projects, including applications of recently developed software programs or new formats, adaptation of teaching materials for the Internet, development of original courseware, creation of online materials, and more.

Through this kind of innovation, followed by assessment of effectiveness, faculty can determine which technologies best achieve their instructional goals. The Instructional Improvement Program is specifically designed to encourage both innovation and assessment in the context of a funded project. The required follow-up report chronicles the unfolding of a project, including its impact on teaching and students' learning. CTE maintains copies of all reports and publishes those of particular note in its quarterly newsletter *Faculty Focus*.

Adjudication of IIP grant proposals is a responsibility of the Committee on Teaching on which it spends considerable time throughout the year. Faculty who request grants must make clear in their applications exactly why and how the proposed innovations will benefit learning in the classroom, and that is the bottom-line consideration that governs the distribution of funds. Assessment of the results of the projects has garnered increasing attention within COT. Moreover, COT is considering supplementary criteria which address the usefulness and wider application of the technological innovations it funds. Specifically, we propose to ask future applicants to indicate how they plan to disseminate the results of their teaching experiments. By gently encouraging such "scholarship of teaching learning," we hope to leverage the campus funds into larger funding, either from system-wide competitive funding (e.g., the Teaching, Learning, and technology Collaborative Grants), NSF, or private foundations.

The annual budget for IIP grants has remained stable at \$120K for more than a decade, with the exception of 1998-99 and 2000-01, both years in which EVC Simpson approved one-time technology augmentations. COT sees a large proportion of proposals in the new technologies area. Last year such applications made up 54% of the total amount requested. The importance of the growth in these funds, particularly in technology, is illustrated in the 1998 Advisory Report of the Millennium Committee which cites new technologies among the factors enhancing UCSC's current opportunity to become a truly outstanding university.

In authorizing the second one-time IIP augmentation of funds for projects incorporating new technologies in instruction, EVC Simpson specified that "Future allocations will be dependent on greater coordination with the Academic Divisional efforts in this area." **Input requested** from the deans enhanced COT's thinking with respect to broader issues surrounding the grant requests, and the committee plans to seek divisional input regularly.

Permanent Augmentation of Funds for Teaching Awards

COT requests a permanent augmentation of \$7,000 in order to double the amount of the Excellence in Teaching Award, raising it from \$500 to \$1,000.

Each year the Academic Senate Committee on Teaching recognizes ten or more UCSC faculty for teaching that is exemplary and inspiring. (Thirteen faculty were selected to receive awards in spring 2000.) Awardees are chosen on the basis of student nominations, letters of endorsement from department chairs, and individual statements on teaching. Currently each one receives a \$500 prize and a framed certificate presented by the Chancellor. Following the awards presentation in spring of 2000, Chancellor Greenwood proposed that COT increase the amount of these awards **\$1000 in order** to align them more closely with those offered on other UC campuses.

A New Category of Teaching Award for Departments

COT is also considering a request for an annual allocation of \$25,000 for a departmental teaching award. There are other universities, including UC Berkeley, which now offer an annual award to a whole department in recognition of a particularly distinctive and high impact contribution to education. Such an award could involve either proposals from a whole department, or it could be awarded in recognition and support of a new but ongoing teaching innovation.

Support for the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE)

Even though CTE is not within the Academic Senate purview, its function is of great interest to the Senate. COT strongly supports the principle that CTE have adequate support to fulfill their function on campus. CTE currently serves the entire population of faculty and graduate students with a permanent staff of two, the director and a program coordinator at 60% time. With the addition of some 600 new faculty and the doubling of the number of graduate students over the coming decade, an increase in the size of the CTE staff is imperative. After several years of close collaboration, CTE and the Graduate Division are now poised to launch a range of new initiatives in support of graduate student development for teaching, and additional permanent staff will be needed to accomplish those initiatives.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE

FRL honoraria

Currently, the Faculty Research Lecture is given once a year by a distinguished scholar chosen by the Senate Committee on FRL. The FRL on every other campus in the UC system carries with it an award ranging from \$500-5000. In recognition of the prestige of the FRL, UCSC must plan to pay an honorarium with the FRL award like every other UC campus.

For the future, the Senate will have two Lectures per year, one award to an Associate or Full Professor and one to an Assistant Professor. The monetary award is particularly important for untenured faculty. This, along with the Service Scholars Program (see "Committee on Committees, above) will encourage more participation in both the Senate and the University community by newly hired faculty.

Once the FRL are nominated, the Senate will begin to work with University Advancement so that any advancement opportunities around the FRL research can be explored.

Revival of Professor's Inaugural Lectures

In addition to the Faculty Research Lectures, the Senate would like to sponsor approximately three Professor's Inaugural Lectures each year. These lectures were at one time a tradition at UCSC, as faculty presented a one-hour lecture to the campus and town communities at the time of their promotion or hiring as full professor. Because of campus growth, the PILs would have to become a much-sought-after honor rather than a routine expectation, and we anticipate broadening the charge of the FRL Committee to select the faculty to receive this honor. The Senate intends to work with the administration to explore the possibility of reviving this excellent UCSC tradition, which could become a jointly sponsored Administrative-Senate event. Such events could serve to provide useful opportunities for the city and the campus to become more familiar with scholarly activities on campus, build a sense of community among faculty and provide important fund-raising opportunities.

The bottom line is that two Faculty Research Lectures (one senior, one junior) and three Professor's Inaugural Lectures per year would make an excellent package of lectures for a major research university.

SPECIAL SENATE EVENTS

Orientation for Senate Committees: The Senate will begin to conduct a mandatory one day orientation/training in the fall for all individuals with Senate appointments. The Millennium Report states that the Senate must "[e]nhance communication among senate committees," and we believe it is vital that faculty doing service be fully informed of current issues from the beginning of the academic year. The goal of this training is to orient faculty to Senate service, concepts of shared governance, campus systems, operations and resources for committee work; and to coordinate committee activities from the beginning of the year, and to improve the functioning of committees and create a positive experience of Senate participation for those new to Senate service.

Joint Administration-Senate Orientation: In view of recent discussions regarding the planning for growth at UCSC, the Senate would like to sponsor one orientation with the Administration each year. The purpose is to explore in depth the background to major issues facing the Senate and Administration for the upcoming year and to coordinate and calendar consideration of the issues. The first such event took place in Fall, 2000 and was very successful. CAB/SAC has endorsed continuing this practice. This retreat might be combined with the Chancellor's fall retreat, or it may be a completely separate, though coordinated event.

Senate Forum

As issues arise, it will be necessary to hold special fora. In the past few years, the Senate has seen an increase in these (on SVC, DOE lab management, planning and Merit Equity Review process) As the Senate becomes more involved in a broader range of issues with increasing complexity, there will likely be greater necessity for these events.