

CPB REPORT # 5 ON THE SILICON VALLEY CENTER/YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

The Senate's Resolution of March 8, 2001 "requests the Chancellor and the EVC with the Graduate Council, CEP, and CPB reach mutual agreement about the timeline for producing and implementing a comprehensive academic plan for the SVC, ... [and] ... to report at the next regular meeting of the Senate on the progress of their discussions with the Chancellor and the EVC in the context of overall planning for growth." The following is CPB's report.

ACADEMIC PLANS

The EVC and CPB agreed to postpone initial discussions of this matter until March 15, when submissions to the 10-year planning process would indicate the extent to which departments and divisions expected to participate in the proposed SVC. At CPB's request, material in the Divisional plans related to both the Silicon Valley Center and Year-round Operations has been extracted, and is now on the following websites:

<http://planning.ucsc.edu/pac/MtgNotes/apc/Plans2001/Plans2001-SVCenter.pdf>

<http://planning.ucsc.edu/pac/MtgNotes/apc/Plans2001/Plans2001-Summer.pdf>

Our review of the March 15 submissions, confirmed in follow-up conversation with the Deans, suggests that there are several plausible research and graduate proposals that could make good use of the NASA/AMES site, but that few academic units have any significant plans to mount undergraduate instruction at the SVC. The most notable exception is the Arts Division, which proposes a coherent BA/MA program in Film and Digital Media that could be largely based at the SVC. Engineering, however, has no present plans to mount its own undergraduate courses at the SVC unless and until it develops a self-contained program that could be taught entirely off campus. Based on current Divisional proposals there is little prospect that a comprehensive undergraduate curriculum for the SVC will be developed without deviating significantly from the planning process currently underway.

Although CPB was informed that the administration was preparing a separate "meta-plan" for the SVC that would relate it to campus-wide planning for the bulge and set a time-table for its development, there is no indication, outside of the Arts, that the Deans are continuing planning for significant lower- or upper-divisions components of instruction at the SVC. The current view of the Administration is that, given the environmental and programmatic issues surrounding the NASA site, there is little immediate likelihood of mounting undergraduate courses at the SVC, and thus, no immediate need for the kind of academic plan that would comply with the Senate resolution of March 8 .

CONTINUING ISSUES

1) COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING: Our remaining concern is not whether a significant component of UCSC's undergraduate curriculum will be offered at the SVC – it will not – but rather, that this conclusion must be acknowledged in the campus planning process. The Chancellor's view is that earlier projections of enrollments at the SVC now stand as a placeholder for yet-to-be-developed plans to accommodate a comparable number off campus, or in year-round operation. For CPB, however, the crucial question is how the campus will deal with projected enrollment growth, now that we know that the SVC will not accommodate the large number of undergraduate students originally envisioned.

2) YEAR-ROUND OPERATION: In the absence of a substantial undergraduate program at the SVC, planning for state-funded summer session takes on new urgency. This urgency has been apparent since April when (despite the express reservations of the Graduate Council, Committee on Faculty Welfare, Committee on Research, CAP, and CPB) the EVC requested state funds for UCSC's existing summer session in 2002 that would be predicated on moving toward increasing state funded summer session instruction.

CPB's review of the Divisional Planning Summaries indicates that only the Arts and Education presently have coherent plans for mounting full academic programs in the summer. Educations could accommodate significant growth. (See extracts on the websites listed on page 1 of this report) A few other units propose introductory or bridge courses in the summer, and most, including Engineering, predicate any involvement in summer instruction on substantial, but unspecified, increases in funds for faculty and staff compensation. Based on the Divisional Summaries thus far submitted, CPB sees no reason to assume that state-funded summer session will resemble year-round operation of the sort envisaged in UC's compact with the Governor. It is CPB's impression that the EVC and the Deans agree with this preliminary assessment. But they argue UCSC will do what it is well able to do, and that by signing on to the Governor's vision of year-round operation UCSC will get state funds for the modest level of summer session it can support.

The Administration's claim that UCSC can make its summer session as small as it likes is plausible if UCSC can put its excess enrollments somewhere else – at the SVC, in other off-campus programs, or on the main campus during the regular year through raising the LRDP enrollment limit above 15,000. A smaller than expected SVC will, therefore, make it likely that this campus may have to plan for a more substantial summer session as part of its comprehensive approach to accelerated enrollment growth. Under emergent systemwide guidelines, future justifications for new classrooms and class laboratories must be based on an assumption of a summer term enrollment of 40% of fall/winter/spring enrollments. This change in the systemwide norm for space utilization will disadvantage UCSC (and any other campus with a small summer session) in its requests for instructional space to relieve overcrowding during the regular academic year. Clearly, it would be in the interests of these campuses to ask that systemwide utilization formulae for instructional space be based on the actual, rather than the normative, proportion of regular term enrollments that are absorbed in the summer.

For this and other reasons, CPB believes that any campus commitment to year-round operation will have serious implications for both capital and academic planning that must be analyzed immediately.

Respectfully Submitted:

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Roger Anderson *ex officio*
Barry Bowman
Carla Freccero (*Senate Vice Chair, invited*)
Ben Friedlander
Alison Galloway
Susan Gillman
Bob Meister
Graeme Smith
Lynn Westerkamp
John Hay, Chair

May 9, 2001