

## **CPB REPORT # 4 ON THE SILICON VALLEY CENTER**

Planning for the Silicon Valley Center (SVC) is now only one of several critical short-term problems with fundamental implications for the long term. In its fall report to the Senate on the SVC, CPB expressed its concern about the delay in producing academic plans for accommodating the projected number of students. That concern has now become urgent. Furthermore the rapid growth in campus enrollment is already underway, but serious capital planning to accommodate that growth is just now beginning – and the necessary construction, even if it is funded, is unlikely to be ready before the end of the decade. SVC and year-round operations have been proposed as the primary options for dealing with this dire situation, given LRDP limits and the lack of capital resources. To date, however, there has been no curricular and resource plan for integrating either of these solutions into the expected academic programs of degree students, and no indication that either or both of the potential solutions can accommodate the student overflow expected at UCSC in the next several years.

### **YEAR-ROUND OPERATION**

Because CPB has yet to be presented with any proposal for year-round operation, the relevant questions about this proposed solution have yet to be asked. They would include the question of whether the existing faculty and courses would simply be spread out over four quarters. If so, how would this resolve the enrollment problem? If not, how would we accommodate that additional number of faculty (up to one third more) who would be necessary to provide a curriculum of the present depth and diversity in the summer quarter? Would faculty have the option of teaching in any three quarters? Would faculty continue to use their research and office facilities year-round? How would departments and committees function with up to 25% of their members missing (over and above those who are on sabbaticals and fellowships)? Where would the overflow students be housed in a resort community where rents rise dramatically in the summer months? It is clear, moreover, that year-round operation (at a scale large enough to address the enrollment overflow) would constitute a fundamental change in the nature of university life as we know it, and that it might also change terms and conditions of employment in a way that could require extensive negotiation with the unionized teaching employees of UCSC. To be successfully implemented plans for a summer quarter will require an extensive process of consultation.

### **SVC**

In CPB's view, the principal questions about SVC are as follows:

- **Can we maintain UC quality?** Can a UC-quality satellite campus be created without the level of funding and facilities that would be required at a UC?

In its fall report to the campus, CPB presented Associate Vice Chancellor Michaels' estimate of the amount by which enrollment-generated funds attributable at the SVC would have to be supplemented if the average per student expenditure at the satellite campus were to be the

same as on the present campus. At the maximum enrollment level of 2000 students, the amount of the required subsidy was projected to be \$4 million. This subsidy would have to come from funding generated by increasing enrollments on the main campus to the extent that it is not available from industry, private donors, and research contracts. We have seen no document, however, directly acknowledging this issue. Neither have we seen an academic plan demonstrating that the courses and programs to be offered at the SVC could be of UC quality without being subsidized. Yet public documents from the campus continue to project 2000 student FTE at the SVC by 2010.

- **Who will be served?** The second question raised is how well the programs best suited to the NASA/Ames site will serve the projected student populations. Public statements focus on such areas as information technology, nanotechnology, astrobiology, and digital imaging. Yet the vision articulated in the original Pastor/Hernandez report, in budget requests to the regents, the UCOP report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission and in the most recent memorandum of understanding with our educational “partners,” state that UCSC is moving into Silicon Valley to serve the historically underrepresented, economically disenfranchised and underprivileged, as well as working adults. Although the most recent campus report to CPEC does show a projected rise in targeted populations within the Silicon Valley region, there is no specific analysis showing that the articulated academic focus of the SVC will effectively serve these target populations.
- **How will plans be produced?** At present, the academic planning for the SVC consists of requesting that departments propose courses or course clusters that could be offered there. This approach conflicts with the report of last year’s Task Force, which directed planning efforts to targeted programs of study. The Task Force’s most fundamental requirement, that an academic plan for the SVC consist of UC quality programs that would intrinsically benefit from a Silicon Valley location and would not needlessly duplicate offerings on the home campus, appears to have receded from view. So, too, has the principle that academic programs at the SVC not be subsidized by funds generated by the growing enrollments on the present campus, where our ability to maintain UC quality is also threatened by the addition of a number of students roughly equal to that expected at the new UC campus in Merced.

Fiscal questions about growth raised by CPB for the past two years, and fully endorsed by last spring’s SVC Task Force, have been incorporated into the ten-year campus planning process that is just getting underway, and which would not be in effect for some years. In the meanwhile, the “bulge” will have arrived on our campus in the absence of a fiscal and curricular plan able to accommodate it. The campus may thus be forced to manage the consequences of accelerated growth as a continuing short-term crisis, and to allow the resulting academic quality to be whatever results.

The only acceptable form of growth is planned growth. At some point before it is too late, the campus must consider that the consequences of rapid unplanned growth may vitiate the expected benefits of growth for the campus as a whole. There may be a constellation of circumstances that would require the campus to slow the rate of growth that is currently anticipated if adequate resources are not forthcoming.

## CONCLUSION

CPB concludes that the Senate can no longer support, by inaction, the continuing absence of academic and fiscal plans for the SVC. The time has come for the Senate to be proactive, and to set deadlines for the actions we expect of our administration at this critical moment in the development of UCSC. These deadlines are necessary in order to ensure that the campus still has meaningful choices before the full complement of Tidal Wave II students has arrived.

According to the most recent report from UCOP to CPEC, the Academic Senate must approve the academic program at the SVC. A similar process of planning and approval must take place for year-round operations, and both planning processes must be fully integrated with a campus plan for accommodating projected enrollment growth.

CPB, therefore, recommends that the administration be invited to a day-long Retreat for a full and frank discussion of the overall planning issues raised by the “bulge.” Following the Retreat, the Senate will set a time frame to deliberate on the question of growth, and to go on record with a well-founded position that would inform the Office of the President on what resources it would take to mount an education that is budgetarily of UC quality at various projected levels of growth. These deliberations would also establish a time frame in which the Senate will have the opportunity to vote how much enrollment growth to accept in the absence of what the Senate and the administration together have agreed would be adequate capital and operational resources.

In support of our concerns, we call for two resolutions expressing the sense of the Academic Senate:

**1. WHEREAS** it is the sense of the Academic Senate that under the present circumstances of rapid enrollment growth the proposals both for a SVC and for year-round operation be regarded as new academic programs requiring Senate approval in their entirety before courses and curriculum are offered **AND**

**WHEREAS** the Senate wishes its committees to consider both the SVC and the proposal for year-round operation in the context of an integrated plan for accommodating the rapid enrollment growth that is expected at this campus.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** no curriculum be offered under either proposal until the process of approval is completed in the form of a vote of the Senate as a whole in a manner to be determined by consultation among the appropriate standing committees.

---

—

**2. WHEREAS**, the Senate must have the opportunity to vote on the feasibility and desirability of campus growth; **AND**

**WHEREAS**, before such a vote, the Senate needs to be fully informed about the budgetary and space conditions under which UCSC can continue to meet CPEC standards for a UC quality education at projected levels of future enrollments, **AND**

WHEREAS, the Senate requires data on the extent to which the campus met (or fell below) CPEC standards before Tidal Wave II, and the rate at which capital projects must be funded and completed in order to reach and maintain these standards as it grows, AND

WHEREAS, the Senate requires data on the per student cost of growth in both capital and operational budgets necessary to maintain a level of education that is budgetarily equivalent (on a per student basis) to what UC offered at the beginning of Tidal Wave II,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the administration shall be invited to a day-long retreat no later than December 2001 to discuss what resources are required for the Senate to approve growth in student enrollment to the extent currently projected.