

December 17, 2013

VPAA Herbie Lee
Chancellor's Office

Re: Senate Review of Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Herbie,

The Academic Senate has reviewed the revised Silicon Valley Academic Plan (October 19, 2013). The responses from the individual committees are varied, and several responses echo concerns raised in the last review cycle that have not been addressed at the level expected. However, the overarching concern of the Senate is that the plan in its last two iterations remains a long way off from articulating clear goals for the campus in Silicon Valley (as opposed to specific programmatic goals for BSoE). Senate Executive Committee (SEC) is cognizant that pushing the current program offerings forward allows the campus to establish a foothold onto which other divisional programs can be built. That said, without a clearly articulated vision for what UCSC is striving to accomplish, this can be interpreted as a continuation of the ongoing Silicon Valley efforts which have lacked cohesion and in some cases connectivity with the campus' goals. Is our intention to host a collection of programs over the hill? Or, are we intending to build-out a satellite campus with tailored offerings that either exist in both geographic regions, or that can only exist in the Silicon Valley marketplace due to prospective student need or reliance on industry partnerships? These are just two of the myriad possible visions for UCSC in Silicon Valley. Unfortunately, with this document the Senate is no closer to understanding the campus' true vision than it was 18 months ago.

Based on CPB's response, which was echoed at SEC, there is a strong feeling that the process of asking faculty buy-in to an "academic plan" is misconceived absent a vision statement of how Silicon Valley operations will help our main campus and absent a business plan that allows us to assess the benefits and opportunity costs. The Senate is unwilling to accept a piecemeal cost analysis based on the rollout of each individual program as they emerge over the coming years in lieu of a thoughtful analysis at the present time. Additionally, the current plan does not involve the UARC and/or re-compete (NAMS) in any of the proposed academic programs, which could play a central role intellectually as well as financially. Specifics on internships and other connections with Silicon Valley industry that are central to the student education and training also are absent. Finally, the proposal lacks any data or letters of support from companies and other stakeholders that would indicate a demand for the academic programs proposed and the need for our physical presence in Silicon Valley.

We are mindful that these considerations exceed the mandate of authoring a Silicon Valley Academic Plan, though we hold that the exercise lacks coherency in the current vacuum. **To expedite moving this planning process forward with all due haste, we suggest that intensive but informal meetings between key principal officers/administrators and Senate members be convened immediately.**

Attached are the committee responses, including specific comments and observations by CAAD, CAFA, CAP, CEP, COR, CPB, COT, and GC. Some of these comments have been touched on in this letter, but many more purview-specific issues, especially around faculty expectations and resource implications, are also raised which should be considered moving forward.

Sincerely,

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate

Enclosures

CC: CPEVC Galloway
VCPB Delaney
VCR Brandt
VPDGS Miller

November 25, 2013

JOE KONOPELSKI
Chair, Academic Senate

Re: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe:

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) reviewed the most recent version of the Strategic Academic Plan for the Silicon Valley. CAAD felt that its response to the 2012 plan was not fully addressed in the new plan, and we reiterate the view that the initiative is an important opportunity to improve outreach in East Palo Alto and Peninsula locations. We are hopeful that UCSC will build new relationships via the Silicon Valley campus and attract promising under-represented students to both sites.

Additionally, CAAD is concerned about the actual faculty hiring necessary to sustain high quality programs at a Silicon Valley campus and is curious as to the specific details of the proposed hiring plan when available. Setting the benchmark of 20 new FTE to support 100 new graduate students, consistent with the UC average ratio of faculty FTE to graduate students in engineering and computer science, appears to be a prudent—though extremely costly—approach. However, we have questions as to how such a hiring paradigm (with a high number of faculty to be “situated” at a Silicon Valley “campus” or site) might affect hiring in other divisions across campus and what effect this might have on diversity, both among faculty and among prospective students.

Finally, CAAD assumes that all faculty hiring will follow the same fair hiring recruitment processes for the main campus, including having a diversity representative on each hiring committee, Academic Human Resource workshops that emphasize diversity in recruiting, etc. We note that there are clear goals for the School of Engineering to diversify their faculty in the most recent “Senate Faculty – Comparison of Incumbency to Availability,” provided to CAAD by the campus Office for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. The hiring of a large cohort of faculty FTE for the Silicon Valley campus gives the School of Engineering another opportunity to meet those goals.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Lau, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action and
Diversity

November 25, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) reviewed the Silicon Valley Academic Plan in our early November meeting but was unsure how the plan related directly to the CAFA charge and therefore reserved detailed comment. The discussion largely pertained to questions around holding students in the Silicon Valley programs to the same standards of admission as those of our UCSC general campus-based students. It was pointed out that at this time the Silicon Valley programming is graduate-related only and therefore not engaged with CAFA as an undergraduate admissions unit. However, we were curious as to how we plan to handle differentiation between the campuses if/when undergraduate students become integrated programmatically or geographically into Silicon Valley.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "June A. Gordon".

June Gordon, Chair
Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid

November 22, 2013

Joe Konopelski
Chair, Academic Senate

Re: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

At its November 13, 2013 meeting, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed the revised Silicon Valley Academic Plan (revised August, 2013). CAP focused on the academic personnel issues related to the plan.

The plan states that it provides an intellectual vision for UCSC academic programs in Silicon Valley, and that it is not meant to be an implementation plan. Thus, CAP's feedback is an appraisal of that vision with regards to the role, responsibilities and expectations of faculty of the Silicon Valley programs (rather than on the details of implementing the personnel review processes of those faculty) as articulated in section 4. *Governance*.

The plan states that faculty situated in Silicon Valley will be evaluated exactly like their departmental colleagues who are at UCSC main campus: Silicon Valley FTE will be *subject to the campus' standard instructional workload principles*, and *each of the BSOE departments have updated their policies to ensure equitable workload while allowing for flexibility based on program needs and faculty expertise*.

CAP is concerned by these statements for several reasons:

1. They seem to make light of the fundamentally different academic programs, and the roles that faculty play in them, when comparing those in Silicon Valley to those at UCSC. To say that the instructional workload for FTE associated with Silicon Valley graduate programs *will necessarily be weighted toward graduate courses*, seems to recognize that the criteria for evaluating teaching in the personnel review process is likely to be different for Silicon Valley FTE compared to FTE on the main campus. Yet, in the same paragraph, it is stated that Silicon Valley faculty will have *the same rights and responsibilities* as those on the UCSC campus. The UCSC administration has delivered a clear message to the faculty that they are expected to teach across all levels, yet there will be existing and newly hired FTE situated in Silicon Valley that will be asked to exclusively serve graduate programs.

2. CAP members, including two from BSOE, are unaware of the *updated policies that ensure equitable workloads* that are referred to in the plan. CAP, and apparently BSOE faculty, have not seen these policies. Thus, it is not possible for CAP to evaluate whether there is sufficient flexibility and/or appropriate guidelines in the existing policies to accommodate such large within-department differences in faculty teaching assignments when faculty are split between two locations and are serving different academic programs.

Mixed messages regarding teaching workload expectations have already caused confusion on our campus, and CAP has no doubt that this confusion, and the possible inequities that will result from it, will only increase unless the intellectual vision of the Silicon Valley campus and graduate programs includes a more realistic discussion about how all aspects of faculty responsibilities in research, teaching, and service might be different for faculty who are not on the main UCSC campus.

CAP is accustomed to applying the criteria of the APM to evaluate faculty from vastly different fields whose accomplishments take vastly different forms. Thus, CAP encourages the development of a more realistic and thoughtful vision - one that acknowledges that there are likely to be different opportunities and roles for those faculty situated in Silicon Valley compared to those on the main UCSC campus.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ana Christina Ravelo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Christina Ravelo, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: June Gordon, Chair, Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid
Kimberly Lau, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Jose Renau, Chair, Committee on Computing and Telecommunications
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Barry Bowman, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Daniel Friedman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Bruce Schumm, Chair, Graduate Council
Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair, Committee on Research
Charlie McDowell, Chair, Committee on Teaching

November 25, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Revised Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed the revised Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) for Silicon Valley (SV). Our discussion was framed with our awareness of the long history of fruitful collaboration between UC and industry and a desire to have UCSC participate in such valuable partnerships. This plan could be seen as having small impact on undergraduate education, but CEP does not see it this way, as we will outline below.

The extremely short section on undergraduate programs begins:

UCSC Silicon Valley will be focused on serving both the needs of corporations for academic partners in research as well as the training of future employees. Training undergraduates to be work-ready for technology firms requires understanding the ever-changing needs of these firms through persistent academia/industry interactions.

We would have preferred this paragraph to be more student-centered and less industry-centered. The mission of this initiative should not just serve business interests but pursue the academic mission of the university. The SAP for SV needs to deliberate, separately from industry partners, which types of academic and professional training are most likely to cultivate long-term success for our students. On the positive side, the initiative proposes many interesting research programs, with potential opportunities for summer and academic undergraduate internships. However, the plan has a heavy emphasis on programs from the Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE), although this is not altogether surprising because of the natural fit of many BSOE programs and SV area industries. This brings to mind two points specifically about BSOE being the lead in SV:

1. We would like to see more indications that other divisions of the campus will benefit from SV relationships. We think the concept of a remote campus will be ultimately more successful with a larger portion of the campus having representation at that remote campus.
2. We found more language about the benefit of industrial partnerships than we did about the core academic values of research and education. We would have preferred it if the influence of BSOE had extended to including some of the clear academic priorities from their mission statement.

Apart from this, we have several more general concerns about the academic plan:

1. Diversity: There is no strategy on how the SV (remote) campus plans to attract underrepresented students. Additionally, although more of a graduate student issue,

- there is some concern that the “Professional Degree Supplement Tuition program” will leave out less affluent students and reduce diversity.
2. **Campus Priorities:** Considerable resources are required to launch this initiative, both in terms of new FTEs and infrastructure. Does investment in SV dilute the educational experience for the main campus (SC-resident) students? How will the allocation of resources to the remote campus affect undergraduate education on the main campus, which has already suffered severe cuts in recent years? If some programs have a majority of graduate students who are SV-residents, how will this affect SC-resident students?
 3. **Keeping Academics First:** When we form advantageous partnerships with SV industry leaders, are we keeping our educational mission at the fore? How do we measure the academic content of different kinds of internships? How do we ensure fair compensation or safe work environment? How do we make sure the academic content of their work can be reported in the appropriate publications? The UCSV Academic Plan needs to describe how UCSV pedagogical priorities are guaranteed in its industry-driven curricula, and how they will be reflected more generally in the evolution of its annual curriculum-and-leave plans.
 4. **Faculty Standing:** There is some concern that the UCSV initiative may lead to a two-tier faculty and that undergraduate students on the main campus may not have access to those faculty teaching at the remote campus.
 5. **Class Choices:** We concur with the concern of the previous CEP that the strategic plan appears to imply that "the needs of graduate students (for TA-ships) [drives] the choice of undergraduate courses to offer, rather than the requirements of the undergraduates for specific courses."
 6. **Campus Planning:** How is support of UCSV-affiliated faculty research (in the form of funding, but also teaching releases, mentorship assignments, etc.) determined to balance the needs of industry partners with the broader research and teaching mission of BSOE and, more broadly, the main campus?

In closing, thank you for giving us the chance to comment.

Sincerely,

/s/

Tracy Larrabee, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Senate Committee Analysts

November 22, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

The Committee on Research (COR) has reviewed the Silicon Valley Academic Plan (revised August 2013). The committee notes that this plan has been around in some form for many years now and has previously undergone Senate review. However, this particular iteration still lacks answers to many questions regarding the context and structure of faculty and graduate student research in Silicon Valley.

COR would like to know more about where faculty and graduate student research will be done and whether it will be done in UC facilities. Will new laboratory/research facilities need to be constructed in Silicon Valley and will these duplicate facilities that already exist on the Santa Cruz campus? The committee also wondered about the level of research impact that UCSC can expect from the planned M.A. and M.B.A. programs. If the programs are not expected to have significant research impact, then COR is interested to hear how the UCSC faculty in Silicon Valley will have access to Ph.D. students with whom they can collaborate for research. Will the types of corporate sponsored research envisioned by this plan be of the type that would normally be awarded a doctorate? There are also significant intellectual property issues at play when discussing UCSC research with corporate partners. These issues may be particularly problematic in the context of graduate student research, if research projects are conceived and supported largely within a business context.

COR recognizes the broad scope of this plan and awaits further clarification from the Baskin School of Engineering and VPAA Lee regarding the above issues. They will almost certainly be addressed more fully in the rollout of specific program plans and we await the opportunity to review these.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

/s/

Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair
Committee on Research

November 25, 2013

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

CPB has reviewed the Silicon Valley Academic Plan (August 2013). CPB holds that the process of asking buy-in to an "academic plan" is misconceived absent a vision statement of how Silicon Valley operations will help our main campus and absent a business plan that allows us to assess the benefits and opportunity costs. Members found the plan lacking in that it fails to involve the UARC and/or re-compete (NAMS) in any of the proposed academic programs, which could play a central role intellectually as well as financially. It also lacks specifics on internships and other connections with Silicon Valley industry that are central to the student education and training. Finally, the proposal lacks any data or letters of support from companies and other stakeholders that would indicate a demand for the academic programs proposed and the need for our physical presence in Silicon Valley.

The last 18 months seem to have brought little progress in developing a coherent Silicon Valley plan with buy-in by the Senate. With an eye to jump-starting a concerted planning effort, we suggest intensive but informal meetings between key administrators and Senate members.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daniel Friedman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Daniel Friedman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

November 25, 2013

JOE KONOPELSKI
Chair, Academic Senate

Re: COT Response to the Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe,

In its meeting of November 12, 2013, the Committee on Teaching (COT) reviewed the new version of the Silicon Valley Academic Plan. The plan raised a number of concerns about UCSC's expansion in the Silicon Valley that the committee would like to see addressed.

COT expressed concern at the extent to which the plan appears to put UCSC in a position of financing Silicon Valley private industries' research through academic programs and research at the new campus. While relationships between faculty/students and industry may be beneficial to UCSC, the plan did not clearly consider the cost to other programs and services such as the Library, IT resources, and undergraduate teaching, which would be required to maintain relationships. Along these lines, members questioned to what extent the proposed engineering programs in Silicon Valley would be expected to be self-sustainable—or even profitable—initiatives that would not compromise the already limited UCSC campus resources.

A majority of members expressed caution about the significant campus resources that would be required to sustain the Silicon Valley academic plan, including twenty new FTE. COT questioned how these resources, which represent a considerable investment directed to a mostly graduate engineering program in the Silicon Valley, may (or not), be diverted from other areas of campus, and voiced concern that the plan offers little for our undergraduate education mission and may supplant funds that support it. A cost-benefit analysis of the additional FTE that includes the educational benefits for all of our students needs to be provided.

Related to the last point, members questioned the meaning of “situating” faculty in the Silicon Valley. What teaching expectations will these faculty have to the Silicon Valley campus, and to the main campus?

Given the geographic difference in campus locations, the plan requires a new level of collaboration and support between the expanding and planned programs (mostly in the School of Engineering) and campus IT resources, Learning Technologies, and the Library. The plan gives no clear indication of how these costs will be covered, and at best suggests that UNEX will continue to cover costs. While the COT was not able to consult with UNEX Dean Rogers, it is not clear from the plan that UNEX can provide these resources and direct costs, nor is it clear that the School of Engineering has been in dialog with ITS, Learning Technologies, or the Library.

Members cautioned that the new version of the plan has narrowed in scope from previous plans, focused now more on programs in the School of Engineering. Members expressed concern that it will be difficult to build faculty support for this plan unless there is a clear benefit to faculty in other divisions.

Related to the last point, members expressed concern about the educational mission of the Silicon Valley plan, noting that many of the expanding and planned programs are more oriented towards vocational training than current academic programs on campus.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

/s/

Charlie McDowell, Chair
Committee on Teaching

November 21, 2013

JOE KONOEPLSKI
Chair, Academic Senate

RE: Silicon Valley Academic Plan

Dear Joe:

The Graduate Council reviewed the revised draft of the Silicon Valley Academic Plan (SVAP) in its meeting of November 7, 2013. We found that the revised plan was more concrete in its listing of programs, along with a straw timeline, that might be initiated at the Silicon Valley Center (SVC). Certainly, the Council looks forward to the review of these proposals as they come forward.

For the most part, the Council found the content of the proposal consistent with the context presented in the October 21 cover letter that accompanied the plan when it was transmitted to you. The experience of several members of the Council cast some doubt on whether some of the programs expected for the latter part of the projected timeline were likely to materialize—particularly for the case of the MBA degrees—but overall the Council appreciated the new draft's identification of specific programs, along with a timeline providing a suggestion of administrative priorities, that are anticipated for the Silicon Valley Center. The SVC initiative is focused primarily on graduate programs, and as such is seen by the Council as a potentially exciting opportunity for the campus. The Council is cautiously optimistic that the SVC initiative will allow our campus to take a significant stride forward in its participation in graduate education and in its impact in associated fields of study, particularly those that might increase our academic and intellectual connections, in the broadest sense, to the dynamic engine of the Silicon Valley. Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined below, the Council came away feeling that some elements were missing after reading the document.

The attendant cover letter (Lee to Konopelski, October 21, 2013) began with a pre-emptive statement that the revised SVAP should not be read as a document that could be implemented, and that the Senate should await the individual program proposals for details on costs and resources. Yet, to a large extent, this is what the Council was hoping for in the revised SVAP. Our progression down the rebenching path has highlighted an issue whose urgency has been growing within the Council, and perhaps the Senate as a whole: the degree of rational and strategic thought that is being brought to the deployment of the significant new permanent funding that is coming to our campus as a result of the rebenching process.

Tied to this was an uncertainty on the part of the Council as to who the primary author or authors were of the SVAP. The Council wondered if the SVAP was primarily a collaboration between the VPAA's office and that of the Engineering Dean, or whether it was developed with a broader participation by campus administrators. The Council recalls that, in an earlier conception, the SVC initiative was imagined to be more broadly interdisciplinary, involving applied and

academic programming in a broad range of disciplinary areas, including the Social Sciences. While there are elements of this within the current plan, they seem to be either somewhat peripheral (the SVC Education program) or speculative (the two MBA programs).

Thus, the Council wondered if the SVAP represented a broad engagement of the campus administration in a consideration of the opportunities and advantages offered by our foothold in Silicon Valley, particularly against the enabling backdrop of the awarding of significant new resources to the campus through the rebenching process. The Council also felt itself wondering how the expected trajectory of the SVC fit into a comprehensive strategic consideration of the opportunities offered by the arrival these new resources. In the absence of an overarching, resource-oriented analysis of the projected development of the SVC and its programs, the Council found it difficult to comment on the appropriateness of launching down the path outlined by the SVAP. How much of the rebenching resources will be needed to hire the faculty and support the lecturers and students that would be associated with the full set of anticipated programs? Have provisions to acquire and augment associated Library holdings and subscriptions been considered? What is the projected growth in the numbers of Ph.D. and Masters students associated with the new programs? How is this growth consistent with the principles and priorities of the campus and how does it articulate with the rebenching mandate? How might the geographical “center of gravity” of graduate instructional effort—particularly that of existing graduate programs—be influenced by the pursuit of the SVAP?

In summary, the Graduate Council appreciates the effort that is being put into the further clarification of plans for the SVC, and shares with the administration an enthusiasm for the development of concrete graduate programming at the SVC. However, the Council would like to have seen a more comprehensive resource-oriented analysis of the implications of this growth, some overall estimate of the contribution of the effort to our growth in Masters and Ph.D. enrollments, as well as a presentation of how this growth will contribute to the satisfaction of campus ambitions associated with the rebenching process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Bruce Schumm', written in a cursive style.

Bruce Schumm, Chair
Graduate Council