

Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force
on Academic Structures and Strategic Planning
Report & Recommendations
May 2013

During Spring of 2012, a series of interrelated campus opportunities and issues were highlighted, both by administrative leadership and, in particular, at the Senate Forum on the Future of the Curriculum. The forum identified the need for cross-campus planning for student success that both maintains a challenging curriculum and enhances the offering of interdisciplinary programs, initiatives, all while planning for the graduate growth aspirational goal embedded within the rebenching initiative. In response to these issues, and given their impact beyond the mandate of any one plenary area or individual leader, the EVC, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, convened this Joint Senate and Administrative Task Force intended to provide a venue for considering the delivery and support of curriculum and research to meet the needs of 21st-century higher education, both undergraduate and graduate, within the context of realistic budgetary models.

Over the course of the Task Force process, initial assumptions about the recurrent challenges throughout each subgroup area (*budget, curriculum & research, and graduate growth*) were evaluated, and the most important outcome of our deliberations is clarity that our campus stands at a crossroads, financially, operationally, and pedagogically. This Task Force report will consider how to accommodate increases in the number of graduate students while meeting resident and nonresident enrollment targets, contextualized by a broad assessment of teaching resources in light of budget cuts. The Task Force has embedded recommendations for a continued and perpetuated method for dialogue and decision making as is required to move forward.

UCSC is currently planning for a campus wide strategic planning effort for the next academic year, which the Task Force views as the essential tool for consideration of many if not all of our reporting to follow. **Our foremost recommendation is that the strategic planning initiative use this Joint Task Force report as a starting point and as essential context** for thinking about strategic values and for the possible operational and curricular changes which may be necessitated by the fundamentally altered funding realities for higher education, UC, and our campus in particular.

Provided here are highlights of the subgroup reports, with the full reports attached for additional detail. Several themes emerge across these reports, beyond the overarching desire for graduate growth. TA allocations and funding for interdepartmental programs are examples of resource flows that merit further discussion.

Task Force Foci - Budget, Curriculum, Graduate Growth

Budget

The starting point for the budget report is that a better understanding of the budget situation is a pre-requisite for an intelligent discussion of the budget process. The report starts by describing several key pieces of the new budget reality, and then proceeds to guiding principles. The implementation of funding streams and rebenching has significant impacts for our campus and our budget process. After five successive years of budget cuts, and, with several more years of potential cuts on the horizon, our campus is in a decidedly different budget environment than the revenue growth perspective we have often used as our planning context, so we need to fully transition our thinking and our approach to match our reality of a steady-state or even declining base budget.

Guiding Principles Essential for Campus Progress

1. The whole budget is always under consideration.
2. We are not looking to 'restore' cuts; we are continually shaping the institution for the present and future.
3. The structures supporting the institution must evolve constantly, including efforts that require multi-year transitions.
4. The foundation of excellence is effectiveness on basic functions.
5. Transparency is needed in the budgeting process.

When setting priorities, is it important to have full stakeholder participation informing decisions. When the final decision is made, if the decision does not match major recommendations, the stakeholders should be informed as to why that decision was made. Communication and a certain level of transparency create buy-in for the decision. In framing the budget context, it is important to understand both what is being cut and what is being kept; the whole budget should be shown, not just the marginal changes.

We recommend that the campus develop pro-active priorities and multi-year planning. We should focus resources on targeted investments and seek the new revenue sources required to support them, rather than dwelling on the decline of state investment in higher education. To the extent possible, campus consensus regarding priorities needs to coalesce, which will provide a framework empowering campus leadership to pursue innovation and growth with all necessary alacrity.

Curriculum & Research

The key functions of our faculty are instruction and research. Our campus has long promoted the values of interdisciplinary research, yet in practice there are challenges to cross-divisional and interdisciplinary teaching and research. In our discussions and report we have isolated several key stumbling blocks and underused opportunities in this area. While this report was originally intended to address both teaching and research, it actually focuses on the curriculum piece, leaving the research considerations for future exploration. The recommendations and questions noted here are intended to help contextualize and frame key concerns for the Strategic Planning process to explore.

Four preliminary recommendations arise:

1. Optimizing Teaching Assistantships – The current TA allocation policy does not optimally match the range of pedagogical styles, practices, and demands in our classrooms and programs. The working group recommends strongly that it is time to revisit the allocation process. Key questions to pursue include: Does campuswide instruction, such as general elective courses or prerequisites which cross departments or divisions, receive an appropriate TA allocation? How

might emergent forms of mediated teaching require new ways of allocating and using TAs? Can TA assignments be streamlined through better use of a clearinghouse based in the Graduate Division?

2. Integrated institutional academic budgetary planning – The working group recommends that there are likely better ways of aligning the curricular purview of the senate with the resources available to the administration. What complementary forms of consultation might be helpful, and how can accountability be built into the process?
3. Summer session – The working group strongly recommends that summer session be better utilized to help students make progress through their degrees in a timely manner. The current funding model should be re-examined, and the ladder faculty remuneration policy and departmental benefit will likely require modification.
4. Coordination of academic planning at the divisional level and beyond – Currently inter-departmental and interdivisional programs are supported primarily through a range of ad hoc MOUs and other bilateral agreements. The working group strongly recommends the consideration of complementary forms of coordination across units. Can we create stronger structures for interdisciplinary instruction and research? How can the joint appointment process be improved? How best can we create interdisciplinary graduate programs to help support our graduate growth goals?

Graduate Growth

Our campus has long stated a desire to grow graduate enrollments. The rebenching initiative now provides both new money and additional incentive to achieve graduate growth. Due to the need for significant planning and for campus cultural adjustments, as well as the complex and inter-related nature of graduate admissions, curriculum, and funding, we recommend consideration of a Senate/Administrative task force for developing and vetting challenging ideas and pathways, and which would have the appropriate moral force in championing them with both faculty and administrative constituencies.

Academic planning must be at the core of large-scale graduate growth, yet the past planning processes have been driven by the academic divisions. Both divisional and inter-divisional initiatives need to be considered, so there would be an advantage to centrally organized planning with a campuswide focus. The primary driver for graduate growth should be our academic mission.

Funding is a key consideration, as the rebenching money is clearly not sufficient alone to achieve the desired goal. We will need a multi-pronged approach that involves additional faculty hires, additional advising by our existing faculty, and generation of new resources for supporting our Ph.D. students. We should incentivize faculty to advise and graduate Ph.D. students, to bring in external funding to support Ph.D. students, and to launch or expand programs that enroll fee-paying masters students. In the detailed report, the Task Force makes several explicit recommendations for the campus to consider as it organizes itself to effect graduate growth.

An honest and objective analysis of the fiscal issues underpinning graduate enrollment growth must inform the deliberation process, and be undertaken immediately. In order to attract top students, we need a change in campus culture to move toward more multi-year funding packages to make the best financial support offers we can with the existing level of resources. It could help to revisit the TA allocation process to include some aspect of graduate support as a consideration.

Full Reports:

Budget	Page 5
Curriculum & Research	Page 8
Graduate Growth	Page 11

Membership

Don Brenneis, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (co-chair)²
Herbie Lee, Vice Provost Academic Affairs (co-chair)¹
Sheldon Kamieniecki, Dean of Social Sciences³
Paul Koch, Dean of Physical & Biological Sciences²
Bill Ladusaw, Dean of Humanities¹
Art Ramirez, Dean of Baskin School of Engineering³
David Yager, Dean of Arts¹
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy²
Scott Oliver, Chair, Committee on Research³
Bruce Schumm, Chair, Graduate Council³
Lynn Westerkamp, Chair, Committee on Planning & Budget¹
Peggy Delaney, Vice Chancellor Planning & Budget¹
Joel Ferguson, Provost, Crown College
Susan Gillman, Literature (at large)²
Karen Holl, Environmental Studies (at large)
Shiku Muhire, Undergraduate Student
John Brown, Graduate Student³
Erik Green, Graduate Student
Analysts: Mary-Beth Harhen¹, Matthew Mednick³, Betsy Moses²

¹ Member of Budget subgroup

² Member of Curriculum & Research subgroup

³ Member of Graduate Growth subgroup

Tyrus Miller, Graduate Dean, was invited to sit with the Graduate Growth subgroup

David Belanger, Associate Dean, attended a number of Curriculum & Research subgroup meetings on behalf of Dean Koch

Budget Subgroup Report

UC and UC Santa Cruz Budget Context

The University of California (UC) instituted a new system-wide budget model beginning in 2011-12 as a result of the [Funding Streams Initiative](#). This model (1) funds the activities of the Office of the President (OP) by an assessment on all campuses, and (2) has campuses retain the revenue streams they generate from various activities (tuition, indirect cost recovery, non-resident tuition, etc.). This was a major transition from the previous more federated budget model in which funds flowed to OP, were commingled, and then were distributed to the campuses not clearly linked to revenue sources and reflecting a complex set of past decisions. Past practices such as “forward funding” of programs by OP with one-time funds anticipating growth are no longer used. The campus now has full responsibility for managing changes in revenue streams, which provides an unprecedented opportunity to influence the fiscal future of our campus. This challenge requires taking responsibility for our financial success by identifying productive investments, creating incentives for revenue generation, operational efficiencies, and transparent mechanisms for distributing resources. This change is characteristic of a mature budgetary system that includes accountability for outcomes.

Funding Streams was followed by the Rebenching Initiative which examined the distribution of State General Funds by campus (the one revenue stream not treated in Funding Streams), using a metric of funds/student on a weighted basis. Over a six-year period beginning in 2012-13, the goal is to bring the funds per student at all campuses to that of the currently best funded campus. For campuses like UC Santa Cruz with a relatively low proportion of academic graduate students at the Ph.D. level, the rebenching process gives weight to aspirational graduate student enrollments, setting a target ratio of 12% doctoral student to undergraduate enrollment for the campus to justify the full allocation under funding streams. The stakes in Funding Streams are high, with an anticipated increase in permanent State General Funds of \$20-24 million for UC Santa Cruz total over the six year implementation. This new funding is greatly welcomed, but it comes with an obligation to increase our doctoral enrollment.

After five successive years of budget cuts, and several more years of potential cuts on the horizon, our campus is in a decidedly different budget environment. Past interludes of budget cuts have always been framed with a return to a growth mode. This is no longer true, given the economic situation of the state and the national trend in decreasing funding for public higher education. Funding provided by Proposition 30 does not fully match increases in mandatory costs, so we must operate with a decreased base from this source. We need to fully transition our thinking and our approach to match our reality of a steady-state or declining base budget from state funds. New programs and initiatives will have to be funded from the very same sources that fund existing programs. The willingness to reallocate funds for changing priorities is now a required discipline. We need to further understand that with expenses rising every year, looking to increases in tuition and/or state support each year is no longer realistic for completely closing the gap. Reallocation and increasing revenue by all means available will be the new mechanism by which changing priorities and new initiatives will be funded.

Student tuition increased significantly in response to state budget cuts to UC and reflecting the changing paradigm of higher education. Student tuition now exceeds state support in our base budget, and it is a major fraction of the overall operating budget. This new paradigm means finding funding from sources other than the state, and it presents new opportunities for creative collaborations. Budgetary stability will come from successfully pursuing revenue streams we can influence, such as non-resident enrollments, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST), and private fundraising. This paradigm shift is an opportunity to both maintain the best of our unique features as a public research university and create the basis for future success.

Some of the budget cuts have appeared quite suddenly in the past few years, which didn't allow time for full strategic planning in making the past cuts. It will be helpful to look at where we are now, and evaluate if the sum of the years of cuts has brought us to an appropriate strategic position. Going forward, we must proactively undertake multi-year academic and operational planning to help counter the reactive cuts of the past.

Conceptual Framework for Teaching, Research and Service at UC Santa Cruz

When considering the budget challenges facing the campus, it is useful to have an organizing framework for mapping academic and research units to our key activities of research, teaching, and public service. From an external viewpoint (prospective students, other institutions, the community, etc.), we have academic programs, research centers, and academic departments. Academic programs are our undergraduate majors and minors and our graduate degree programs, designated emphases, and certificate programs. These programs can cross departmental and divisional boundaries. As they are programs, rather than budget units, they have the ability to evolve more quickly than department structures. Research centers and institutes collect affiliated faculty around a particular research topic, which is often cross-disciplinary. Center staff and non-ladder faculty may be supported by external funds. These centers may provide critical facilities and instrumentation for campus researchers. Academic departments are both budgetary and Bylaw 55 voting units, providing curricular and personnel stability and accountability.

The research shape of the institution is defined by the composition of the ladder-rank faculty, complemented by externally supported researchers. The choices made about faculty hiring and disciplinary emphasis define our research profile and graduate programs, and are the basis for reputational excellence.

The budget situation requires deliberate thought in the deployment of instructional resources. Ladder rank faculty form the core of the undergraduate and graduate curricular capacity of the institution. They are complemented by lecturers with security of employment (LSOE), who are also members of the Academic Senate with permanent faculty positions backed by budgeted FTE. These positions meet ongoing instructional needs and leadership in areas like writing and languages and in particular areas like accounting. Non-senate faculty are lecturers who may hold continuing appointments based upon ongoing need for particular courses or may hold temporary appointments to provide needed flexibility for meeting urgent curricular demand. Graduate student instructors are an instructional option that could help with the goal of graduate growth.

Guiding Principles

The whole budget is always under consideration. The previous year's budget is a starting point, but the only guarantee is that we will continue to fund the filled senate faculty FTE. Everything else is subject to re-allocation.

1. We are not looking to 'restore' cuts; we are continually shaping the institution for the present and future. All cuts should be made with the intention of being permanent. If new revenues later become available, investments will be made for the future of the institution. (We recognize that this perspective has not always been taken, and there may be a select few past cuts that need to be addressed as part of our investment for the future.)
2. The structures supporting the institution must evolve constantly, including efforts that require multi-year transitions. Both academic support and institutional support units should think longer-term about how best to support the core academic mission in the most efficient manner possible.

Stakeholders (especially faculty) by clearly understanding incentives and benefits will need to understand that changes in levels of service will occur.

3. The foundation of excellence is effectiveness on basic functions. We can ensure sufficient support for the core work required and prioritize excellence by performing basic functions at an effective level, rather than an ideal level.
4. Transparency is needed in the budgeting process. The campus community must have the context to be able to understand why budget decisions are made, but we don't want to spend too much time over-analyzing every detail of every budget.

Moving forward, the key is aligning process to principles

Two key questions that need to be addressed are:

1. What would we do with new resources?
2. If further reductions are required, how are they to be made?

Some additional questions that can help provide context for these decisions are: Where are we excellent already? Where else can we achieve excellence? What are we required to do?

Importance of a clear budget decision process

When setting priorities, is it important to have full stakeholder participation in informing the perspective of decision makers. The process needs to provide a place for informed participation. A clear engagement process allows stakeholders to understand the context of the budgetary environment so as to provide useful input for informed decisions. To create buy-in amongst stakeholders, they must have an understanding of both the rationale for decisions and how they are vetted. Such a process is intended to ensure that decision makers are informed by broad stakeholder input, and that the stakeholders are sufficiently informed to be able to understand justifications for choices and trade-offs.

In framing the budget context, it is important to understand both what is being cut and what is being kept; the whole budget should be shown, not just the marginal changes. Understanding the context of the whole budget and understanding what the priorities are provides crucial information for interpreting the cuts that are made. A functional analysis is critical in this process, so that the context is clear in terms of the consequences of implementation, rather than just how the money flows. Ideally priorities can be aligned and leveraged among units and with institutional priorities so that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

One example of where we currently have a misalignment between our budgeting process and an institutional priority is program support. Our current budget process provides resources to academic divisions and from there to departments. But program resource needs do not always fully align with department priorities. An inter-departmental program by definition does not align with any individual departments. It could be helpful to envision a funding structure that better supports program needs.

We look forward to the upcoming strategic planning process, which should ultimately lead to a renewed set of priorities and accompanying budgeting structures. As we conduct that process, we encourage participants to keep the above principles in mind.

Curriculum and Research Subgroup Report

The Academic Structures/Strategic Planning Task Force was created in response to a campus-wide conversation initiated in spring 2012 (Senate Forum on the Future of the Curriculum) about the challenges of cross-divisional and interdisciplinary teaching and research. There was consensus at the forum about the impediments in our policies (workload and resource allocation) and the need for more strategic and comprehensive cross-campus planning of interdisciplinary programs, research initiatives, and courses within and across departments and divisions. At the same time the system-wide rebenching reform provided additional resources for graduate education at UCSC, specifically targeted at growth in numbers of doctoral students.

This history of the Joint Task Force set in motion our subgroup on Curriculum & Research, which has worked to enhance the strategic planning process by focusing on four specific topics: TA and workload allocation; integration of budgetary and academic planning in curricular development; integration of Summer Session in annual curricular and leave plans; coordination of academic planning within and across divisions. These topics emerged in our discussions as the best routes, grounded in campus practices, to address larger policy issues. We gathered information on campus planning practices and policies in the divisions and in Senate/Administrative committees to get a comparative sense of how departments and divisions differently organize their annual planning, to identify areas of common ground and, most important of all, to determine best local practices that may be useful to the campus as a whole. We also considered how many interdisciplinary programs we have on campus (both graduate and undergraduate), what their governance structures are, and how to duplicate or adapt their successes. Finally, we looked comparatively across the UC campuses at how the planning process is structured elsewhere, where some campuses have incorporated campus-wide academic planning committees into the annual process. While we do not yet have a complete inventory of best practices, we are ready to offer EVC Galloway four recommendations.

Our discussions and specific suggestions were shaped in the context of aspirational graduate growth, an idea that was a touchstone for our four themes and that might be stymied by the types of procedural issues we raise. These four clusters of recommendations should be kept firmly in mind as the campus enters into the forthcoming year-long strategic planning process.

Four preliminary recommendations

1. Teaching assistants and workload allocation

How should the different nature and function of courses, including the anticipated growth in online courses, count in allocating teaching assistantships? The campus has developed different ratios for allocation of TAs by division, college, and course-subject codes in response to overall undergraduate enrollments. The ratios are based on an assessment of the likely workloads for TAs serving different types of courses in different parts of the campus. These formulae can produce tensions within divisions, where labor-intensive courses (some labs in Engineering, PBSci and Social Sciences) require faculty-student ratios that may be lower than the divisional norm.

Given that the division-specific student/TA ratios were changed in 2008 and have not been reviewed since then, this is an opportune moment to examine them to ensure that they remain up to date. How should TA allocations be made in proportion to different types of demands from undergraduate enrollment, and how can they be used most strategically for graduate support? Given the current push for graduate growth, the campus is now at a point where more outcome-based TA allocations could better reflect the contributions of programs and divisions to campus

priorities. We recommend using alternative measures of programmatic value and service to the campus, including increased numbers of majors and degrees granted along with improving major quality and time to degree. In addition, as undergraduate enrollments increased, the campus increased the total number of TAs allocated, but some divisions returned a portion of these allocations to meet budget cuts. Annual accountability for the actual campus TA allocation and numbers of TAs hired by departments and divisions will be important in determining graduate support levels in relation to needs. Our recommendations are thus deliberately responsive to the state of both undergraduate and graduate education.

All divisions provide curricula that serve students across the campus (GEs, prerequisites and other major requirements), fulfilling campus-wide functions that shouldn't depend on the divisional location for funding ratios. To insure the academic quality of our programs, the campus needs to reflect on the appropriate range of teaching support both at the campus level and internally for each division. Making sure that stakeholders understand how resources flow, both TA allocations and centrally allocated instructional support funds, is especially critical for the success of cross-divisional graduate programs.

Finally, in order to streamline the assignment of TAs across departments and divisions, we recommend strengthening the TA-assignment clearinghouse in the Graduate Division (perhaps drawing on the model developed for the Schools at UC Irvine). Such a robust and flexible clearinghouse would allow departments to match course needs with qualified graduate students, whatever their departmental or divisional affiliation.

2. Integrated institutional academic-budgetary planning

Curricular development and directives initiated by the Senate and/or by the Administration must be accompanied by financial analysis. To achieve a reliable line-up of resources with aspirations, it is essential to forge a closer formal link among the Senate and Administrative decision-makers, most critically, CEP, Graduate Council, CPB, and Planning and Budget. The aim is ensure that cost considerations are incorporated in the structure of academic planning and routinely taken into account in the planning process. We have a partially successful model of such integrated institutional planning in the new GE requirement in writing, Disciplinary Communication (DC), which was developed with a quantitative analysis of the resource needs but lacked administrative follow-through to allocate those resources. How can we incorporate accountability for initiatives that require several years to produce an outcome when academic administrators and Senate committee members turn over relatively quickly? Alignment of aspirations with resources and accountability is especially critical for inter-departmental and inter-divisional programs.

3. Summer session: integration with regular curricular planning

To better incorporate summer session into 4-quarter curricular planning, our sub-group recommends discussing how most effectively to shift from the current voluntaristic approach to more systematic thinking about what kinds of courses might be offered – and needs met – through summer session. Some departments structure preparatory or prerequisite courses into summer session, for example, as a routine means of building capacity for the curricular minimum to be offered for graduation. Some departments routinely use summer-session courses in this way. Funding from summer session could be used creatively – to support online course development, as an incentive to improve retention and otherwise meet our obligations to serve students. Finally, to implement the above, the campus needs a more contemporary, comprehensive budget model for summer session, including recalibrating ladder rank summer course salaries and increasing

financial incentives for departments. Simultaneous planning of curriculum for the summer and the academic year would be more productive than the two separate calls that currently occur.

4. Coordination of academic planning at the divisional level and beyond: degrees of centralization?

The working group was impressed by the range of divisional curriculum-and-leave coordination practices currently in place on campus. Some divisional strategies include both faculty committees to focus on substantive coordination and staff groups to avoid scheduling conflicts and to make the most effective use of courses offered. Our working group encourages the strategic planning group to identify best practices in this area and, with an eye to the broader question of interdivisional planning, to consider strategies for more effective coordination.

A larger question has to do with what kind of body might work effectively across divisions. How do we encourage experimentation within and across divisions? How might we revise workload formulas, for example, to follow split faculty time across divisions? Joint appointments are still frustratingly rare at Santa Cruz despite being formalized in the academic personnel process. Does the lack of such appointments reflect or lead to lost opportunities for intra- and inter-divisional collaboration and innovation?

In addition, our interdepartmental programs, both undergraduate and graduate, are largely *ad hoc*, organized by individual MOUs. In contrast to the numerous academic departments that participate in interdisciplinary instruction and research, interdepartmental degree programs have special needs because they are outside the department governance and funding process. These programs were renamed interdepartmental in the campus review procedures to help identify all degree programs supported by charter and faculty bylaws because they are governed outside an academic department. How might these be scaled up to provide the best method of coordination within and across departments and divisions for an explicit policy of intercampus cooperation? The proposal from the Task Force sub-group on graduate growth provides a clear example of why more systematic and flexible ways of starting and maintaining interdisciplinary/interdivisional arrangements may be crucial, both in terms of the funding model and how to structure cross-departmental and/or inter-divisional programs.

Preliminary conclusions

Our recommendations focus on implementation of changes in curricular planning but point to larger policy issues for strategic planning. We address four overlapping critical needs that reflect both the current moment and the future, including the question of TA numbers within the context of support for graduate growth and the issue of how streamlining/strengthening the undergraduate curriculum as well as graduate growth reflect pedagogical activities across divisions. To envision what a 21st century UCSC will look like, we suggest that the campus needs to create a venue for Administrative-Senate cooperation that goes beyond the formal committee structure. There should be a greater role for the Graduate Division to provide leadership. Finally, we believe that the kinds of recommendations we make here instantiate a revised and renewed approach to policy-making that is neither top-down nor bottom-up, but rather produces change by working simultaneously at multiple levels within our current academic and budgetary structures.

Graduate Growth Subgroup Report

Introduction

Despite its history of receiving one of the lowest shares of per-student funding of any of the University's ten campuses, UCSC has evolved into a dynamic and respected institution that serves the region, state, and nation well. The recent initiative to increase per-student funding relative to our sister campuses ('rebenching') places this campus in a strengthened position to further its stature in the area of research and research-driven education. However, with this increase in resources comes a mandate that we significantly increase our graduate student, and more specifically, Ph.D. enrollments. Those campuses that have been awarded additional resources under the rebenching initiative have received them with the expectation that they will strive to achieve Ph.D. enrollments of at least 12% of their total undergraduate enrollments, commensurate with UC system norms. Currently at approximately 7%, this would imply an increase in UCSC's Ph.D. enrollments by 800 students.

This goal represents a daunting challenge, and one that, if achieved, would significantly change the nature and aspect of our campus. But, as much as a challenge, the focus on increasing graduate enrollments on our campus presents an unprecedented opportunity to work towards a long-stated common goal of both the faculty and administration.

In what follows, we discuss a number of considerations relevant to the graduate growth initiative, putting forth ideas for further discussion that, while somewhat changing the way "business is done" on our campus, may be necessary to contemplate should the campus community unify around the notion of graduate, and particularly academic doctoral, enrollment growth.

There are a number of ways to grow the graduate enterprise on our campus, ranging from an approach that seeks approximate divisional balance in graduate growth to the concentration of a large fraction of the rebenching resources in a small set of transformative initiatives. Growth could be managed with an eye towards our campus' eventual elevation to AAU status, noting that increasing Ph.D. enrollments is a central component of developing a campus profile similar to that of other AAU institutions. The campus could choose to emphasize professional training rather than academic study in its development of new graduate programs, arguing, in full view of the mandate from the Office of the President to increase Ph.D. enrollments, that such a path best serves the interests of the State. While this would come at the risk of foregoing a degree of state support, forceful arguments that such a use of rebenching resources best serves State need might compel our campus to move in such a direction. Regardless, achieving an increase in our graduate enrollments commensurate with the rebenching challenge will almost certainly entail a significant change to the nature and culture of the campus and its effort to provide a world-class education for its students.

Given the magnitude and nature of the challenge and opportunity offered by rebenching, the Task Force emphasizes that participation of the Senate throughout the process, including its earliest stages, is essential. While many of the decisions made and actions taken will be administrative in nature, the impact on the curriculum and faculty will be substantial, and the campus will likely find it difficult to proceed in an effective manner without the cooperation of the Senate. In addition, as discussed below, it is likely that a number of steps and cultural adjustments needed to aspire to significant graduate growth will lie within the purview of the Senate. Thus, the Senate must both engage and be engaged as a full partner in the graduate growth initiative. In this measure, a joint Senate/Administrative task force may prove pivotal in developing and vetting challenging ideas and pathways, and in having the appropriate moral force in championing them with both faculty and administrative constituencies.

Academic Planning

In the view of the Task Force, academic planning lies at the core of efforts to increase graduate enrollments in a cogent and beneficial manner. The strategic planning initiative getting underway is an ideal forum in which to simultaneously and synergistically engage both the faculty and administration in a dialog about the future trajectory of the campus' academic mission. Given this, it would seem essential that the notion of graduate growth and the deployment of rebenching resources be put forth clearly and explicitly as a primary component of the charge to the planning effort. Additionally, the planning process should not array itself independently of the standard modes of deliberation on our campus, but should leverage the existing advisory and consultative processes. The Task Force also recommends that those involved in the planning process be unflinching in their efforts to evaluate and publicize the fiscal aspects of graduate growth. An informed discussion can only take place if concrete assessments of the resource requirements associated with graduate enrollment growth are available, and equally concrete assessments of potential revenue sources are at hand.

On our campus, the planning process seems to be driven in large part by the academic divisions, which assess needs and opportunities in their areas of familiarity and advocate for resources to fulfill their corresponding goals and aspirations. While cooperation between divisions has led to the launching of a number of interdivisional programs, the planning process itself is largely a siloed, divisionally-driven undertaking.

The Task Force believes that the current call for academic planning requires that the planning be centrally organized and campus-driven from its outset. The planning process should knit together divisional thrusts and aspirations into a unified, collaborative vision for graduate enrollment growth, exploiting interdisciplinary opportunities as they present themselves, and developing a coherent, achievable path towards expanded graduate programming that lives up to the magnitude of the rebenching opportunity. Divisional initiatives need to be identified and undertaken in full view of the challenging aspirational goals that confront the campus as a whole, and need to shape themselves accordingly. Dialogs between the divisions, mediated and guided by the central administration, must play a central role in the planning process.

An input that, to the Task Force, underscores the need for a centrally-coordinated planning process, comes from the 2013-2014 FTE request from the Dean of Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci). In this document, Dean Koch steps forward and, given the initiatives that he sees as possible within the Division, projects the amount of rebenching-catalyzed graduate growth the Division might achieve were it to garner 40% of the rebenching FTE. On this basis, Dean Koch projects that at the end of the rebenching period, approximately 100 additional Divisional Ph.D. enrollments would accrue specifically to the additional faculty funded by these rebenching resources. The addition of new, research-oriented faculty might be expected to stimulate Ph.D. enrollments among current faculty through greater competitiveness for large extramural awards and training grants or through improvements in program stature, but it is difficult to quantify that potential impact. Dean Koch feels that number of new Ph.D. enrollments associated with increased support generated by the existing faculty is likely to be no more than 100. Naively scaling these two sources of new PBSci's Ph.D. enrollment to that of the entire campus, one might project fewer than 500 additional Ph.D. enrollments would accrue to the campus by the end of the rebenching period – well short of the 800 needed to reach the 12% aspirational goal given current undergraduate enrollments. To the Task Force, this suggests that without a centrally-organized, goal-oriented planning process, our campus is unlikely to approach the aspirational goal.

The Task Force recommends that an academic planning process, focused on graduate growth with a weight commensurate with that of the rebenching challenge, be undertaken immediately. It

is likely to the advantage of both processes that this effort be enmeshed with the strategic planning effort that is currently getting underway.

In addition, the nature of the aspirational goals themselves needs to come under examination. The Division of Graduate Studies (DGS) has explored a model of expanded graduate programming on our campus that permits an initial assessment of what will be required of the campus in order to achieve the 12% Ph.D. enrollment goal. While not intended as a plan for graduate growth, this study provides a good jumping-off point from which to begin to grasp the trade-offs and sacrifices that would likely need to be made to achieve the goal. Such an exploration can form the basis of a campus-wide discussion of the wisdom and appropriateness of striving to meet this goal, and either develop the support required to make and follow through on difficult choices or help identify a more appropriate and tractable objective for the campus. As a result of this deliberation, a set of “core principles” guiding the graduate growth process might be developed, against which specific graduate growth scenarios must be measured.

The Task Force recommends that a dialog among the various academic stakeholders (departments, administration, Senate) be initiated, with the goal of developing a set of principles that will guide the process of planning for graduate growth.

Resources for Aspirational Growth

The Task Force believes it important that the Division of Graduate Studies be supported to finalize the study by the Graduate Division mentioned above, examining and perhaps expanding its underlying assumptions, and make its findings widely available to the campus community. It is difficult to discuss the various impacts, positive and negative, of the graduate growth initiative without at least an approximate sense of the evolving fiscal landscape associated with increasing graduate enrollments. In this light, the discussion of any proposed model of graduate growth, and indeed the appropriateness of the aspirational goal itself, can only be undertaken in an informed manner if the concrete fiscal implications can be understood through the sort of study initiated by the DGS.

Well known to anyone familiar with the rebenching discussion, and underscored in concrete terms by the DGS study, is that rebenching resources alone will fall short of the additional revenue needed to achieve the 12% enrollment goal. Under clearly-stated assumptions, the DGS study projected the availability of additional resource streams that would become available, or would need to be developed, under the straw growth model explored in the study. In addition to the direct support of graduate students with rebenching funds, the study pointed to increased external support attaching to new FTE hires, resources generated by new, and perhaps professionally-oriented Masters programs, and increased philanthropy.

The overall conclusion of the DGS study was encouraging, suggesting that, under the assumptions made, significant growth in Ph.D. enrollments is feasible. However, the additional funding needed to leverage rebenching resources does not come for free, and the scenario laid out by the DGS study would entail significant engagement by the campus administration and faculty. It can be stated with certainty that, should the campus choose to strive towards the 12% goal, scarce resources will continue to be competed for by divisions. In the view of the Task Force, the rebenching challenge actually increases the campus' acute need to secure new sources of revenue – revenue that will be essential to support new graduate program initiatives. In particular, the possibility of increasing campus revenues through increased enrollments of non-resident undergraduate students is an opportunity that should be aggressively pursued, and the campus appetite for directing these resources towards the support of graduate growth should be assessed.

The Task Force notes that there are a number of fiscal aspects of growing our graduate ranks that must be borne in mind, and may increase resource requirements relative to naïve expectations. In order to continue to attract leading faculty, and the students that they will in turn attract, it is imperative that UCSC have a world-class research infrastructure, which entails fiscal commitments for both acquisition and maintenance of state-of-the-art equipment, facilities, libraries and information technology. To maintain the quality of our graduate student body, it is likely necessary to increase both the amount and duration of our offers of support – an area for which UC as a whole, and our campus in particular, is known to lag our peers. Recent increases in tuition and fees have decreased the relative attractiveness of employing graduate students relative to more advanced post-doctoral fellows, eroding the incentives for faculty to take on new research-funded Ph.D. students. The current practice for allocating TA positions is driven largely by undergraduate enrollments, which may not provide the best alignment with Ph.D. enrollment growth; consideration, for example, of the relative degree of teaching-based graduate support may need to be factored into the divisional allocations of TA resources.

The Task Force emphasizes that increasing external funding will be a critical facet of the effort to achieve graduate growth over the next few years. While grant activity in the various divisions has increased over time, the campus will have to continue to bring in significantly more external support in order to achieve appreciable growth in graduate enrollments. Additional Graduate Student Research (GSR) appointments will be needed to reduce the reliance on other, more constrained, state-funded and undergraduate enrollment-based sources of financial support (e.g. TAs), and will be required in our campus push to creating the sort of multi-year support packages that will draw the best students into our graduate programs. Furthermore, GSR positions are an essential contributor to graduate program quality, in that they provide critical research and publication opportunities for graduate students. A significant increase in GSR appointments will greatly improve graduate education on our campus, as well as the prospect for the professional placement of our degree recipients.

In addition to an increased emphasis on government- and industry-sponsored grant and contract funding, the Task Force recommends that the campus also place greater emphasis on obtaining foundation grants. There are numerous foundations – large and small – that offer substantial awards in areas that our faculty already pursue. This includes not only areas in science and engineering, but also in areas related to the Arts, Humanities, and the Social Sciences, for which opportunities may increase should the campus achieve AAU status. Such grants will contribute to the increased use of GSRs on our campus, and can significantly augment government agency support, which is under a degree of pressure as governments around the country and world are forced to examine their expenditure policies.

There are areas in which a focus on Ph.D. enrollment growth may lead to pressures that suggest choices that not all faculty and administrators see in their best interest. Although the straw scenario explored by DGS modeled relatively even growth among the divisions, actual growth scenarios may favor one disciplinary area over others. If this is the case, it would be important to understand this as early in the planning process as possible, so that such a reshaping of the campus can be evaluated on its merits, in full view of the institutional costs of such an undertaking.

All in all, the Task Force sees an urgent need for the faculty and administration to engage in a discussion of the fiscal aspects of graduate, and in particular Ph.D., growth leveraged by the augmentation of campus budgets by the rebenching resources. Some of the assumptions that underlie the Division of Graduate Studies' graduate growth scenario may not play out as projected (for instance, the following discussion of the role of Masters programs), and reliance on conclusions drawn from the study may thus lead to a plan for graduate growth that struggles to achieve its goals. An informed and candid discussion of the DGS study, and in particular an evaluation of its underlying assumptions, will be necessary to allow us to move forward with the development of a graduate growth strategy best suited for the campus.

The Task Force recommends that the fiscal aspects of graduate, and in particular Ph.D., growth be evaluated in an honest and forthright study that does not shy away from highlighting the fiscal challenges that may confront us as we aspire to the rebenching mandate. This study should begin with a re-examination of the DGS study, and be informed by its findings.

Role of Masters Programs

Even if focused on Ph.D.-level programming, graduate enrollment growth is likely to include increased Masters enrollments as well as new Masters programs. Arguably, Masters programs in established disciplinary areas may leverage existing faculty resources in a way that can bring revenue onto campus through their additional enrollments. These revenues arise from the additional general funds from direct state support for the additional enrollments, from return-to-aid on tuition, and, for professional programs, Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. In addition, these new Masters programs can be closely enough aligned with the campus' research and creative directions that they directly enhance the campus' prospects for Ph.D.-level instruction. Indeed, the scenario explored by the Division of Graduate Studies included significant new revenue from Masters programs. Incidentally, it may be noted that the total (Masters plus doctoral) graduate enrollment at the end of the rebenching period, under the scenario explored by the DGS, would be consistent with our campus' long-stated goal of having graduate students account for 15% of all campus enrollments.

In any regard, identifying promising avenues for, and then initiating, growth of Masters programming is a different matter than merely exploring the implications of expanded Masters offerings. To actually effect such a growth in Masters programs would imply a significant push on the part of the campus, and this may call into question the appropriateness of assuming significant support for increased Ph.D. enrollments will arise from increased Masters enrollments.

Recognizing this, the Division of Graduate Studies has spearheaded an initiative that provides an incentive for the development and expansion of Masters programs by awarding some of the generated revenue directly back to the department or program responsible for its generation. This "returned" revenue comes back to the program with no specific mandate for its use, though it would be an ideal source of revenue to support and strengthen Ph.D. programs in a related area.

In addition to this, though, the Task Force notes that significant growth in Masters enrollments is only likely to be possible through the creation of new Masters degree programs. These programs will only be approved, and prosper, if they stand on their own merits in terms of need, demand, and their alignment with campus interests and expertise. Masters program proposals should be predicated on the service they would provide to the State and its professional and academic communities, and with their propensity to advance institutional goals and the standing and reputation of the campus. The Task Force feels that the notion of returning additional undesignated funds to the department should play a secondary role in the conception and promotion of new Masters programs, and while coordinated Masters and doctoral growth is an important imperative of the graduate growth planning process, Masters program development should be justified by considerations independent of the need to promote Ph.D. enrollments.

The Task Force also notes that there are costs associated with increased Masters enrollments that need to be incorporated into the academic planning process. Departments may expect, and make a compelling case for, new faculty FTE to support increased Masters enrollments. Also, it can be the case that departments have finite capacity for the near-term development of new graduate programming, and a failure to align new Masters initiatives with existing or proposed Ph.D. programs may inhibit the faculty's capacity for increasing graduate program enrollment and quality in the most efficient manner.

The Task Force is optimistic that strategically increasing Masters enrollments may bring both curricular and financial benefits to the campus. It recommends caution in making the acquisition of such revenue sources a central component of graduate growth planning.

Cultural/Incentive Considerations

While planning and discussion are essential to creating an appropriate framework for graduate growth, the on-the-ground inspiration for developing new graduate programs and enrolling more graduate students will need to come from the faculty that design and offer graduate programs and the students that the programs attract. It is the position of the Task Force that, as we engage the process of increasing our graduate enrollments, particularly for Ph.D. students, the campus should take a careful look the manner in which campus and Senate policy and culture promote graduate instruction and support.

Changes to policy, practice, and culture never come easily to large institutions, particularly institutions as pluralistic as UC, and proposals to do so nearly always encounter spirited debate and, at times, controversy. The rebenching challenge merits a broad discussion and examination of practices and culture on the part of both the administration and Senate, and acknowledges that some possible proposals to change practice in a way that will provide tangible incentives for graduate growth may be vigorously questioned by the campus' stakeholders. However, it is just this process of examination that the Task Force wishes to promote. Thus, without either endorsing or recommending against them, and with the purpose of provoking discussion, the Task Force puts forward the following set of possible changes to campus practice geared towards providing greater incentive to increase graduate programming and enrollments on campus. This list is not intended to be comprehensive, and, along with the discussion of these possibilities, suggestions for further proposals are encouraged.

In the Task Force's experience, individual faculty members are very sensitive to how they are viewed by their colleagues, a principle that lies at the center of the performance review process conducted by the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). CAP develops and promotes principles for faculty file review that are geared towards the promotion of institutional values, and is able to evolve those principles effectively and nimbly as underlying institutional values evolve. If, after discussion by the various academic stakeholders (particularly the Senate), rebenching-seeded graduate growth is confirmed as a primary institutional priority, CAP review policy could be tailored to promote graduate growth by giving a relatively greater emphasis to performance factors related to the promotion of graduate study, such as number of Ph.D. advisees, Ph.D.s completed, and magnitude of external support relative to field norms. While all of these factors are currently given weight during the review of faculty files during the promotion and hiring process, the relative emphasis such factors are afforded could be managed in order to promote broadly accepted institutional goals, in this case whatever generally-accepted mode of graduate growth arises from the campus' discussion of the rebenching opportunity. The Academic Deans, VPAA, and EVC, who have administrative authority and roles in personnel actions, should be engaged in the discussion.

The Task Force recommends that the Senate and administration collaborate in the development of criteria for the review of faculty performance that appropriately promote and provide incentives for graduate growth, in alignment with the devised principles for graduate growth. In addition, taking a cue from last year's Graduate Council study on interdisciplinary graduate study, these criteria should explicitly address the question of rewarding faculty contributions to interdisciplinary graduate programs.

Systemwide instructional workload policy calls for all ladder faculty to have five course equivalencies. On our campus, each department defines its own policy for the balance of formal classroom instruction, graduate and undergraduate student mentoring, and other instructional activities.

The Task Force recommends that departments explicitly include graduate mentoring in their instructional workload policies.

This would allow those with greater mentoring loads to teach fewer didactic classes than their colleagues with lesser mentoring loads, providing a further incentive to engage and support graduate students.

Graduate student support lies at the heart of increasing graduate, and particularly Ph.D., enrollments while maintaining or improving the caliber of the students that accept our offers of admission. Support comes from many sources, including Teaching Assistantships, Research Assistantships funded by external grants and contracts, and Fellowships deriving from campus funds.

To promote growth in graduate enrollments, it may pay to revisit the way that TA positions are allocated, exploring the possibility of tying support for TA positions more towards graduate programmatic needs.

The implications of doing so would need to be explored carefully, and the impact on the undergraduate program understood, so that tradeoffs could be evaluated and mitigations, such as restricting enrollments in impacted majors or limiting overall undergraduate enrollments, could be carefully considered.

To attract a significant number of new, highly-qualified graduate students, and maintain the quality of the current student body, it will be important to offer support packages that are competitive with our peers in both quantity and duration. The Task Force recognizes the importance of continually assessing the quality of our support offers and strategies, and of identifying resources within the institution to bolster offers and compete for the best students.

Graduate student support practices must be structured in a way that provides an incentive for faculty, and the institution as a whole, to direct resources towards supporting students. Current tuition and fee levels are high, and for specific projects many faculty may find the relative return per grant dollar higher for post-doctoral scholars than graduate students, providing a disincentive to support graduate students in externally supported research projects.

The Task Force recommends that the possibility of some degree of return-to-source of tuition and fee payments on behalf of students, particularly those without California resident status, be explored.

Program review is an important method for promoting institutional priorities.

The Task Force stresses the importance of taking advantage of the external review process to evaluate graduate, and particularly Ph.D., enrollment capacity.

The Academic Senate has direct control over the allocation of certain funds, such as money distributed by the Committee on Research to support and promote research on the campus.

The Task Force recommends that COR's practices for the allocation of these funds be revisited, and that the Senate consider instituting principles promoting graduate student support.

Finally, in many institutions, philanthropic support and endowments provide an important source for the promotion of graduate study, and would be a critical resource for our own graduate growth.

Once the principles of graduate growth have been established, the Task Force recommends that the activities of University Relations be quickly aligned to reflect those priorities.

For example, the possibility of enhancing quality of graduate support offers, long felt to be an impediment to attracting the best students to our campus, through aggressive development efforts should be explored.

Senate Role

Throughout the planning and execution phase, the Senate, as a formal body that develops and organizes the faculty's positions and executes its plenary role with respect to academics, has an essential role to play.

To begin with, the Task Force recommends that the structuring of the Senate's participation in the planning process, including the evaluation of the opportunities offered by rebenching and the establishment of graduate growth goals, be an issue of ongoing and focused attention.

While the joint Senate and Administrative Task Force itself represents an important component of the Senate's participation, it does not stand as a substitute for an informed and substantive deliberation among the committees and departments of the Senate, as well as on the floor of Senate meetings. While the size of the deliberative body – the hundreds of Academic Senate faculty – imposes certain constraints on the deliberative process, the Task Force feels that a well-managed deliberative process will be an essential piece of the development of a campus consensus about graduate growth, and the attainment of the degree of faculty buy-in necessary to achieve the campus' aspirational goals.

The Senate, via a consensus developed during the deliberative process, can provide feedback to the administration that will allow it to act with efficacy and economy. A renewed faculty consensus with respect to graduate growth, informed by a concrete understanding of the likely tradeoffs that will be entailed by an aggressive push towards aspirational goals, will empower the administration to move forward with an appropriately bold vision. The concerns that arise during that debate, if appropriately conveyed, will also allow the administration to tailor its growth strategy in a fashion that will maximize faculty engagement and cooperation. The Task Force points out that, as the plans move from the development into the execution phase, it will be the faculty that will provide the impetus, energy, and perspicacity to execute the plans, and the process will be neither insulated from nor immune to the opinions and actions of the Senate. Thus, in the view of the Task Force, the earlier an informed "sense of the Senate" can be formed, the greater our likelihood of successful graduate growth will be.

A number of possible avenues to increasing incentives to graduate enrollment growth lie within the purview of the Senate, or within Senate committees whose advisory activities carry great weight. As the campus's aspirational goals develop, the Senate, in consultation with the administration and staff, should revisit its practices in view of these goals.

In summary, the role of the Senate, as the formal governmental body of the campus' faculty, is primary in the development and execution of the campus's plans for graduate growth. If managed well, rather than being an impediment to the execution of administrative scenarios and initiatives, the participation of the Senate will enhance the prospects for a successful outcome for the rebenching process.

Summary

With the onset of the rebenching initiative, the campus finds itself in a fortunate and unique position to advance its enterprise of graduate education – a long-stated goal of both the faculty and administration. Such an opportunity is unlikely to arise again in the foreseeable future. However, the process of striving towards this goal is a formidable one, requiring a significant effort on behalf of all the campus's academic stakeholders, as well as a likely need to consider tradeoffs that will emphasize the growth of graduate enrollments over other laudable institutional goals.

In the view of the Task Force, both the magnitude and complexity of the rebenching challenge demand that we immediately embark upon a well-structured academic planning process that begins with a development of principles that will guide the growth of graduate programs and the bolstering of their enrollments. Both the administration and Senate have rolls to play in this planning process, and the process of forming and then acting upon institutional consensus will require a thoughtful and flexible re-evaluation of campus practices and the resulting structure for providing incentives for the promotion of the growth of graduate study. This process promises a spirited debate that will likely entail an examination of some of the most fundamental aspects of the way the campus approaches its institutional mission, and as such will require a deep and well-structured consultation and deliberation process within the Academic Senate. The Task Force has put forward a number of recommended points of consideration – some of them quite specific – to catalyze this discussion. The Task Force emphasizes that, in order that this process be as productive as possible, this deliberation and planning process be begun without further delay, and be conducted with a magnitude and force commensurate with that of the rebenching challenge itself.