

August 6, 2007

VPAA Alison Galloway
Chancellor's Office

Re: CPB Response to the Draft Strategic Academic Plan, March 2007

Dear Alison,

The Committee on Planning and Budget reviewed the latest version of the Strategic Academic Plan dated March 8, 2007, and has the following comments and questions.

This document is more clearly intended for an external audience than the earlier draft (see attached CPB comments dated December 11, 2006). Nevertheless it raises important, internal questions about how the guiding principles (p. 7) work in the context of the planning process as a whole.

1. UCSC as a single unit:

The overall campus perspective is limited largely to the articulation of the six themes and thus has the disadvantages of broad generalities. (FTE details in earlier versions of the strategic plan have been largely removed. See below, #3 on FTE allocation.) This may be attributable to the current uneven state of the divisional plans, which range from the highly specific and fairly detailed (Arts, Physical and Biological Sciences (PBSci)) to the more general, broad-brush approach of Humanities and Social Sciences. The latter two plans have been, to a greater or lesser extent, revised by the new divisional deans, and thus also reflect a more recent stage in overall planning than do Arts and PBSci. Finally, and most glaring, is the absence of a completed plan from Engineering. What all of this adds up to is a striking unevenness in the component pieces of the plan that make their incorporation into a coherent whole difficult to achieve. We are preserving the divisional structure but simultaneously aiming to be strategic for the campus overall. Thus far, these two approaches do not seem to have been brought into conjunction.

2. UCSC must invest differentially:

Where and how has differential investment been codified? How does this principle fit with the overall FTE allocations to the divisions, which have already been decided and which are currently in the process of being implemented? (See #3 below.) On the one hand, the principle of differential investment appears simply to expand the divisional sizes within their predetermined parameters; on the other hand, the plan includes some new, differential kinds of requests but neglects others. Among the potential ways that resources may still need to be allocated differentially, which have yet to be addressed, the following stand out: TA, TAS and open FTE. All of these different kinds of resources must be addressed as part of a systematic differential investment. Equally important, there must be parallel planning for workload targeted differentially by program and department. Resources and needs must be explicitly aligned. Most important is the terms of accountability that are formulated: concrete benchmarks must be established so that FTE follow workload as well as research measures; "workload" is to be defined not simply by measuring enrollments per se but by meeting specific faculty-student ratios, measured differentially by program, major, and department.

3. Current FTE allocation:

Does the plan have any impact on FTE allocation to date? How does the principle of differential investment align with the current FTE requests for 2007-08?

4. Graduate growth and professional schools

The plan is too narrowly focused on meeting the campus goal of 15 percent graduate students through professional schools. The net effect, perhaps unintentional, is to make the 15 percent a problematic measure because it pushes professional schools as a goal in itself rather than one means to the larger end of graduate growth. Instead, the advantages of graduate growth might be articulated more broadly in terms of 1) state need for specific professional degrees; 2) closer alignment of research with undergraduate instruction; 3) more faculty involvement with graduate education. The decision process for professional schools should address whether and how pre-proposals advance principle #1, the mission of UCSC as a single unit, and which ones do so with the greatest chance of success.

The discussion of professional schools is fragmented and scattered in the plan, and it doesn't include the two best developed ideas, those with greatest faculty and divisional support, that have emerged since the winter 2007 Senate meeting (surely, if only partly, in response to our public discussion at that meeting of professional schools, Silicon Valley funds, etc.): 1. Environmental Science and Policy and 2. Public Health.

We need a specific plan for meeting the 15 percent graduate goal, in terms of deciding which programs are to be targeted for development. In terms of overall strategy, UCSC could well decide to make itself *the* UC campus that targets growth at a slow pace via academic graduate programs (the highly selective, elite programs in Humanities and Sciences, plus a few of the pillar programs with potential for success (Anthropology, Psychology, Literature, History are singled out in the divisional plans). Specific program planning would have to be done collaboratively, so that we create clusters of interdisciplinary excellence (for example, UCSC as a center for language study, bringing together a vibrant all-campus program in language teaching with graduate work and faculty research in Linguistics, Literature, and Psychology). This in turn would entail greater coordination between the different sections of the plan, bringing together more strategically divisional and "campus" perspectives.

Incentives for graduate growth:

One single approach to addressing virtually all of the above concerns would be to create a highly targeted incentives program that would encourage the specific kind of interdisciplinary programs the campus has decided to forward. Rather than simply retaining a number of FTE at the center, as the administration now does, some small number, 6-8, for example, would be earmarked, in an ongoing pool, for specific programmatic purposes. Faculty groups on campus could, in collaboration with a dean or deans, apply for these FTE, perhaps as part of the later stages of a pre-proposal process. (See UC Davis for a successful model using a small number of FTE in this way.)

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

Enclosure

Dear Faye,

Graduate Council briefly discussed the March 8 version of the Strategic Academic Plan at our last meeting. We wanted to note several concerns. First, the SAP doesn't really speak in any serious way to questions of balance of undergraduate and graduate student bodies, nor of strategies and principles for achieving some ongoing balance across academic divisions.

We also had a much more specific concern regarding the discussion of "Transnationalism and globalization" (pp. 26-27). The top of p. 27 addresses the purpose of coordinating individuals and programs on campus concerned with these two closely related topics. We applaud this idea and note how it moves UCSC toward a concrete solution of some of the issues, e.g., international exchanges and recruitment, that we have mentioned, above. However, the recommendations to house such a coordinating center in the proposed School of Management appears to be well off base. Not only does this School not exist at present, but were it to be added to UCSC, it would be in a "line" agency unsuited to exercising the "staff" function in question. Moreover, we cannot see the substantive rationale for placing this coordinating function for the entire campus in a unit whose culture, oriented toward business and, perhaps, government, is unlikely to address the many complexities of globalization/transnationalism in an adequate way. For both of these reasons, the Graduate School appears to provide the proper housing for the coordinating unit, possibly placed under a New Associate Dean of the Graduate School for Global and Transnational Affairs.

I hope these comments are helpful as you think about a broader Senate response to the revised document.

With best wishes, Don

Don Brenneis
Department of Anthropology
U.C.S.C.
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
Vox (831)459-3855
Fax (831)459-5900

July 3, 2007

Faye Crosby, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Dear Faye,

CEP has read and discussed the revised Strategic Academic Plan (dated March 12, 2007). Since the issues raised here overlap a good deal with those raised by CPB's proposed Conditions for Growth, we will refer to our response to the latter and ask that you consider both responses together. We also ask you to consider providing the VPAA and EVC with the full text of both of our responses. They have received the Conditions for Growth response directly.

We were told that we might see our primary goal as one of responding to the five principles of the Plan given on pp. 7-8. Put briefly, we see these principles as advocating an approach to planning that emphasizes and facilitates interdisciplinarity, and that, in a context of slowing growth and scarce resources, favors investment in those programs having greatest promise and strength. CEP fully supports these principles.

We suggest that the third principle be reformulated in a way that places less focus on "competition" and more on the "niches" we are in a strong position to fill, e.g.:

Third, we should target development of departments and programs to areas where we will have the greatest impact. To do this, we must be aware of the unique strengths we already possess, *the specialized fields where we are poised to make significant new contributions to the advancement of knowledge, and the particular needs of the state and its citizens that we are well positioned to fulfill.*

With regard to the interdisciplinary themes, we have a suggestion not about the proposed subject areas but about how they are approached. We believe these themes might be more engaging, and do a better job defining and responding to our notions of the campus mission, if they were recast as *goals*. For example, rather than state a theme of "Cross-Cultural Initiatives", consider a goal of *fostering cross-cultural understanding*. This emphasis on *raison d'être* brings them more into focus, and provides a better means by which we could judge how well a program or hire would contribute to the theme.

Though we support the Plan's principles, we have concerns, laid out below, about how they are or will be implemented.

Professional School

We look forward to concrete proposals for professional schools that would 1) synergize well with current campus philosophy and programs, and 2) come with sufficient dedicated funding (such as from development campaigns) to require *little or no* diversion of funds from current campus programs apart from faculty FTE already provisionally allocated. Until such a time comes, a choice to pursue no professional schools should remain clearly on the table. Indeed,

since there are other good uses the campus might envisage for FTE currently allocated for a professional school, the senate and administration should agree on a concrete time window within which professional school proposals will be entertained. There are two reasons for doing this. First, having such a deadline might spur on proposals that would otherwise be slower in coming. Second, we need to know when it is time to put aside discussion of a professional school and devote our scarce resources to programs of real promise and strength. CEP suggests that this window extend to no more than one year from now.

Bases for decisions

Though a policy of differential investment makes sense, it is most likely to succeed in the context of a very open campus discussion about the bases for our choices. Here we mention just a few questions we would like to have frank discussion about. First, do we assume differences in faculty-student or TA-student ratio by division, and if so, why? Second, is our Humanities division under-resourced in comparison to similar units at other UC campuses, as argued in detail by CBP?¹ If so, what are the arguments in favor of continuing this situation? Third, in view of its continued huge losses, should we seriously curtail or abolish UNEX?

Resources and the undergraduate mission

We are glad to see affirmations in the Plan of our commitment to excellent undergraduate education, and to see acknowledgement (in several places) that current capacity issues must be addressed at least in part by means of permanently allocated FTE. On this topic we refer the reader to our response to CPB's Conditions for Growth report. That response and this one should be taken together.

Sincerely,

Committee on Educational Policy

Heather Bullock

Russ Flegal

David Helmbold

Pamela Hunt-Carter, *ex officio*

Anatole Leikin

Loisa Nygaard

Jaye Padgett, Chair

Joel Ferguson, Provosts' Representative

Flori Lima, SUA Representative

Sarah-Hope Parmeter, NSTF Representative

George Zhang, SUA Representative

¹ Committee on Planning & Budget Addendum to Comments on the Ten-Year Academic Plans, at <http://senate.ucsc.edu/cpb/indexplan.html>.