

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
10 YEAR PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY REVIEW
PART I. GENERAL QUESTIONS AND PRINCIPLES**

A. CAPITAL PLANNING: The Deans' Summaries should explicitly relate their proposals for spending enrollment-generated operating funds to campus and divisional priorities for capital projects.

1) RESOURCE DEPENDENCY: Several Deans explicitly state that they will not be able to accommodate projected enrollment growth unless and until new space resources become available. To what degree are these warning serious? Do they imply that targeted growth in the Division should be scaled back or phased in more slowly if the space resources are not forthcoming? How should the likelihood and timing of new capital projects affect programmatic priorities on campus, and how should programmatic priorities affect the phasing of capital projects?

- a. **LAG:** Should it be a planning principle to minimize the lag between enrollments and space? This is a question that the Deans should address explicitly for the purpose of campus-wide planning. The campus needs to decide (almost immediately) whether it should prioritize programmatic development based on the order in which the necessary space will come online or whether it should, rather, reprioritize its capital requests in order to accommodate the (i) most important or (ii) most impacted programmatic needs.
- b. **SPACE PRIORITIES:** What principles should govern the campus ranking of state-funded capital projects? Should these principles reinforce or offset the bias resulting from the expected availability of non-state sources of funding.

2) TIMELINES: What will be the effect of the time taken up by the planning process itself on the feasibility of the plans developed? To what extent do these various plans assume that capital projects are underway right now? What would be the effect of assuming that they would not be proposed to OP until c. 2004-5.

B. ACADEMIC PLANNING: In their 10-year plans the Deans are being asked to build a bridge between planning based on a zero-sum competition for enrollments to planning based on optimizing the relation between programmatic size and quality. The Executive Summaries should state how this shift is to be accomplished between now and 2010, and in particular what the optimal student faculty ratio should be in programs that no will no longer be pressured to show enrollment growth as a precondition for future FTE. Based on these statements, the Deans should articulate forward-looking principles that would allow prioritization of the academic plans in their Divisions.

1) PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS: At the present stage of the process, the Deans were asked, in effect, to presuppose the absence of professional schools on their campus, and encouraged to absorb the resulting unmet student demand. The campus planning process as a whole, however, should address the desirability of professional schools in certain areas (e.g. business and/or public policy) as basis for assessing the proposals coming

from the Divisions. How do the quality of professionally-oriented programs mounted under liberal arts divisions or departments compare with the MA and BA programs offered elsewhere in the UC system and in CSU's? To what degree has UCSC's Division-based competition for resources pre-empted desirable discussions of the desirability of expanding UCSC's professional offerings beyond Engineering?

2) INTERDISCIPLINARY INITIATIVES: The Deans' Executive Summaries should explicitly relate the "interdisciplinary" initiatives proposed by Divisions than the intellectual rationales for significant developments both in and out of existing disciplines. CPB is concerned that some of the proposed interdisciplinary programs may have only a transient appeal to student constituencies, and may, rather, reflect the immediate priorities of funding sources. To support these interdisciplinary proposals, the Deans should define an "interdisciplinary program," explain the particular value attributed to the idea of interdisciplinary study and address why such proposals would bring the campus greater intellectual distinction than the development of existing strengths and potentials in the disciplines. What means have been used to encourage the development of interdisciplinary programs from the bottom up? CPB would in particular like the input of both departments and individual faculty members on their support of and commitment to the proposed programs.

3) CORE MISSION: Because of the emphasis on new programs and interdisciplinary centers, some of the academic plans provide little information about the standing and future of the core academic disciplines. The final plans should articulate the views of the faculty about the directions in which the disciplines are developing. Are the departments of sufficient size and strength to mount an excellent program of undergraduate and graduate teaching? Can the department attract and support faculty with scholarly activities of national and international distinction?

4) CONSTITUENCIES: The Deans seem to have solicited plans and proposals mainly from existing departmental units. CPB was given to understand that there were mechanisms for the input of various programs and committees of studies on campus -- yet the actual participation of such groups in this first iteration of the planning process is seldom in evidence, even in cases where Deans have made proposals that would seem to reflect the interests of existing faculty constituencies not presently organized as department. The central campus planning process should address the question of what further faculty constituencies need to be consulted before the preliminary proposals of the Deans are approved.

C. INTERIM PLANNING: The present 10-year planning process will take up nearly the first 5 years for which we are planning. In the interim, positions are being filled on the rationale of "forward funding." There is in the Deans' Executive Summaries, however, a general absence of accountability for the positions currently being filled under ongoing funding from "initiatives," pre-existing divisional plans, TOE's, and double hires. Recognizing that such an interim accounting was not requested in the current phase of the planning process, CPB has requested it from the EVC. Without this information, we cannot responsibly evaluate the plans that the Divisions have submitted.

D. EXTRAMURAL FUNDRAISING : One of the EVC's stated goals is to double the extramural funding for research as UCSC becomes decreasingly able to rely on state funds to support our core mission. In order to evaluate Divisional proposals based on this goal, CPB requires a hard analysis of the costs and benefits of investing campus resources in FTE that are likely to bring "opportunity funds" to UC. How would various scenarios for the return of these opportunity funds from UCOP to the campus affect the return that the campus would realize on startup funds? If, e.g., we invest \$1M in startup funds to hire four FTE, what level of funding from NIH, NSF, DOD, etc. would repay that \$1M to the campus in a form that could support otherwise underfunded elements of our core mission.

E. THE DISTRIBUTION OF OPPORTUNITY FUNDS: The Divisional summaries had to assume that the method of distributing opportunity funds within the UC system and on the campus is settled. The final campuswide plan for the campus needs explicit discussion of the relative claims of all campus units on resources that are raised by a campus choice to invest in a particular unit. Part of that discussion should address the effect on the intellectual mission of that unit of a redistribution elsewhere of the opportunity funds that result from its research.

F. GOALS AND STANDARDS: The Deans' Summaries should directly comment on how the campus can enhance the performance of its core mission of teaching and research as it moves out of the era of enrollment-driven planning. In addition to discussions of marketability and societal demand, the Deans' Summaries should reflect the internal development of fields of research or modes of thought. They should also reflect the possibility that oversubscribed undergraduate programs that no longer have incentives to maximize their size might, eventually, be given incentives to manage enrollments by setting more demanding requirements. CPB feels there is an implicit assumption that programmatic innovation (or novelty) are desirable in themselves, and would like to see plans that place more emphasis on genuine originality and excellence. The absence of coherent and developed intellectual rationales for many innovative proposals set forth by the Divisions makes it difficult to weight their significance, and the lack of grounding in the teaching and research interests of existing faculty members is disconcerting.

Finally, the efforts made by the Deans to fit their plans within the "campus goals" articulated in the EVC's Call should now lead to an explicit reconsideration of those goals themselves. What, for example, are the standards for AAU membership? Are these standards independently desirable for a campus like ours? Are the goals articulated in the Call compatible with each other under anticipated resource constraints? If not, how should we modify or prioritize them? Are there other goals that should be included? What academic and resource models should UCSC attempt to emulate? What academic and resource models should we explicitly reject? How, in particular, can we build into Divisional plans not merely the preservation, but also the enhancement, of programmatic quality? What measures of accountability should there be to assure that this takes place?

May 8, 2001