

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**  
**Annual Report, 2001-02**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

**Relations with the Administration:** 2001-02 was a year of fruitful interaction between CPB and the central administration. At the beginning of the year, we established protocols to be followed by both the Committee and the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) John Simpson on all subjects of mandatory consultation: (1) advance documentation would be required so that consultation time would not be taken up with oral presentations; (2) following consultation, the Committee would provide its written advice to the CPEVC within two weeks; the CPEVC would not act before receiving this advice, and would provide a written response reporting his action and indicating the degree to which he agreed or disagreed with the substantive recommendations of the Committee. We are pleased to report that this protocol was generally observed on all sides, that most consultations were timely and complete, and that a record of the Committee's advice and the CPEVC's response is available in the Senate office to any interested Senator.

The quality of our work was enhanced during 2001-2002 by the regular presence of the Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget Meredith Michaels at our meetings. Her invitation to sit with the Committee was not *ex officio*, but personal – based on the value of her contributions.

In addition to his formal consultations, the CPEVC sought CPB's informal opinions on several topics that were still in early stages of planning. The Committee welcomed the opportunity to engage in these off-the-record discussions. As a precondition, CPB and the CPEVC agreed to respect each other's confidence in these discussions, while reserving the right to agree or disagree on the record when formal proposals were presented to the Senate.

**Academic Planning:** The most important area in which both formal and informal consultation occurred during 2001-02 was the review of the Divisional Ten-Year Plans. Throughout the Winter Term, CPB spent many hours providing informal advice to CPEVC Simpson on the details of the plans, and on their broader implications for the campus budget process. The result was a detailed consensus between CPB and the CPEVC about the merits of the specific proposals made by the Deans and Vice Chancellors, and broader agreement about the new direction that campus planning should take.

We made an Interim Report to the Senate in May (AS/SCP/1349) reflecting this broader understanding with the CPEVC that the future planning process should be more closely tied to the criteria by which plans are to be implemented in the annual budget. At that time, we reserved the right to comment further after he completes his final response to the 10-year plans. The final response has not yet been released as of the date of this Annual Report.

For the present, we would note, first, the fact that the total resources requested by the Deans would exceed the present FTE expectations of the campus, and, second, that in general the plans submitted by the Deans were not sufficiently prioritized. This implies, we believe, a need to prioritize among the proposed positions, using consistent methods that evaluate the impact of new positions in terms of both costs and benefits to the educational and research missions of the University.

We were not equally impressed with all divisional plans. Three divisions provided plans that, to varying degrees, provided a basis for moving forward, while two divisional plans were inadequate.

At year's end, CPB and the CPEVC agreed that substantive discussions of the divisional plans could be carried forward in the form of fuller and earlier Senate scrutiny of the annual divisional budgets. Such scrutiny would, henceforth, extend not only to the proposed uses of incremental funding by the divisions, but also to the priorities reflected in their base budgets.

**Enrollment Planning:** A major theme in CPB's review of the Ten-Year Plans was enrollment planning. The Committee's concern was that the projected growth of the campus from 10-15,000 students over a six-year period would occur almost entirely at the undergraduate level, leaving UCSC with an unacceptably low ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. CPB reached early agreement with the EVC on the need for affirmative steps to reverse the deterioration of the UCSC graduate ratio. The first step in this reversal was the divisional Senate's endorsement of a resolution (jointly sponsored by CPB and the Graduate Council) setting a minimal goal of 15% graduate enrollments for the campus. The next step has been the translation of this goal into a comprehensive plan for managing undergraduate enrollments as the campus approaches its long-range target of 2250 graduate students in a total on-campus enrollment of 15,000. The principal question addressed by this plan is how far the campus can go in accepting new undergraduate enrollments (and the revenue they generate) without jeopardizing its ability to reach its minimal goal for graduate enrollments and its status as a major research university.

Given the 15,000 student enrollment limit – and based on the best available data from Admissions, the Graduate Division, Student Affairs and Planning and Budget – CPB has determined that the campus must limit undergraduate enrollments to a maximum of c. 13,500 FTE on campus students, eventually converting c. 750 of these slots to graduate FTE as new and expanded graduate programs come on line. This planning strategy, however, depends on three further elements: (1) an academic plan that would allow UCSC to accommodate temporarily an additional 750 undergraduates while using the advance dollars they generate to increase graduate enrollments; (2) a budgetary plan that would reverse the relative decline since the early 1990's of per student expenditures on Instruction and Research in comparison to administration, student services, and others items; and (3) a fundraising plan that would allow UCSC to reach the level of expenditure per student that would be necessary to sustain a graduate enrollment of 15%. Clearly other elements of enrollment planning will more centrally involve other Senate Committees, e.g.: fast-tracking new graduate programs (Graduate Council); maintaining and enhancing the quality of undergraduate instruction (CEP); preparing for selectivity in admissions (CAFA); increasing support for research (COR).

**Space and Capital Planning:** Although CPB focused primarily on academic planning during 2001-2, it received periodic reports on the space and capital implications of campus enrollment growth. CPB has been concerned that UCSC entered "Tidal Wave II" as the least-adequately capitalized campus in the UC system, and that, on the present trajectory, we may be even further behind the rest of the system by 2006. A further concern is that the Growth and Stewardship Committee is still consulting on the degree to which UCSC should develop the North Campus, and the degree to which it should rely on infill to accommodate the new enrollments that are already here. Until such decisions are made, the necessary capital projects cannot be proposed, funded, and completed – a process that, itself, takes a minimum of five years.

Much of CPB's work on enrollment planning this year was based on the assumption that space and capital planning for the campus is on track. Future CPBs must address the fundamental questions underlying this assumption: Is UCSC's projected enrollment large enough to cost-effectively develop the North Campus? Is it too large to accommodate by infill? If the campus faces a planning

dilemma, then the widest range of possible solutions should be discussed during the coming academic year.

**Development and Fundraising:** Clearly, the campus cannot reach its programmatic and capital goals without assuming a large increase in extra-mural funds. Based on a preliminary review, however, we were not positively impressed with either the recent performance of the Development Office or its 10-year plan. We recommend that next year's CPB report to the divisional Senate about what steps have been completed, are being taken, or need to be taken, to improve the Development Office's performance and whether its recent increase in staffing is being effectively utilized by University Relations.

**Silicon Valley Center:** The Silicon Valley Center has not taken up as much of CPB's time as in previous years. During the Fall, CPB reviewed a Concept Outline for an Academic Plan at the SVC. The Outline stressed the research potential of UCSC's affiliation with NASA Ames, and proposed an undergraduate program consisting of upper division majors for Community College transfer students in fields that UCSC does not offer, and has no plans to offer. CPB noted that the enrollment-generated FTE for these hypothetical new departments at the SVC would not directly strengthen existing programs, and would, presumably, come at the expense of enrollment generated FTE in the School of Engineering and Natural Sciences. More fundamentally, the Committee thought that this approach to undergraduate curriculum at SVC was incompatible with the approach articulated by the SVC Task Force (Spring 2000) and in the CPEVC's Call to campus Departments to include the SVC in their Ten-Year plans. There were, we concluded, serious questions about why the campus should establish undergraduate programs at the SVC that would require significant FTE in areas that lie outside our current campus plans.

A copy of our comment on the SVC Concept Outline is attached to this Report on the web (<http://senate.ucsc.edu>). The Administration did not respond in writing to our questions, but we have been told that there are no present plans to develop an undergraduate degree component at the SVC, and that enrollments at the SVC are no longer expected to contribute significantly to accommodating the 1,900 students that the campus is expecting in excess of the main campus enrollment limit.

**Academic Information System:** CPB reviewed the proposal for a \$15M Academic Information System in the context of the substantially less expensive versions of the same proposal that we saw in the Initiatives process. We were not persuaded that earlier questions about outsourcing, customization costs, licensing, cost-sharing, upgradability, compatibility, etc. had been satisfactorily addressed. In general, the Committee expressed the view that a project of this magnitude ought to be managed by a campus Chief Information Officer with responsibility for integrating campus systems. In the midst of our consultation, however, the software vendor was purchased by a competitor, which chose to discontinue the product that was to have been customized for UCSC. The campus has subsequently solicited a bid from another vendor. We are concerned about the negative comments made about this vendor in the earlier bid process. Although we support the rapid implementation of a new system, we are concerned that a final decision has apparently been made over the summer without allowing CPB to comment on the proposed cost and method of financing.

**VPIT:** In the context of CPB's suggestion that the campus appoint a Chief Information Officer, CPEVC Simpson asked our advice about whether the proposed Vice Provost for Information Technology (VPIT) should function as a consultant or as administrator. CPB responded

unequivocally that the new appointee should have direct administrative responsibility for campus information technology.

**Criteria for the Establishment/Disestablishment of Programs:** CPB commented that the proposed criteria for the Establishment and Disestablishment of Programs ceded too much power to the divisional deans and department chairs, and gave an insufficient role to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Graduate Dean in fostering, and possibly administering, new programmatic initiatives. There has as yet been no response to our comment.

**Opportunity Funds:** CPB reviewed a proposal by the CPEVC for distributing the incremental gains in opportunity funds that are expected in future years. The Committee believed that the CPEVC's proposal gave too much discretion to his office and that of the VCR, and that a greater share of future opportunity funds COR. We emphasized that the amounts at issue could be considerable if campus attains its goal of increased sponsored research. The CPEVC's response emphasized how small the amounts would be in the near term, and committed his office to accounting to the Senate (CPB and COR) for the use of all Opportunity Funds that fall under the administration's discretion.

**External Review Guidelines:** CPB reviewed the proposed new guidelines for external reviews. Rather than express our concerns in writing, the Committee decided to wait for the VPAA's revisions in response to the concerns expressed by our sister committees.

**Campus Curriculum Initiative:** CPB expressed concern to the CPEVC about the history and outcome of some of the CCI searches and the questionable use of this resource for recruiting purposes other than those originally proposed. We recommended that these questions be addressed before the remaining CCI positions were filled.

**Writing:** CPB wrote an extensive letter to the CPEVC expressing a series of concerns about the future health of the campus Writing Program. There has, as yet, been no response.

**Freshman Seminars:** CPB was entitled to comment on the resource and planning implications of establishing 1-2 unit Freshman Seminars at UCSC. Unfortunately, we must now report that a solicitation letter for proposals for such seminars was distributed to the faculty over the summer, and that no consultation with CPB has yet occurred. We are gravely concerned about the source of this funding given the current state budget crisis, especially in view of the fact that CEP's letter on Freshman Seminars stated the following: "Any approval CEP would give to this project would depend on our being convinced that something of greater importance were not being sacrificed to make this new program possible." [Freeman to Goff, 5/2/02]. We are further concerned about how this expenditure of funds fits into campus priorities of increasing graduate enrollments and research. The incoming CPB should immediately address the issue of shared governance raised by the decision to implement Freshman Seminars without full Senate consultation, as well as the budgetary aspects.

**Colleges:** CPB reviewed the proposed academic program for College Nine, and suggested that certain college-specific graduation requirements be deferred until broader anomalies in the academic role of the colleges are addressed. To this end, the Committee co-sponsored with COC legislation in the Winter establishing a Special Committee on the Colleges, charged to consider not merely the existing college system but the possible role that the College form might take in the development of graduate programs and professional schools. Pending the report of the Special Committee, we

suggested that the placement of College Nine within the Social Sciences Division be treated as an experiment, to be evaluated after three years.

**UCB Proposal to Reduce Days of Instruction:** CPB commented on a proposal by UCB to reduce its days of instruction from 146 to 140 in order to accommodate summer session. We did not believe that the educational and political implications of this proposal had been well-considered, and noted the apparent failure of UCB to consider alternatives, such as the reduction of its semester break.

**Routine Business:**

In addition to addressing the issues listed above, CPB performed its routine review of FTE requests and other issues pertaining to academic planning.

**1) External Reviews**

Draft Charges: Ocean Sciences, Theatre Arts, History, Education, and Economics

CPB wrote a series of letters suggesting that draft charges be made less broad and general, so as to give greater guidance to review committees.

Closure Letters: History of Consciousness, Anthropology, Math, Art History, Literature, and CE

CPB wrote responses to the above reviews, and sent representatives to the closure meetings.

**2) FTE's**

CPB performed its normal role in reviewing FTE requests, and faculty transfers between departments. We gave special attention to requests for double hires from a single search, expressing concern about this practice in general and articulating specific guidelines for its use.

**3) Program Proposals**

CPB reviewed proposals for the following new programs:

Education Ph.D, Bioinformatics, Social Documentation M.A., Digital Arts/New Media M.F.A., EE Biology Ph.D., MCD Biology Ph.D.

**4) CPB Reports/Resolutions**

Resolution on Enrollment Management (Winter Qtr)

Resolution on the Colleges (Winter Qtr)

Enrollment Management at UCSC: Planning and Information Needs (Spring Qtr)

Interim Report: Divisional 10-Year Planning (Spring Qtr)

**5) Miscellaneous Issues**

School of Engineering Admissions Policy, IGPP/ten-year planning, Five-year list 2002, WASC Accreditation, Economics: limit entry to major

Respectfully Submitted;

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

George Blumenthal, ex officio

Ben Friedlander

Alison Galloway, ex officio

Susan Gillman

Brent Haddad

Paul Koch

Jennie McDade

Graeme Smith

Lynn Westerkamp

Bob Meister, Chair

September 26, 2002