COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Resolution to Establish Special Committee on the Colleges

TO: The Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

As the campus enters the final stage of developing its 10-year Academic Plan, the Committee on Planning and Budget believes that the time is right to ask what role the College-form might play in implementing the new directions UCSC will take. The attached letter gives CPB's reasons for proposing a Special Committee to consider the future roles that Colleges might play at UCSC. Attached, also, is a Resolution, jointly sponsored by CPB and the Committee on Committees, creating such a Special Committee. We will ask our colleagues to adopt this resolution at the Senate Meeting on March 6.

Respectfully Submitted;

Chair Shelly Errington
Chair Bob Meister

February 14, 2002

January 10, 2002

VPAA George Brown
McHenry Library

Dear George,
On November 29, 2001, the Committee on Planning and Budget had a productive consultation with you, VP/DUE Goff, Dean Chemers, Provost Ladusaw, and Associate Dean Leaper on the revised bylaws for College Nine, and on the status and potential of the UCSC college system. Our recommendation on the College Nine bylaws has arrived as a separate letter. Here we address more general issues about the colleges that were sparked by our discussion.

Evaluation and Review of College Nine
As emphasized by Dean Chemers, AD Leaper, and VP/DUE Goff, the plan for College Nine, which incorporates close oversight and control by the Division of Social Sciences, should be viewed as an experiment. The Divisional model being tested for College Nine may offer new opportunities, especially related to the establishment of academic programs, that could lead to renewed faculty interest in college academic affairs. However a Divisional model has several potential downsides. If, for example, it evolves into a system where college requirements are effectively set by the division (though we acknowledge that college faculty have formal control of the curriculum), the perceived arbitrariness of such requirements could be problematic, as students are often assigned to their second or third choice college simply to manage campus housing. If the student population were to be drawn principally from the division managing the college, this imbalance in undergraduate life also would be troubling. Thus, the campus must develop methods to evaluate this experiment in college organization, paying special attention to the rationale for college-based graduation requirements (if any), the principles by which students choose and are assigned to colleges, and the nature and degree of faculty involvement in whatever curriculum the college develops. We recommend that VP/DUE Goff, Dean Chemers, AD Leaper, and other interested parties develop explicit procedures for assessing the College Nine experiment. Collection of metrics should begin as soon as the College Nine bylaws are approved by the Regents. In addition, we recommend that the college undergo a review after three years. We see no reason for other colleges to adopt the model of College Nine while it is still in its experimental phase.

Planning for Future of the Colleges
Timing of the College Nine review is critical. Rapid campus growth over the past five years has stressed all aspects of the college system. If the college system is to be maintained as UCSC enrollments grow further, the campus must develop a broad plan for college organization and academic mission that is both acceptable to the faculty and attractive to students. The Report of the Advisory Group on UCSC Colleges provides a

nice overview of the organization of the colleges, along with their strengths and weaknesses. The report makes several recommendations about college organization and the colleges as student affairs units that are under review by administrative committees. The report recognizes, however, that decisions regarding college faculties and academic mission must flow from the faculty. It recommends a number of short-term actions by faculty, such as a) clarifying the college affiliations of faculty, b) reviewing core course content, c) developing new models for meeting Subject A requirements, and d) clarifying what role (if any) college faculty should have in mentoring freshmen and sophomores. We agree that these issues must be addressed, but think that the time is ripe for a more fundamental examination of the college system.

In our meeting on November 29th, VP/DUE Goff asked us to consider how the campus should go about planning for the academic mission of the colleges. We recommend the following strategy. The Academic Senate should establish a Special Committee to evaluate alternate models for college academic organization. The Committee should examine two issues. First, it should explore a range of models for college academic mission that preserve the present function of the college as units for delivering services and perhaps an academic program to undergraduates. Possible models include the following. 1) Remove all curricular content from the colleges; keep them solely as student affairs units. 2) Keep our current, one-size-fits-all, core-course model. 3) Have all the colleges forge tight links with divisions (i.e., adopt the College Nine model, if it proves successful). 4) Have the colleges develop much more focused curricula and allow them to set general education requirements (e.g., the UC San Diego model in which students choose, at the time of application, among a relatively small number of college). 5) Move to an eclectic system, where different colleges have very different types of academic organization.

Second, the committee should explore whether there may be creative uses of the colleges other than as the primary conduit for delivering undergraduate student services. An obvious example that has received a good deal of discussion is a Graduate College. Another alternative would be to establish professional schools or other academic units as new colleges (e.g., College of Education, College of Natural Resources, College of International Affairs, etc.), or as programs under existing colleges. Here, UCSC would take advantage of the recognized role of "Colleges" throughout the UC system in performing a variety of academic functions.

The lists of ideas above are not exhaustive, and we are not advocating any of them. We offer them only to emphasize that the committee should be considering ideas that could lead to broader uses of the college form of organization, and not just those that tinker with the current system.

To be effective, the Special Committee must have a broad membership that includes faculty who arrived at UCSC in the 1990s, after the historical role of the colleges had changed. Such faculty may currently have no connection to the colleges, but might be

interested in the colleges as loci for new programs. While considering alternate models, the Special Committee should consult with administrative offices and committees, students and alumni groups. Different college models may have major implications for the admissions process, housing, college diversity, student life, alumni affairs, and development, so these impacts and costs must be evaluated thoroughly. Following this period of evaluation and more limited consultation, the Special Committee should put forward two (or at most three) models for consideration by the campus community as a whole. After a period of public consultation, a model would be chosen by vote of the Academic Senate.

We recognize that given ongoing concerns about the budget, and the recent debate regarding narrative evaluations and grades, some faculty may not be eager to explore the college question immediately. We believe waiting would be a mistake. Despite the near-term budget shortfall, enrollment growth that will severely tax the college system are likely in the next five years, and the need to develop new curricular entities, particularly at the graduate level, will continue.

Finally, we emphasize, in agreement with the Report of Advisory Group on the UCSC Colleges, that the goal must be to strengthen and re-invigorate the college system. The colleges play a vital role in the lives of our students, chopping a large, sometimes impersonal university into smaller, more intimate communities. We must maintain this role of the colleges as we devise plans for their academic mission that meet the needs of our future students and faculty.

Sincerely,

Bob Meister, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: EVC Simpson
VPDUE Goff
Provost Ladusaw
Dean Chemers
Associate Dean Leaper
COC Chair Errington
GC Chair Williams
CEP Chair Freeman

TO: THE ACADEMIC SENATE, SANTA CRUZ DIVISION

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

A Special Committee on the Colleges be formed with the following charge.

There will be six members of the Santa Cruz Division representing a broad sector of faculty constituencies, including those involved in the colleges as they currently exist and those who are not. One non-voting provost's representative selected by the Council of Provosts as well as one graduate and one undergraduate student representative shall be invited to sit with the committee.

In consultation with a broad range of campus constituents, including relevant senate committees, the committee will explore a range of models for the colleges. The committee will be established in Spring 2002 and make an initial report in Winter 2003.

Respectfully submitted:

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Sandra Faber
John Hay
John Isbister
Lincoln Taiz
Shelly Errington, Chair

And

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET
George Blumenthal, *ex officio*
Ben Friedlander
Susan Gillman
Alison Galloway, *ex officio*
Paul Koch
Jennie McDade
Graeme Smith
Lynn Westerkamp
Bob Meister, Chair

February 14, 2002