
**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET REPORT
THE INITIATIVE PROCESS AND ITS AFTERMATH**

TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE, SANTA CRUZ DIVISION:

I. INTRODUCTION

Last year, much of CPB's energy went into the Initiative Process. In May, CPB issued a detailed Report to the Senate expressing its lack of confidence in that process as a comprehensive mechanism of campus planning. Shortly thereafter, the EVC announced, for reasons of his own, that it would be discontinued. He then commenced discussion with CPB and other Senate bodies about what should replace the Initiative Process.

We here report on the interim results of those discussions, which are still in progress as this is written.

II. REFORMING THE PLANNING PROCESS

There has been considerable agreement between CPB and EVC Simpson that last year's budget and planning process needed to be improved for the purpose of both (a) planning for eventual campus build-out and (b) making the critical decisions about how to cope with the next few years of accelerated enrollment growth. In late June, the EVC scheduled a Retreat to discuss these problems, and CPB contributed a Working Paper (Attachment A), proposing a range of constructive solutions. At that meeting, the EVC stressed the need for a successor to the Initiative Process that was more likely to elicit from campus units long-term planning toward build-out. CPB stressed the need for effective mechanisms to monitor short-term decisions in a period of growth that may have long-term effects on the character and quality of a UCSC education.

All present agreed, however, that with accelerated growth the campus faces a planning emergency requiring creative adaptation of the normal processes of shared governance. UCSC is expected to absorb within the next four years the entire enrollment growth originally projected over a period of twenty years. Such a rapid influx of new students will necessitate administrative decisions on which the Senate *must* be formally consulted in advance. In the present circumstances, however, the normal process of consultation would be likely to involve the Senate too late to have much influence on the irreversible changes that have already been set in motion. There is thus good reason for relevant Senate committees to engage in formal consultation at the earliest stages of next year's planning if shared governance is to remain meaningful.

For this reason, CPB gave a positive preliminary response to the EVC's proposal to form a series of new planning committees with combined administrative/Senate membership. We advised the EVC that the operative meaning of shared governance could be preserved within such a structure. In our view, shared governance requires that the administration receive the advice of the Senate before acting, and that the Senate be fully informed about whether its advice has been followed. Through this conception of shared governance, the Regents have empowered the Senate to act as a watchdog on administrative decisions that are not under its direct control by reporting on the degree to which these administrative decisions are consistent with academic quality, academic freedom, etc., as understood by the UC faculty. The presumed power of the

Senate to report, positively or negatively, on the degree to which the administration has followed its advice is the foundation on which the UC justifies many of its public positions.

Joined by other Senate Committees, CPB advised the EVC that there were specific conditions under which his proposed committee structure could be consistent with shared governance, thus conceived. The most important is that faculty representation on the new planning committees be selected by COC in a way that would effectively constitute a Senate caucus on each committee. In this way, the new committee structure could become a locus of interaction between the administration and the Senate – in effect, the principal site of shared governance, rather than a purely administrative body.

The EVC held three productive meetings over the summer with available members of various Senate committees in which he thoughtfully addressed our position. We hoped, and expected, that a committee structure consistent with the Senate's advice would be in place before the end of the summer.

III. THE EVC'S PROPOSAL

The committee structure that the EVC presented to us at the end of September was responsive to some, but not all, of our concerns. He heard and understood our advice that he not appoint at-large faculty who would not represent in the planning process the considered views of Senate committees. In his proposed planning structure, all faculty representation is appointed through COC.

The principal area of dispute at the moment concerns the overarching committee in the proposed structure, at one point called the Central Planning Committee. As originally proposed, this Committee (which was to deal with the entirety of campus planning) had virtually every senior administrator as a member and only token representation from the Senate. When the EVC was advised that this committee should either have adequate Senate representation, or reduce its role to that of an administrative staff meeting, the EVC chose the latter. He did not, however, change the charge of this committee, which remains responsible for overall campus planning and priorities. As a consequence, the Central Planning Committee (reabeled as the Provost's Advisory Council and consisting entirely of administrators) has met, but without any present provision to interact or consult with CPB. To date, CPB has not been provided with its agenda and minutes, as originally promised.

We have already told the EVC that this outcome of last summer's discussion is highly unacceptable, and we must now report to the Senate that the Initiative Process has thus far been replaced by a new process in which the role of CPB is as yet undefined. At present, this matter is in the hands of COC. We would hope for a satisfactory resolution by the time of the November 9 meeting of the Senate.

III. CONCLUSION

As matters now stand, the Initiative Process, which gave CPB unprecedented access to the internal planning documents of every campus unit, seems to have been replaced by a relatively closed process in which "shared governance" does not occur until the end. This is not acceptable under any circumstances, but it is especially troubling at a time of accelerated growth, when major administrative decisions are both urgent and far-reaching. For all we know, irreversible

decisions are already being made within a *de facto* process. By the time we discover them, the moment for effective shared governance may be past.

We expect to report to the Senate on a regular basis about the degree to which CPB has been excluded from the actual planning process that is taking place on campus. This is a matter of the highest concern.

Respectfully Submitted:

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET:

Roger Anderson

Barry Bowman

Tina Campt

Ben Friedlander

Allison Galloway

Susan Gillman

Bob Meister

Tudor Ratiu

John Hay Chair

ATTACHMENT: Working Paper June 28 CAB/SAC Retreat

October 19, 2000