TO: THE ACADEMIC SENATE, SANTA CRUZ DIVISION:

Planning for the Silicon Valley Center (SVC) is now only one of several critical short-term problems with fundamental implications for the long term. In its fall report to the Senate on the SVC, CPB expressed its concern about the delay in producing academic plans for accommodating the projected number of students. That concern has now become urgent. Furthermore the rapid growth in campus enrollment is already underway, but serious capital planning to accommodate that growth is just now beginning — and the necessary construction, even if it is funded, is unlikely to be ready before the end of the decade. SVC and year-round operations have been proposed as the primary options for dealing with this dire situation, given LRDP limits and the lack of capital resources. To date, however, there has been no curricular and resource plan for integrating either of these solutions into the expected academic programs of degree students, and no indication that either or both of the potential solutions can accommodate the student overflow expected at UCSC in the next several years.

YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

Because CPB has yet to be presented with any proposal for year-round operation, the relevant questions about this proposed solution have yet to be asked. They would include the question of whether the existing faculty and courses would simply be spread out over four quarters. If so, how would this resolve the enrollment problem? If not, how would we accommodate that additional number of faculty (up to one third more) who would be necessary to provide a curriculum of the present depth and diversity in the summer quarter? Would faculty have the option of teaching in any three quarters? Would faculty continue to use their research and office facilities year-round? How would departments and committees function with up to 25% of their members missing (over and above those who are on sabbaticals and fellowships)? Where would the overflow students be housed in a resort community where rents rise dramatically in the summer months? It is clear, moreover, that year-round operation (at a scale large enough to address the enrollment overflow) would constitute a fundamental change in the nature of university life as we know it, and that it might also change terms and conditions of employment in a way that could require extensive negotiation with the unionized teaching employees of UCSC. To be successfully implemented plans for a summer quarter will require an extensive process of consultation.

SVC

In CPB’s view, the principal questions about SVC are as follows:

- Can we maintain UC quality? Can a UC-quality satellite campus be created without the level of funding and facilities that would be required at a UC?

In its fall report to the campus, CPB presented Associate Vice Chancellor Michaels’ estimate of the amount by which enrollment-generated funds attributable at the SVC would have to be supplemented if the average per student expenditure at the satellite campus were to be the same as on the present campus. At the maximum enrollment level of 2000 students, the amount of the required subsidy was projected to be $4 million. This subsidy would have to come from funding generated by increasing enrollments on the main campus to the extent that it is not available from industry, private donors, and research contracts. We have seen no document, however, directly acknowledging this issue. Neither have we seen an academic plan demonstrating that the
courses and programs to be offered at the SVC could be of UC quality without being subsidized. Yet public
documents from the campus continue to project 2000 student FTE at the SVC by 2010.

- **Who will be served?** The second question raised is how well the programs best suited to the NASA/Ames site
will serve the projected student populations. Public statements focus on such areas as information technology,
nanotechnology, astrobiology, and digital imaging. Yet the vision articulated in the original Pastor/Hernandez
report, in budget requests to the regents, the UCOP report to the California Postsecondary Education
Commission and in the most recent memorandum of understanding with our educational “partners,” state that
UCSC is moving into Silicon Valley to serve the historically underrepresented, economically disenfranchised
and underprivileged, as well as working adults. Although the most recent campus report to CPEC does show a
projected rise in targeted populations within the Silicon Valley region, there is no specific analysis showing that
the articulated academic focus of the SVC will effectively serve these target populations.

- **How will plans be produced?** At present, the academic planning for the SVC consists of requesting that
departments propose courses or course clusters that could be offered there. This approach conflicts with the
report of last year’s Task Force, which directed planning efforts to targeted programs of study. The Task
Force’s most fundamental requirement, that an academic plan for the SVC consist of UC quality programs that
would intrinsically benefit from a Silicon Valley location and would not needlessly duplicate offerings on the
home campus, appears to have receded from view. So, too, has the principle that academic programs at the SVC
not be subsidized by funds generated by the growing enrollments on the present campus, where our ability to
maintain UC quality is also threatened by the addition of a number of students roughly equal to that expected at
the new UC campus in Merced.

Fiscal questions about growth raised by CPB for the past two years, and fully endorsed by last spring’s SVC
Task Force, have been incorporated into the ten-year campus planning process that is just getting underway, and
which would not be in effect for some years. In the meanwhile, the “bulge” will have arrived on our campus in
the absence of a fiscal and curricular plan able to accommodate it. The campus may thus be forced to manage
the consequences of accelerated growth as a continuing short-term crisis, and to allow the resulting academic
quality to be whatever results.

The only acceptable form of growth is planned growth. At some point before it is too late, the campus must
consider that the consequences of rapid unplanned growth may vitiate the expected benefits of growth for the
campus as a whole. There may be a constellation of circumstances that would require the campus to slow the
rate of growth that is currently anticipated if adequate resources are not forthcoming.

**CONCLUSION**

CPB concludes that the Senate can no longer support, by inaction, the continuing absence of academic and
fiscal plans for the SVC. The time has come for the Senate to be proactive, and to set deadlines for the actions we
expect of our administration at this critical moment in the development of UCSC. These deadlines are necessary in
order to ensure that the campus still has meaningful choices before the full complement of Tidal Wave II students
has arrived.

According the most recent report from UCOP to CPEC, the Academic Senate must approve the academic
program at the SVC. A similar process of planning and approval must take place for year-round operations, and both
planning processes must be fully integrated with a campus plan for accommodating projected enrollment growth.

CPB, therefore, recommends that the administration be invited to a day-long Retreat for a a full and frank
discussion of the overall planning issues raised by the “bulge.” Following the Retreat, the Senate will set a time
frame to deliberate on the question of growth, and to go on record with a well-founded position that would inform
the Office of the President on what resources it would take to mount an education that is budgetarily of UC quality.
at various projected levels of growth. These deliberations would also establish a time frame in which the Senate will have the opportunity to vote how much enrollment growth to accept in the absence of what the Senate and the administration together have agreed would be adequate capital and operational resources.

In support of our concerns, we call for two resolutions expressing the sense of the Academic Senate:

1. **WHEREAS** it is the sense of the Academic Senate that under the present circumstances of rapid enrollment growth the proposals both for a SVC and for year-round operation be regarded as new academic programs requiring Senate approval in their entirety before courses and curriculum are offered AND

**WHEREAS** the Senate wishes its committees to consider both the SVC and the proposal for year-round operation in the context of an integrated plan for accommodating the rapid enrollment growth that is expected at this campus.

**IT IS RESOLVED THAT** no curriculum be offered under either proposal until the process of approval is completed in the form of a vote of the Senate as a whole in a manner to be determined by consultation among the appropriate standing committees.

2. **WHEREAS**, the Senate must have the opportunity to vote on the feasibility and desirability of campus growth; AND

**WHEREAS**, before such a vote, the Senate needs to be fully informed about the budgetary and space conditions under which UCSC can continue to meet CPEC standards for a UC quality education at projected levels of future enrollments, AND

**WHEREAS**, the Senate requires data on the extent to which the campus met (or fell below) CPEC standards before Tidal Wave II, and the rate at which capital projects must be funded and completed in order to reach and maintain these standards as it grows, AND

**WHEREAS**, the Senate requires data on the per student cost of growth in both capital and operational budgets necessary to maintain a level of education that is budgetarily equivalent (on a per student basis) to what UC offered at the beginning of Tidal Wave II,

**IT IS RESOLVED THAT** the administration shall be invited to a day-long retreat no later than December 2001 to discuss what resources are required for the Senate to approve growth in student enrollment to the extent currently projected.

Respectfully Submitted:

**COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET**

Roger Anderson  
Barry Bowman  
Ben Friedlander  
Alison Galloway  
Susan Gillman  
Bob Meister  
Tudor Ratiu  
Lynn Westerkamp  
John Hay, Chair
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January 31, 2001
APPENDIX 1

CPB REPORT # 3 ON THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY REGIONAL CENTER
TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE, SANTA CRUZ DIVISION:

I. INTRODUCTION

This is CPB’s Third Report to the Senate on the proposed Santa Clara Valley Regional Center (SVRC).

In our first Report (Winter 2000), we expressed doubts that a UC-quality academic program could be provided at the SVRC (or any satellite campus) out of the state funds generated by the students who would be enrolled there. These doubts reflect the ways in which fundamental principles of UC budgeting disfavor the absorption of enrollment growth on satellite campuses: (a) for each incremental student the state provides the campus with significantly less funding than its average appropriation for each student already in the system; (b) if the academic programs at a satellite campus were to be funded by their own enrollments, the average expenditure per student would therefore be significantly less than on the main campus; (c) there is, thus, *prima facie* reason to suppose that the academic programs on the satellite campus would not be budgetarily equivalent in quality to similar programs on the main campus, *unless* they were subsidized by funds generated by enrollments on the main campus, or from some outside source. In our first Report, we asked the Task Force on Academic Planning for the SVRC to address the presumptive problem of providing a UC-quality education at a satellite campus under these budgetary conditions.

The Task Force Report explicitly endorsed CPB’s analysis and concerns. In doing so, it limited the academic component of the SVRC to programs that would be enhanced by their presence in Santa Clara Valley, whether or not there is a Regional Center. It did not argue that these educationally appropriate programs could bring in sufficient state funds to create or sustain a Regional Center, nor did it argue that the anticipated enrollment “bulge” could be accommodated by the SVRC. Rather, the Task Force explicitly set aside all consideration of whether a desirable academic program could accommodate the number of students (now estimated at 1900 student FTE) that UCSC is expected to admit in excess of the enrollment cap (15,000 student FTE) for the main campus, and whether the State would fund an SVRC that did not have this goal. It then concluded that a limited range of programs (accommodating perhaps 400 students) could be appropriately placed at the SVRC, assuming that the establishment of such a Regional Center was funded by other means. In reaching this conclusion, the Task Force left to the Senate as a whole the job of ensuring that the programs placed in the SVRC were an appropriate projection of UCSC’s mission and quality; to CPB was left the task of developing mechanisms that ensure the funding of programs in Santa Clara Valley would not drain resources from the main campus.

In its Second Report to the Senate, CPB attached a near-final version of the Task Force Report. CPB’s brief comment identified the charge that it had been given by the Task Force, and promised to report in the Fall on the extent to which the campus administration had worked with Senate leadership to implement the safeguards demanded by the Task Force, ensuring that academic planning for the Regional Center could proceed within the recommended guidelines. This is the subject of our Third Report.

II. Implementation of the Task Force Recommendations

A. Academic Planning: The record of the administration has, thus far, been mixed. There was no consultation with the Senate during the summer on the substance of academic planning for the SVRC.
Neither has there been any consultation on the process. A principal recommendation of the Task Force was that the Senate be closely involved in the selection of a Director for the SVRC who would supervise academic planning. Over the summer an Interim Director was appointed with no Senate consultation. As of the submission of this document, COC has not been asked to nominate members of the Search Committee for a permanent director. On the subject of academic planning, the administration has not yet proceeded to implement the Task Force recommendations.

The administration’s delay is troubling for at least two reasons. The first is that the desirable academic planning identified by the Task Force has not yet gone forward, despite the great urgency under which the Task Force was asked to act. The second is that the statements made about the SVRC by the administration to the Regents and the public do not reflect any of constraints on expectations that should have been the result of last year’s process of consultation. Thus far, no public statement by UCSC reflects the now general recognition on campus that the SVRC is very unlikely to make a major contribution to absorbing the enrollment “bulge,” or the general recognition that enrollment-generated funds would have to be substantially supplemented from other sources in order to meet the Task Force’s concern about maintaining UC quality at the SVRC at almost any level of enrollment. The Chancellor, the EVC, and the Interim Director have each explicitly acknowledged both of these points in recent meetings with CPB.

Serious academic planning for the SVRC has been deferred for the current academic year. While the Office of the President expects to receive reassurance on the subject of academic planning if it is to continue funding the SVRC, no representatives of the administration have expressed the expectation of any planning document going forward (to the Regents or CPEC) that will require, or allow, Senate consultation. Overall planning for the SVRC will thus, presumably, go forward on the assumption that an academic plan is in preparation that could accommodate up to 2000 students and still meet the standards of quality demanded by the Senate.

CPB believes that, if there is to be an SVRC fulfilling the curricular purposes endorsed by the Task Force, then the Senate must be adequately informed of its budgetary base and must be in a position to review the plan as a whole before any significant commitments are made. Even more pressing, because there is now little likelihood that the academic plan for the SVRC will accommodate those students in the “bulge,” there must be other planning by UCSC to accommodate those students, who will be here by 2006 under current projections. CPB is unaware that any such planning is underway.

This broader inadequacy of academic planning for UCSC as a whole is, perhaps, the most serious consequence of its absence in the more limited sphere of the SVRC. CPB recommends a continuation of the Task Force process that would embrace the relationship of academic planning for the SVRC to academic planning for the main campus. We view the curriculum in the SVRC as new enterprise or program of UCSC that must be approved as a whole, rather than as a series of individual course offerings.

B. **Budgetary Planning:** We are pleased to report that the administration and the Senate have successfully cooperated on budgetary planning for the SVRC.

The Task Force asked that the administration develop meaningful fiscal benchmarks for monitoring the impact of the center and of its particular programs on the funding of the teaching and research mission of the main campus. In cooperation with CPB, AVC Michaels had already begun to track the adjusted expenditure on Instruction and Research per student at UCSC and on our sister campuses. This method of analysis can be used to evaluate the curriculum at the SVRC in its entirety from a budgetary point of view, and it can be extended to determine the degree to which the specific programs offered at the proposed SVRC would be budgetarily equivalent to similar programs offered at UCSC, and other comparable campuses in the system.
The most important use of these benchmarks, however, would be to calculate the fiscal shortfall that must be overcome in order to bring the per student funding of education at the SVRC up to the level of the main campus – the funds that must be generated from other sources (state and/or private) to ensure that the academic programs at the SVRC are budgetarily of UC quality. At CPB’s October 10 meeting, AVC Michaels presented a “Preliminary Financial Feasibility Analysis” for the SVRC. Her initial scenario assumes first, that the mix of programs to be established there are on average the same in cost as those on the present campus, and second, that the programs at the SVRC will not benefit from “economies of scale” except in the area of services (e.g. the Registrar, etc.) Under these assumptions, the annual shortfall in funding for the SVRC would be over $4M at an enrollment level of 2000 students (and proportionately less at lesser enrollment levels.) This would represent the amount of additional core funding that UCSC would need each year to maintain the satellite campus under current the assumptions stated above. It does not include capital funding, and one-time (startup) funding required to establish the SVRC.

AVC Michaels emphasizes, and CPB understands, that the assumptions stated above are merely a starting point for an analysis of financial feasibility of the SVRC’s curricular component. The specific programs to be placed in the SVRC may be less expensive than the average cost of programs on the main campus; they may, however, be more expensive. There may be greater opportunities for economies of scale than anticipated; we may also find, however, that infrastructure in the Santa Clara Valley is more expensive to build and maintain than comparable facilities in Santa Cruz. The sole purpose of this preliminary analysis of financial feasibility is to set the baseline presumption from which discussions of a more specific academic plan can proceed. Those who wish to target the academic program at a given number of student FTE would now have the burden of identifying the sources of the capital, start-up, and continuing core funding that would be necessary to supplement the enrollment dollars brought in by those students. If programs are to be located in Silicon Valley that are less costly per student than those at UCSC, then the burden will be on those who advocate such a plan to show (a) that these programs are of UC quality, and (b) that their presence at the SVRC would not indirectly raise the cost of instruction on the main campus. The financial information that we have requested, and are now getting, is precisely the kind of information that the administration will need in order to request budgetary supplements from OP, the Regents, and the Legislature for the establishment of an SVRC.

Finally, the Task Force has charged CPB with the responsibility of establishing reporting mechanisms to determine the extent to which planning funds and capital funds for SVRC are being diverted from the main campus. AVC Michaels has created a separate account for the line item funds that have been appropriated to plan the SVRC, and the Banner System can now generate reports on this account. There is as yet, however, no reporting mechanism for determining whether funds from other accounts have in fact been spent on the SVRC.

CPB is pleased that the campus received $20M augmentation of its capital budget in order to give it the flexibility to plan for Silicon Valley. We note, however, that the planning process that generated this augmentation is far from transparent. The funds, we are told, cannot be specifically designated for the SVRC unless and until there is an approved academic plan, but they cannot be spent elsewhere if the campus so decides. CPB hope and expects that a separate accounting will be made of capital funds expressly appropriated for the SVRC, and that no capital funds will be used there that could have been used to meet urgent needs on the main campus.

### III. The Changing Mission of the SVRC

CPB has always been aware that the academic component of the SVRC is only one of its aspects: the others are research, outreach/public service, and collaborative education with San Jose State and community colleges. The most prominent driving force behind the SVRC proposal, however, was to provide academic
programs for the growing number of UCSC students who were part of Tidal Wave II. It has become clear by
now that this is no longer an appropriate justification for the Center, and that it cannot provide the basis for
academic planning consistent with the recommendations of the Task Force.

The administration’s choice of the NASA Ames site for the SVRC has changed the character of the academic
planning for the Center. We now understand that the Space Act requires NASA to form partnerships with
educational institutions (such as UCSC) in order to develop 213 acres of prime Silicon Valley land as a
business and research park. This partnership could provide potential research collaborations and funding for
some UCSC faculty (e.g. in astrobiology), and could consequently provide opportunity funds (overhead) to
UC as a whole. From NASA’s perspective, we understand that the partnership with UCSC and other
universities will be research-driven. UCSC, however, has made it a condition of the partnership that it be
allowed to locate appropriate academic and outreach programs on the NASA site. The academic component
is apparently no longer driving the SVRC – the possibility of such a program is rather a one of the terms
under which UCSC has agreed to participate (along with other universities) in the development of 213 acres
of government land for research and business purposes.

Despite these developments, the public representation of the SVRC remains that of a satellite campus that
would both handle the “bulge” and educate otherwise underserved students. When we have asked why this
has not changed, we have been told only that OP and the Regents would not be interested in funding a
Regional Center that did not address the “bulge.” This explanation suggests that planning funds for the
SVRC would become unavailable if it were to be publicly acknowledged that something else must be done
about the “bulge.” Given the present lack of clarity, CPB finds it extremely difficult to fulfill its obligation to
advise both the Senate and the administration on either the SVRC or the “bulge.”

**IV. Conclusion**

CPB believes that the time has come for the Senate to express its intentions on the issue of SVRC. In the
Winter Call we plan to propose an action item that would express the desire of the Senate to review and vote
on an academic plan for the SVRC, in its entirety, before individual programs or courses are offered there.
We have here presented the reasons for our concern, and would welcome the opportunity to discuss them
more broadly with the Senate and the administration in the coming weeks.

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

October 16, 2000
To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The following report is endorsed by the Senate Advisory Committee.

The Committee on Planning and Budget is pleased that the Task Force on the Santa Clara Valley Regional Center has endorsed in its “Interim Report” (attached) the seven concerns set forth in the CPB analysis that appeared in the Winter Senate Meeting Call (AS/SCP/1262) and that it has proposed specific safeguards that address those concerns. We look forward to working with the EVC to implement these safeguards over the summer, so that planning for the Regional Center can proceed in the Fall along the lines that the Task Force recommends. In our view, the most important of the proposed safeguards are as follows:

1. Develop meaningful fiscal benchmarks for monitoring the impact of the center and of its particular programs on the funding of the teaching and research mission of the main campus.

2. Develop adequate procedures for reporting to the appropriate Senate Committees the degree to which forward-funding of proposed activities in Santa Clara Valley drain resources from the main campus, both prospectively and on an ongoing basis.

3. Obtain guarantees that the capital budget for the Regional Center will be provided separately from, and in addition to, the capital budget of the main campus.

4. Obtain guarantees that faculty released time for planning the SCVRC, and all other planning costs, will be centrally funded, and will not be a drain on revenues generated by enrollment growth on the main campus.

5. Appoint a respected faculty director for the SVRC in full consultation with the Academic Senate.

6. Establish a Senate Committee to monitor planning for the SVRC and advise the administration on whether to proceed.

7. Senate oversight of academic planning must be sustained over the summer.

In its “Interim Report” the Task Force relies on CPB, and other committees of the Senate, to implement these conditions. CPB believes that academic planning for the SVRC cannot proceed (except in the most preliminary way) until the essential preconditions are met to the mutual satisfaction of the Senate and the administration. Our greatest immediate concern is that the accounting mechanisms called for in the Task Force Report do not now exist, and that they need to be in place before any meaningful academic planning can go forward in a way that will not unduly impact the academic mission of the main campus.

This concern is heightened by CPB’s recent discovery (through the campus Initiatives Process) that the new building required by increased enrollment will not come until planning and infrastructural development have been done, and that the anticipated cost of this work will leave little enrollment-generated money for new faculty and courses. Over the next several years, the
main campus will thus be expected to squeeze a rapidly growing student population into existing facilities and into existing classes. According to the Task Force, we cannot look to the SVRC to alleviate this problem. We must, therefore, develop accounting mechanisms that will guarantee that developments in Silicon Valley do not make anticipated stringencies on the main campus even worse.

CPB is working closely with Associate Vice Chancellor Meredith Michaels to develop a transparent method of accounting for the impact of expenditures on the SVRC on the funds available for instruction, research, and new facilities here at the Santa Cruz. Based on this method of accounting, we expect to report to the Fall Academic Senate meeting on the financial feasibility of the sort of program suggested by the Task Force for the SVRC. We will also report on the extent to which the administration has met the other conditions imposed by the Task Force on academic planning for SVRC. If appropriate, we may request a Senate vote on the desirability of proceeding with academic planning for the SVRC in the context of rapid enrollment growth at the Santa Cruz campus.

Respectfully Submitted:

Committee on Planning and Budget

Roger Anderson (ex officio)
Ilan Benjamin
James Clifford
Alison Galloway
Susan Gillman
Bob Meister
Frank Talamantes
John Hay, Chair

May 17, 2000
APPENDIX 3

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET ANALYSIS

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A UCSC REGIONAL CENTER IN THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY

Introduction
The Chancellor's proposal to establish a regional center cannot be separated from academic planning on this campus. It is, rather, part of a plan -- already underway -- to increase UCSC's enrollment by over 60% in the next decade. Governor Davis has included $1.1m in next year's budget to plan a "Santa Clara Off-campus Center" in the expectation that it will help UCSC (and therefore the entire system) absorb an estimated 16,900 students by 2010-11 -- a number significantly higher than anticipated in the LRDP for the present campus.

UCSC already has a significant (and valuable) presence in the Santa Clara Valley, but this is both heterogeneous and scattered, granting academic credit in some cases and but not in most. CPB believes at this point, however, that the anticipated need to accommodate an enormous increase of enrolled students, either on this campus or elsewhere, eclipses all other issues in deciding whether and how to extend UCSC's presence into Santa Clara Valley. The crucial questions now concern the kind and the quality of degree program that UCSC could offer at a satellite campus, and whether establishing such a program would threaten the quality of what UCSC offers here at Santa Cruz.

To plan for Santa Clara Valley under currently accepted scenarios is also to plan the educational future of the present campus. It is not enough simply to acknowledge this and to restate our commitment to first-rate education. CPB urges everyone at UCSC to think long and hard about our collective future.

This bulletin sets forth CPB's seven major concerns about the educational and financial impact of academic planning for Santa Clara valley on the future of UCSC as a whole.

1. Justifying the Academic Plan: The Academic Plan must be produced before programs are instituted and it must (a) specify the target student body, (b) outline a framework of instruction and (c) propose means of delivering this instruction that will convincingly address the anticipated demographic "bulge".

Questions: How far will the enrollment at the Regional Center in degree-related programs go toward meeting any excess enrollment over the LRDP for the UCSC main campus? Where would the targeted student population otherwise go?

2. Adequacy of facilities: The academic plan for the regional center must provide a close match between the needs of the segment of UCSC students who will be educated there and the facilities that will be provided.

Questions: what levels of physical plant and support structure will be needed for the targeted student body? Will providing it in the Santa Clara Valley be cost-effective relative to the main campus? Given UC's dire shortage of funds for capital improvement,
to what extent will any such funds applied to a regional center reduce what remains for UC in general and UCSC in particular?

3. Preserving the financial base of the main campus: The Chancellor has stated that the Santa Clara Valley Regional Center must not be funded out of revenues generated by enrollment growth on the main campus. The Chancellor has referred to this principle as a “budgetary fire-wall,” under which UCSC's instructional activities at the Regional Center will be entirely funded by the additional funds brought in by students actually enrolled there.

Questions: Can “forward-funding” of the Regional Center from the main campus’s budget be avoided? How can maintenance of a “fire-wall” be guaranteed, in what categories of expenditure and for how long?

4. Maintaining standards: EVC Simpson, in his consultations with CPB has readily agreed that any programs mounted at the Center must fully adhere to the academic standards and values of the UCSC campus. The meaning of a “UCSC degree” should not diminish in any way whatsoever, nor be blurred by the encroachment of any other qualification based on the difference between the satellite and the main campus.

Questions: are programs proposed for UCSC-enrolled students at the Regional Center consistent with the present academic mission and vision of the main campus, and of their sponsoring departments? If programs at the proposed Center change our educational mission, rather than simply extending it geographically, by what process should those changes be considered and evaluated?

5. Preserving faculty, teaching-assistant, staff and student rights: All UCSC employees and our students have well-established expectations of conditions under which they work. The Center should not affect these adversely in any way.

Questions: How should these conditions be protected? Can students be assured of the opportunity to study with faculty engaged in active research in the manner that defines UC? Can the proportions of student FTE taught by ladder and non-ladder faculty approved as now appropriate be maintained at the Regional Center and at UCSC as a whole?

6. Relationship to Initiatives in general: The proposal for a Center is not only a particular kind of initiative, it is also running parallel to our new “Initiative Process.” They may both play a major role in defining the new campus that will emerge from a growth of over 62%. EVC Simpson has reassured the campus (see his {memo on budgetary allocation}, p.), that no “Initiative” that is explicitly and specifically directed towards the Center will be approved in this year's process.

Questions: once initiated, how will balance in planning a multi-campus organization be maintained? Would the development of the Regional Center have a negative effect (even initially) on the discretionary resources available for academic programs on the main campus?
7. Planning and approving the academic program: The EVC is in the process of appointing a task-force to develop an academic plan under principles that it will be establish as its first order of business. Investigation of real estate and discussion of administrative plans has already been proceeding for several months, and it has been announced that a task force pursuing these issues will be formally appointed soon.

Questions: how, under what conditions, and when will the Senate and its standing committees choose to exercise the plenary power delegated by the Regents to supervise the quality of the curriculum and maintain academic standards?

Conclusion
CPB believes that the Senate as a whole must have a full opportunity to discuss and vote on a comprehensive academic plan for the Regional Center before the necessary approval of its elements by relevant committees, and before the Regional Center begins operation as a site of regular instruction for UC-enrolled students. To this end, CPB is consulting with the other senate committees and expects that the Senate will be presented with a recommendation as to how such discussion and approval should take place.

Respectfully Submitted:
Committee on Planning and Budget
John Hay, Chair
Roger Anderson (ex officio)
Ilan Benjamin
James Clifford
Alison Galloway
Susan Gillman
Bob Meister
Frank Talamantes
Anujan Varma

February 9, 2000