

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Annual Report 2013-14

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) had a productive year thanks to close working relationships to our Senate colleagues, to Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor (CPEVC) Galloway, to Vice Chancellor Planning & Budget (VCPB) Delaney, and to other administrators.

2013-14 Budget and Budget Process

The year 2013-14 was pivotal as well as productive, due to a sea-change in the budget outlook for the state, UC and our campus. For the first time in about five years, the campus did not have to take targeted cuts to academic and administrative support units, and no campus-wide budget review was initiated this year.

CPB was therefore able to turn its energy and focus away from budget cutting, and instead actively consult on how the campus should operate in the current “steady-state budget environment.” This environment has two sides. On the revenue side, the campus cannot expect a return to pre-crisis levels of state funding. Fiscal health therefore requires that the campus increase revenue in areas we control: summer session, extramural funding, masters and professional degrees, non-resident tuition, and development. CPB discussed and provided feedback to the CPEVC and VCPB on revenue enhancement strategies.

On the expenditure side, we should still look for ways to do our work more efficiently, but now have the opportunity and the duty to make modest investments in our future. This year, most new investment went to new faculty lines and graduate growth support, the top campus priorities as articulated by CPEVC Galloway. Going forward, CPB will continue to play a proactive role in developing these priorities as part of a campus academic plan.

The next several sections review the major issues CPB dealt with this year. The last section will discuss CPB priorities for next year.

Faculty Recruitment

The Committee on Planning and Budget reviewed the divisional requests for faculty recruitment and met with each Dean individually. The campus target this year was to fund up to 16 new FTE. The CPEVC’s call letter stated “11 positions will be used to support campus strategic investments (minimum 1 per division), three FTE will be available for LSOE/LPSOE¹ hires, and at least two FTE will be allocated for the initiation of cluster hires”. We submitted our recommendations to the CPEVC on May 19, 2014 and were pleased to see that her decisions announced June 17, 2014 were largely consistent with our recommendations, while expanding the number of new FTE to 18. This increase helped to service the numerous clearly articulated

¹ LSOE - Lecturers with Security of Employment / LPSOE - Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment.

divisional requests for LSOE/LPSOE hires, which CPB was gratified to see taken seriously as a campus priority.

While discussing our deliberations with the CPEVC, we were encouraged to take a more holistic, academic planning approach to faculty recruitment. The CPEVC call encouraged the Deans to propose cluster hires, defined as comprising two to four faculty hires over two or three years. With the opportunity provided by a more stable funding environment, the idea is to develop world-class excellence by leveraging existing strength in important areas of teaching and research. CPB supports the strategy of leveraging strengths, and explored models for developing clusters outside of the usual divisional recruitment process. CPB members played a key role in developing the Senate's Faculty Initiated Group Hire (FIGH) initiative, which solicited faculty proposals for multiple hires in an interdisciplinary area. Criteria for FIGH preproposals were similar to those of the CPEVC's clusters. The Deans proposed about a dozen clusters, and the FIGH process produced 19 preproposals.

In sorting through all the cluster proposals and preproposals, we found that a majority fell into broader categories that we will refer to as interdisciplinary themes. The logic behind clusters readily extends to these themes: creating a cluster in one specific area can often leverage several adjoining clusters. In some cases, the opportunity to achieve world-class excellence becomes clear only at the interdisciplinary thematic level and crosses divisional boundaries. CPB members identified three interdisciplinary themes that we see as the most promising for UCSC over the next 5-10 years: Cultural Crossings, Data Science, and Environmental Sustainability. These are spelled out in the CPB memo to the CPEVC "Identification of Interdisciplinary Themes and Academic Planning Process," which can be found here - <http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cpb-committee-on-planning-and-budget/reports/fte-recommendations/interdisciplinary-themes-1415.pdf>.

Graduate Growth

As part of the systemwide Rebenching effort, UCSC was allocated additional funds to bring our graduate enrollments up to numbers similar to other UC campuses. The graduate growth initiative is now in its second year. CPB has followed graduate growth developments closely all year and consulted with Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Studies (VPDGS) Tyrus Miller on two occasions. CPB provided input on the draft Master's Incentive Program, intended to implement a tuition revenue sharing model in Masters enrollments to incentivize enrollment growth and new program development and to create revenue that can support Ph.D. enrollment growth. CPB also reviewed CPEVC augmentations to the Graduate Division's resource allocation for the purposes of funding additional graduate support. We understand and appreciate the substantial jump in Ph.D. enrollment at UCSC last fall, but understand that preliminary data suggests fairly flat Ph.D. enrollment and some increase in M.S. enrollment for Fall 2014.

In consultations with VPDGS Miller, we expressed concern that the specific strategies and impacts of the Graduate Division's graduate growth efforts (the "ground game") were not widely known and understood among all faculty. To rectify this, we recommended that VPDGS Miller author a White Paper which explains the variety of incentive, student support, and institutional support strategies which he has negotiated with various departments for Ph.D. growth over the

past two years. We also recommended that information on the impact of the Masters Incentive Program and the trends in Masters and post-doc populations as well as Ph.D. populations be included. VPDGS Miller indicated such a document would be available for review sometime during summer 2014.

Internationalization

International (and, to a lesser extent, domestic non-resident) student enrollment growth has been a major issue for our campus for several years. CPB has been actively engaged and has provided considerable feedback to the relevant administrators through consultation and in writing. We began the year evaluating the international consultant's "International Recruitment Assessment" as well as a report prepared by the Undergraduate Education (UE) Division, "International Student Growth and Campus Globalization." These reports assess the current status of international student recruitment and support, and propose strategies to cultivate our reputation and recruitment in particular regions as well as build campus support structures for our current and prospective international students. CPB's responses can be found in [Appendix C](#) of this report.

While Senate committees have not yet had time for a full review, CPB was able to respond to a draft version of the joint UE/Planning & Budget document "International Support Resource Plan" (ISRP) (June 2014). This document at last begins to specify the campus funding commitment to support recruitment, yield, and retention efforts of international students to meet or exceed LREP planned growth through 2017-18. We regard this document as a good starting point. Our response made three recommendations:

- Accelerate the hire of the leadership team, the Senior International Officer and the Director of the International Education Office. Ideally they will be in place by Fall 2014, to deal with the large influx of new international students and to build sustainable structures for recruitment and retention.
- Identify as soon as possible a central location ("one stop shop") for international students to access resources and support personnel.
- Develop a central funding model for necessary support courses such as college core, writing and Academic English courses, to replace the current ad hoc approach.

Impaction and Undergraduate Student Success

CPB formed a joint subcommittee with CEP to focus on the issue of impaction of majors. It came to the conclusion that the most important aspect of impaction was its effect on students' timely graduation and retention. To better understand impediments to timely graduation, the subcommittee examined data on time to degree by major (supplied by VPDUE Hughey's office but not certified by Institutional Research) and over enrolled classes (supplied by the Registrar). These data along with the following recommendations for future actions were conveyed to CPB at its May 29, 2014 meeting:

- The administration's Student Success Steering Committee is the best avenue to pursue the issue of impaction, and the CPB/CEP subcommittee should be disestablished. The SSSC should report to CPB on progress quarterly.
- A faculty member with expertise in statistics should be added to the SSSC to help establish the best practices for data collection and analysis.

- The SSSC, led by Undergraduate Champion Jaye Padgett, should work with Summer Session to help alleviate over-enrolled gateway classes and majors that have many students taking longer than the average time to graduate.
- AIS wait lists should be utilized for all classes so that all over enrolled courses can be systematically tracked.

Summer Session

The CPB Subcommittee on Summer Session examined how Summer Session might meet the CPEVC's twin goals of its helping to improve graduation and retention rates and doubling enrollments. UCSC Summer Session is under-enrolled relative to other UC campuses, enrolling about 15% of FWS average enrollments versus the other UCs, which enroll 22% to 27%. UCSC undergraduates make up 90% of Summer Session students. In a recent survey students pointed to the high cost of housing, the limited financial aid available, and the small number of courses offered by regular faculty, as major reasons they do not take summer courses at UCSC.

Summer Session Director Monica Parikh is making a wide range of low-cost reforms aimed at serving both campus goals. These include:

- Summer Session enrollments in 2014 will be added to AY enrollments in determining TA allocations for the academic year, and the Central Administration will distribute 48-60 new TAs to Divisions in 2014 and 2015.
- Financial aid will be increased somewhat to a limited number of high-need students in 2014.

While those changes promise to improve Summer Session enrollments, we think more aggressive reforms (some of which are already under consideration) are needed to make real progress. These include:

- Putting a 15-unit (or lower) cap on tuition paid for Summer Session.
- Fast-track pathways for high-impact majors using Summer Session and enabling students to graduate a year earlier. One or two should be piloted next year.
- Removing other ways Summer Session is under-resourced or disadvantaged relative to AY quarters, e.g., TA salaries.

CPB has two main recommendations at this point:

- The goal of doubling Summer Session enrollment is unrealistic and should be relaxed somewhat. Reaching parity with other UC campuses – increasing enrollments by 50% – would require the more aggressive reforms mentioned above.
- Director Parikh should continue to convene a Summer Session Strategy Group to review progress and make plans for the following year. It might help to add faculty and academic division members, who may serve as liaisons during the year. She should work with the VPDUE and VCPB on an eight year plan that works towards increasing enrollment and improving Summer Session's contribution to UCSC academic mission.

A CPB report on Summer Session can be found on [Appendix B](#) of this report.

Silicon Valley

For the last decade or so, the campus has debated when, how, and at what scale to develop a Silicon Valley presence. Besides continuing individual faculty relationships with Silicon Valley firms and the UARC contract, the apparent strategy recently has been to offer new professional masters programs through the Engineering School, and to somehow build on those. Of the two such programs launched last year, it appears that the Game Design M.S. program has met some success, but the Technology Management program remains in the pilot stage. The way forward is unclear.

Last fall, CPB urged the administration to convene a small informal meeting with key Senate and Administration players right away, to try to develop the rudiments of a more coherent strategy. The administration agreed, but the meeting didn't take place until April 20th, and it was a much larger and more formal affair than the "working group" CPB envisioned. The only product of that meeting so far is a one page statement of principles, found in [Appendix D](#) of this report.

We hope to see far more rapid progress next year on planning UCSC's future in Silicon Valley.

Regular Committee Business

FTE Review

CPB reviewed the divisional requests for faculty recruitment authorizations for 2014-15, including (as noted earlier) requests for 16 new centrally funded positions. The divisions made 41 total requests, 27 of which were for the 16 new slots. The committee consulted and made recommendations on several partner-hire requests, and waivers of open recruitment. CPB also reviewed and made recommendations on four Target of Excellence (TOE) appointments and one Presidential Post Doc appointment.

Program Review

CPB participated and commented formally on the ongoing program reviews of fifteen academic departments, ranging from comments on the charge to External Review Committees to participation in closure meetings.

CPB also reviewed proposals for the establishment of the Languages & Applied Linguistics Department and the Computational Media Department; for the establishment of a new B.A. program in Critical Race & Ethnic Studies, an M.F.A. program in Environmental Art and Social Practice, an M.S. program in Scientific Computing and Applied Mathematics, an undergraduate minor in Sustainability, and a Joint Bachelor/Juris Doctor Program with Hastings Law School, as well as the disestablishment of the American Studies Department.

Other Campus Reviews

CPB also reviewed the following:

- Campus Online Education Course Agreements
- Waivers of Open Recruitment Policy
- Faculty Start-Up Funding (Library Collections)
- Master's Incentive Program Proposal
- Online Course Proposals - Cross Campus & Coursera
- Overseeing Deans of Academic Programs

- Silicon Valley Academic Plan Review
- UCSC Faculty Mentoring Program
- Campus WASC Accreditation Review

'External' Review of Administrative Divisions

In recent years, the campus has fostered a practice of reviewing administrative divisions and/or units at a rate of approximately one per year. These reviews follow a protocol similar to that for reviews of academic departments, featuring a self-study, review committee findings, constituency review which includes Senate Committees, and a chance for the division to comment and close on the findings. Recent reviews which provided detailed and useful data were completed for Information Technology Services and Office of Research. Unfortunately, no such review was carried out in 2013-14. CPB strongly urges that the administration re-start this practice, and create a prioritized schedule for the review of our campus administrative divisions. This practice is especially important in the emerging environment of stabilizing budgets.

Systemwide Issues

CPB responded, along with other relevant Senate committees, to the following issues:

- Revisions to the Compendium
- Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy Proposal
- Bylaw 55 Proposed Revisions

Continuing Issues for CPB 2014-15

Next year should be as productive as 2013-14. Beyond continuing efforts with enrollment planning (especially international and domestic non-resident students), CPB anticipates engaging with the administration's major academic planning exercise. We expect the exercise to include faculty recruitment plans that integrate the divisional, cluster, and FIGH processes. The top priority should remain building the campus' overall profile in research and teaching, but we hope to see more attention paid to departmental teaching loads.

CPB also anticipates engaging with the administration as it reworks the existing model for allocating funds to the academic divisions to support instruction and research. Several deans want to break the tight link between new FTE slots and I&R funding increments, but the appropriate alternative model is not yet clear.

As the campus adapts to the new steady-state budget environment, CPB would like to participate in an in-depth rotating annual review of important segments of the campus budget. The idea is to address the budget proactively and avoid responding only to emergency situations or proscriptive budget cuts.

One budget segment we have in mind for next year is the recharge system. CPB has been concerned about recharges for several years, see for example our 2012-13 annual report (http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cpb-committee-on-planning-and-budget/minutes-agendas/12_13cpb_ar.pdf). Next year we hope to renew our focus, probably starting with Information User Charges (IU) which have caused seemingly unwarranted difficulties at least to Academic Divisions. The effort to understand and reallocate Divisional resources should provide an opportunity to re-address IU. More generally, CPB is concerned that in some areas recharges

may create excessive workload for staff that we can no longer afford. We will seek ways to streamline and realign the recharge system with the new budgetary environment.

Another segment of the campus budget we hope to deal with next year concerns new housing and capital planning. Significant growth in faculty and graduate students, together with modest growth in the undergraduate population will require new construction, but the whole process seems a bit rusty after years of retrenchment, and needs a fresh look. We need to understand how our construction costs compare to those in private industry and to those of other campuses, and how we can get better value for our investments in physical capital.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Zsuzsanna Abrams

Sue Carter

E.G. Crichton

Susan Harding

Suresh Lodha

Eric Porter

Abel Rodriguez

Susan Schwartz

Don Brenneis, *ex officio*

Joseph Konopelski, *ex officio*

Dan Friedman, Chair

Whitney DeVos, GSA

Guillermo Rogel, Student Rep.

APPENDIX A

HOW CPB FUNCTIONS

CPB consists of ten regular members (one of whom serves as Chair), including two *ex officio* members, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate. All members are selected by the Committee on Committees (COC) and are subject to Senate approval. CPB brings a balance of perspectives to campus issues by including members from each academic division. CPB also had a graduate student representative and places for two undergraduate student representatives to sit with the committee throughout the year. Members represent CPB on other academic and administrative committees and share the tasks of writing and editing documents. The duties of the Chair include setting meeting agendas, facilitating meetings, assigning tasks to CPB members for preparing reports and written responses, meeting commitments in terms of timely response to consultation, signing CPB documents and attending UCPB. All CPB letters and reports, unless otherwise noted, represent the consensus opinion of CPB.

APPENDIX B

SUMMER SESSION REPORT

The CPB Subcommittee on Summer Session examined how Summer Session might meet the EVC's twin goals of its helping to improve graduation and retention rates and doubling enrollments by 2021. We consulted with VPDUE Richard Hughey, Summer Session Director Monica Parikh, Faculty Advisor to the EVC Jaye Padgett, CPB colleagues, and staff from Planning and Budget and the Faculty Senate. We also reviewed VPDUE Hughey's April 2014, draft report, "Summer Session 2015: Additional Strategies for Growth"; information from the Class Availability Student Survey (2014) pertaining to Summer Session, and additional documents produced by Planning and Budget and Summer Session.

UCSC undergraduates make up 90% of Summer Session students. Undergraduates responding to the recent CLASS survey cited the following as primary reasons for taking summer session classes:

- To take major classes (94%)
- To graduate on time or sooner (89%)
- To take GE courses (58%)
- To participate in an internship/field study (53%)
- To take an elective (49%)
- To participate in an academic summer program (42%)
- To remain in the area because of my job (40%)

Despite such interest, UCSC Summer Session is under-enrolled relative to other UC campuses, enrolling about 15% of FWS average enrollments versus the other UCs, which enroll between 22% and 27%. Moreover, enrollments have been declining steadily since 2010.

Students responding to the CLASS survey emphasized the high cost of summer session and summer housing as well as the limited financial aid available as major reasons they do not take summer courses here. Anecdotal information suggests we're at a disadvantage because Santa Cruz is small and proportionally fewer of our students live here than, say, in LA, San Diego, or the Bay Area. We've also learned of student dissatisfaction with the course offerings during Summer Session and with the relatively small percentage of regular faculty found in Summer Session classrooms. In 2013, for example, only 16% of instructors of Summer Session classes were regular faculty.

Changes underway to meet the EVC's goals include:

- Director Parikh is making a wide range of low-cost reforms aimed at serving both campus goals (for example, in curriculum planning and content; communication with other units and students; TA allocations; and by increasing impacted courses offered).
- In 2014, Summer Session enrollments will, for the first time, be added to AY enrollments in determining TA allocations for the academic year, and the Central Administration will distribute 48-60 new TAs to Divisions in 2014 and 2015. This will motivate Departments to offer more large courses in Summer, assuming the TAs are distributed to Departments in proportion to their Summer enrollments.
- Financial aid will be increased somewhat to a limited number of high-need students in 2014.

These changes promise to improve the quality of Summer Session and seem likely to increase enrollments. Departments have offered more courses for 2014, and preliminary figures suggest modest growth in student headcount and numbers of units they are taking on average. Such growth, however, is not on track with the ambitious enrollment goals proposed by the EVC, and more can be done to link summer session to the campus's academic mission and, particularly, to the goals of improving time to degree and retention.

We think more aggressive reforms (some of which are under consideration by Jaye Padgett, VPDUE Hughey, Summer Session, and Planning & Budget, and all of which require funding of some sort) are needed to make real progress. They include:

- Putting a 15-unit cap on tuition paid for Summer Session across both sessions. The fact that the summer program is broken into two sessions for purposes of the cap (ie, students might end up paying for 20-25 units over the two sessions rather than for a "cap" of 15 for both sessions) is likely a major factor in our relatively low enrollments/units taken. Summer Session and Undergraduate Education are also considering various plans for offering discounts for units taken above an even lower cap. The "pay for 12" plan discussed in the VPDUE's draft report seems to be the variant with the most potential. Although it would cut the "margin of profit" for the Center, it might make up for that by substantially increasing enrollments and making Summer Session a livelier and more attractive option. We strongly recommend that the VPDUE and Planning and Budget collaborate to put such an arrangement in place for 2015.
- Fast-track pathways for high-impact majors using Summer Session and enabling students to graduate a year earlier. Data from the CLASS survey suggest that there is significant interest in 3-year tracks. Almost half (44%) of four-year students said they "would be" interested in pursuing a fast track version of their major and 40% said they "might be

interested.” 92% of current freshmen said they would or might be interested in pursuing a fast track version of their major. VPDUE Hughey and Director Parikh both seem to favor moving forward by piloting fast tracks in two or three high impact majors. We urge them to begin working on this immediately, perhaps in coordination with Faculty Advisor Padgett, who has expressed interest in this approach to improving time to degree. Piloting fast tracks will require, 1. administrative commitments and financial incentives for departments, including extra staffing during summer, and 2. incentives for more faculty to teach during summer.

- Removing the various ways Summer Session is under-resourced or disadvantaged relative to AY quarters, for example: equalize financial aid available with AY quarter aid; increase on-campus housing; enable regular faculty to count Summer Session teaching as part of their AY workload (instead of additional 1/9th salary); equalize Summer TA and GSI with AY pay (it's 77-80% now); increase rebates to Departments for Summer Session teaching; incentivize all Departments to think about Summer Session more actively in their AY curriculum planning. Removing these impediments will require better coordination among various groups on campus. Toward that end, we recommend that Director Parikh continue to convene a Summer Session Strategy Group (adding faculty/Division, who may serve as liaisons during the year) to review progress and make plans for the following year, and that she work with the VPDUE and Planning and Budget on a detailed 8 year plan that works toward the EVC's goals and improving Summer Session's contribution to UCSC academic mission.
- Increasing Summer Session staff. None of these aggressive reforms can be undertaken without more robust staffing of the Summer Session office. Director Parikh has only had one full-time staff member at her disposal, and that person has recently resigned. We have learned that the VPDUE has considered increasing Summer Session staff to three full-time positions. If he has not already undertaken this step, we recommend that he do so immediately.

While the EVC has set a target of doubling enrollment in eight years, we think that goal is unrealistic and likely counterproductive. We recommend focusing attention on reforms that serve Summer Session students and improve its academic mission. As these reforms are carried out, we may see a more plausible rate of growth and perhaps some, though certainly not all, of the budgetary benefits envisioned by the more aggressive growth estimates.

APPENDIX C

INTERNATIONAL MEMOS

The CPB was encouraged to see progress on plans for campus internationalization, and we are happy to respond to your request quick feedback on the interim draft report. To that end, the following comments recap some of the key issues you raised in that report and in your consultation, and include our suggestions and follow-up questions.

1. We agree that (a) internationalization of the campus is an important goal in its own right, and (b) non-resident growth targets (for budgetary reasons) can only be achieved by rapid internationalization of campus.

- CPB continues to emphasize the need for appropriate support structures for international students. The revenue they do and can bring in must be used in part for establishing adequate resources for them in terms of pre- and post-admissions outreach, recruitment, advising, curricular supplements (e.g., L2 writing and language courses, possibly targeted core courses, etc.), amongst others.
 - To this end, CPB would like to receive updates regarding the current cohort's grades in writing and mainstream courses as soon as fall grades are available, and regular updates on hiring staff in crucial support positions (e.g., in the International Education Office).
 - CPB also feels that "early alert" mechanisms need to be established to monitor the performance of international students in their courses. Waiting until grades are available at the end of the quarter to make decisions and intervene appears to the committee to be a recipe for disaster.
2. It is a useful exercise to ponder internationalization impacts on UCSC's emerging identity: how we think of ourselves as an international campus.
- Updates on international efforts should include the following: What outreach is being made to spread the UCSC brand overseas, which is crucial for attracting excellent international applicants? What internal inquiries are being made to ensure that effort is supported by all stakeholders on campus (students, faculty, staff, alumni, etc.)?
 - Since Dr. Anuradha Luther Maitra's position is limited to a two-year term, we would like to know how faculty will be involved in the recruitment and program-building process, to ensure the program's continuity, ergo viability.
3. We were pleased to hear the developments in Summer Session that will provide essential scaffolding for international students, such as courses, and an orientation program more integrated with both the students' and UCSC's needs.
- We would like to hear more details about the way resources will be allocated for grants and return-to-departments from non-resident tuition (you mentioned 2%), for study abroad (5%) and for prospective student recruitment (10%). Specifically, we'd like to know more about how these percentages were determined and what measures will be used to assess whether these are the most effective uses of these funds.
4. CPB remains quite concerned about leadership positions for internationalization, specifically, that roles are currently unclearly distributed among various individuals, with apparently limited communication between them and other stakeholders (e.g., college advisors, provosts, IEO staff, etc.).
- We support your goal of appointing one person with a 100% appointment. Some committee members felt that your proposal to split the appointment with 75% attention to inbound students, and 25% to outbound students may make it difficult for either issue to receive adequate attention. At the same time, some committee members are concerned that establishing this position so early at this level may reduce flexibility as we learn more about campus needs. Perhaps this structure will need to be re-evaluated a year or so down the line in terms of long-term effectiveness.

- Near term, we would like to see the job description for the head of internationalization (title TBD) as soon as it is available. It is essential that that this person has enough authority to communicate and implement important steps in internationalization across the entire campus.
 - We would like to see regular, physical meetings between key stakeholders to make the internationalization process transparent and as smooth as possible, especially over the next year or two. At the very least, there should be regular meetings for admissions, faculty who do recruiting, pertinent departments, the VPDUE's office, and perhaps SEC representatives, as we deal with (and learn from) the first cohort that is already here and work on recruiting the next cohort. Effective communication is key to success.
5. The committee agrees that developing a “go-to office” for international students (and possibly for faculty and staff information about international students) is a key next step. The Senate should be consulted in the process of design and implementation:
- This location should have enough staff resources to provide thorough information to students (e.g., about visas, course-work, advising, etc.) and a staff sensitive enough and trained to deal with international students' concerns.
 - The office must also have authority and resources, as well as provide a social “home” for international students. This is crucial for making international students feel safe. This location should be functional by the arrival of next year's cohort at the latest.
6. We ask that the VPDUE's office continue to examine what programs may have the biggest impact on increasing our international student population. How can recruitment be made more effective? How can existing connections with overseas programs be made stronger and new ones be created? What communication plans will be the most attractive and competitive for attracting top-notch international students?
- CPB feels that there should be an individual responsible for communications in the Office of Admissions to work specifically with international student populations. This position should be expected to work closely with the head of internationalization as well.
 - We ask that the Ambassador Fellowship Program (draft) be examined for potential use with undergraduate students (in addition to or as an alternate to graduate students).
 - The amount and distribution of scholarships to international students needs to be revisited to ensure that the \$4,000/\$6,000 amounts are the most effective at recruiting and retaining international students. CPB would like to know more about how this effectiveness is measured and what changes are considered as data becomes available. In particular, the committee feels that a flexible scheme for financial aid to international students should be developed to eventually replace the current uniform grants.

The Committee on Planning & Budget (CPB) thanks Vice Provost & Dean of Undergraduate Education Hughey for circulating the *Proposal for Support of International Student Growth and Campus Globalization* (December 20, 2013), and the associated job description for an Associate Vice Provost of International Education. We heartily agree with the goals stated in the report title and elsewhere in the report, but respectfully disagree with the approach these documents take to confronting our challenges.

We write to you now (with copy to CP/EVC Galloway) because the issues concerning international education are campus-wide and interconnected, and are not fully contained within the purview of the Undergraduate Education division. We are recommending a different course than that outlined in the documents circulated by the VPDUE, a course that we believe will bring greater success at lower cost.

The current proposal and job description lack two indispensable ingredients: a clear description of what a successful international operation would look like at UCSC five years from now, and an early infusion of expertise to bring coherence in dealing with our multiple challenges. So far the campus response to our challenges has mainly been asking staff whose primary responsibilities lie elsewhere to work with each other on an ad hoc basis. We see the same approach implicit in the current documents. Specifically,

1. The job description for an AVP of International Education keeps the current administrative structure intact, and expands an existing position reporting to the VPDUE from 50% to 100% time. The AVP would have responsibility for outbound undergraduates (EAP) as well as incoming undergraduates, and would connect to Admissions only through overworked officers higher on the organization chart. The AVP would not have the mandate to work with dimensions of campus globalization beyond undergraduate education, such as building pipelines that include graduate student and research components. It seems to us that this job configuration will do little to bring coherence to our internationalization efforts.
2. CPB recommends, by contrast, that the next international officer hired be placed higher in the administrative structure, perhaps as a Vice Provost, and have primary responsibility for building our international programs for undergraduates, graduate students and faculty. The point is that our needs are interconnected and extend beyond the scope of the Undergraduate Education division. Our recommendation is consistent with that in the recent consulting report by Ian Little. More importantly, many other campuses have mounted successful international programs in recent years and, to the best of our knowledge, all of them have a campus-wide chief international officer (CIO) with broad responsibilities and professional expertise. We attach typical job descriptions as an appendix to this memo.
3. To elaborate on the last point, we believe that it is essential that the CIO address immediate and ongoing issues in communication and collaboration in and beyond the Undergraduate Education Division. The CIO must handle the logistical (e.g. legal and pipelines) issues and implementation. The proposed AVP position satisfies neither of these roles, and might over-complicate the process of implementing this preferred structure in the future.

4. The proposed AVP position continues to conflate EAP (abroad) roles and responsibilities with those of international recruitment and partnerships, which CPB views as non-aligned goals for one position to manage without clearer articulation of the other support positions involved.
5. The CIO needs to have a clear mandate for Senate collaboration and interaction. The current AVP job description includes no such mandate.
6. Plans must be clearly articulated for establishing and maintaining diverse international student pipelines. Experience here and elsewhere shows that such pipelines stabilize enrollment growth and greatly improve international student success at all levels. The VPDUE report implicitly assigns pipeline responsibility to the Special Advisor to the Chancellor position, under the unlikely assumption that that position will be in place for up to 10 years. Although the Special Advisor may help initiate pipelines and international partnerships near term, it seems evident that other administrative structures will be necessary for maintaining them even in the medium term.
7. We would like to see a clear analysis of how the lower level hires within UE and the EAP office will be handling the administrative work and provide support for the VP/AVP. This is a key concern given the difficulties in communications within the current structures.
8. It is essential that physical space be purposed as a hub for international students, faculty, and staff. This area will provide the scaffolding of essential community for this population, and perhaps be proximate with support services. This recommendation also is clearly articulated in the consultant report, but seems not to have been heeded.
9. We do not yet have a clear business plan. Surely some direct return of resources from non-resident tuition (NRT) to international operations is reasonable. The current proposal calls for certain percentages of NRT to be plowed back in specific ways. We await the analysis of the funding formula from Planning and Budget and understand that you cannot make decisions without it, but in the meantime we have two general points to make.
 - b. Some initial investment is required up front. At present, this investment is scattershot, with many individuals asked to acquire bits and pieces of international expertise, and to coordinate their efforts, at the cost of taking time away from their regular tasks. Retention and transmission of expertise is problematic, further raising implicit costs. Explicit expenditure on a single individual with the necessary expertise would greatly reduce these costs, and save money in the long run and perhaps even (with full accounting for implicit costs) in the short run.
 - c. As NRT revenues expand, a decreasing fraction of them will be needed for operations.

For the last several years, CPB has been discussing issues regarding non-resident enrollment and internationalization with increasing frequency and urgency. We know that the VPDUE and other leaders in the administration take these matters seriously and we respect their thinking. Nevertheless, the discussions within CPB have led to a strong consensus opinion that:

- A. We have an immediate need for a plan of the desired administrative structure when international enrollments approach steady state numbers and other aspects of globalization begin to mature, perhaps five years from now. In other words, we need to know now where we are headed, and let that guide our immediate actions.
- B. The next filled administrative position must function to coordinate all campus efforts, and bring expertise across the many areas involved. Therefore we recommend giving priority to a professional (career) position that will become part of a future sustainable international structure, rather than to the AVP position as presently defined. Again, to clarify the difference, we attach several sample job descriptions we harvested online.

APPENDIX D

VISION FOR UC SANTA CRUZ IN SILICON VALLEY

As the closest UC campus to Silicon Valley, UC Santa Cruz should serve its population and utilize its vast expertise, facilities and innovative spirit to enhance our research, teaching, and service mission. A physical presence in Silicon Valley will bring closer collaborations between UCSC faculty and students with Silicon Valley professionals and researchers. For students living in the Bay Area, it provides research and training opportunities that are better balanced with their work and family demands. Due to Silicon Valley's global reputation, UC Santa Cruz's physical presence in Silicon Valley will increase our international and regional profile, helping to attract additional non-resident and summer school students. Finally, a physical graduate campus in Silicon Valley will allow us to pursue new growth opportunities in research and instruction that are currently limited (by the LRDP) to 19,500 on-campus student FTE and the lack of affordable housing in Santa Cruz.

Our research mission in Silicon Valley will focus on areas that benefit from access to Silicon Valley expertise, instrumentation, technology, and facilities provided by industry and government agencies. These areas of research could include: high performance computer, software, semiconductor, and energy technologies; research in aeronautics, space technology, geology, oceanic, and atmospheric science in collaboration with government agencies (NASA Ames, USGS Menlo Park, NOAA); research that utilizes government-run synchrotron and materials facilities (LCLS, SSRL, SLAC, MACS at NASA Ames, Stanford Nanofabrication Facility); and research and creative activity that takes advantage of the vast cultural and ethnic diversity, international communities, urban infrastructure, museums, libraries, and performing art venues available in Silicon Valley.

Our teaching mission in Silicon Valley will complement our research mission, and include professional masters and doctoral programs that may uniquely serve Silicon Valley or be co-offered with a main campus program, academic masters and Ph.D. programs that are primarily based on the main campus but involve internship or research components in Silicon Valley, internship and practical training for upper division undergraduates from the main campus, and continuing education opportunities for Silicon Valley professionals in collaboration with UC

Santa Cruz Extension. Organized internship and collaborative programs with Silicon Valley industry and government organizations will open up opportunities for our students for on-the-job education, learning of new skills, and financial support.

Our service mission in Silicon Valley will align with our research and teaching mission and enable our faculty to apply their expertise for the good of the local communities, such as assisting with sustainable planning for urban cities, providing expertise for policy decisions involving education and the environment, and serving the needs of diverse communities in Silicon Valley. Working more closely with the entrepreneurial community in Silicon Valley will provide valuable resources and experience that will benefit entrepreneurship on the main campus and result in job creation in Silicon Valley, Santa Cruz and Central Coast enabled by UC Santa Cruz innovation.