Committee on Planning and Budget
Annual Report, 2017-18

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) worked on a wide range of issues this year, including (a) the campus Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) process; (b) divisional faculty FTE and Competitive Target of Excellence (CTOE) requests; (c) the BSOE Reshaping proposal; (d) the Academic Literacy Curriculum review, and (e) graduate growth initiatives. In addition, the committee continued to address planning issues, including Silicon Valley programs, capacity planning, capital planning, and the use of academic and student data, while also engaging with the administration as CPB developed and refined its guidelines for review of second hire and CAPM 101.000 waiver of open recruitment requests. The report also documents the committee’s ongoing requests for better organized financial information from the Office of Planning and Budget and CPB’s consultation process in the context of shared governance principles. Extensive routine business for the committee included review of new degree program proposals, participation in external reviews of departments, and review of off-cycle and waiver of open recruitment FTE requests. A detailed summary of CPB’s work in 2017-18, as well as a list of anticipated issues for 2018-19, is provided below.

Strategic Academic Planning
In previous years, CPB identified the lack of a Strategic Academic Plan as the most critical issue facing our campus, and the committee invested substantial effort advocating for the development of such a plan. Since her arrival at UCSC, CP/EVC Marlene Tromp has strongly supported the development of a Strategic Academic Plan (SAP), identifying such planning as one of her top priorities. In the fall, she set out an ambitious timeline for completing a plan before the start of the 2018-2019 academic year, and CPB was engaged throughout the year with the SAP process. The committee met directly with CP/EVC Tromp and then AVPAA Berger, who was overseeing the SAP process. Like other Senate committees, CPB provided feedback to the SAP team through the Academic Senate Chair on several aspects of the SAP, including structural barriers, a prioritization survey, resource allocation questions, the themed academic working group proposals, and the draft SAP and Implementation Playbook.

Structural barriers
In December 2017, the committee reviewed a list of structural barriers to research and teaching that were identified through information collected by Entangled Solutions, the consulting firm retained by the campus to assist in the SAP process. Barriers to interdepartmental and interdivisional collaborations, and how these affect teaching and research activities, were a major focus of CPB’s discussions. CPB identified difficulties in facilitating team teaching, the divisional “ownership” of research space, and the barriers to hiring across departments or divisions as areas that will need to be addressed if the campus wishes to promote collaborative research and teaching.

Barriers that hinder the flexible allocation of resources to meet shifting student interests also limit our ability to serve students, creating imbalances between the distribution of students across programs and the distribution of instructional resources. The absence of a campus
enrollment management system makes the development of such imbalances more likely, and the backward-looking mechanism for setting temporary academic staffing (TAS) allocations, while facilitating planning, reduces the flexibility to move instructional capacity quickly to areas of rapid student growth.

Prioritization Survey and Campus Landscape Analysis
Entangled Solutions provided the results of the SAP Assessment Criteria Prioritization Survey and Campus Landscape Findings and these results were reviewed by CPB in April. CPB members felt the survey results were likely to be heavily affected by the framing of the factors respondents were asked to prioritize. Concerns were expressed about the way in which the responses of different populations of respondents (faculty, staff, students) were mixed together, especially when the objective was to establish potential research areas that would define UCSC. Despite these problems, CPB was struck by some of the data the survey revealed, particularly the apparent faculty mistrust of the administration, and the sharply different perspectives held by faculty in Arts and Humanities, on one hand, and Engineering, on the other. This mistrust emphasizes the importance of securing broad faculty support for the strategic directions that emerge from the SAP.

Resource Allocation Issues
CPB was asked to provide input on resource allocation guidelines by AVPAA Berger. The committee’s discussion highlighted the need for integrated campus financial, staffing, and enrollment information provided in a format amenable to scenario analysis. The absence of such information is a barrier to planning, and CPB has been engaged with VCPB Peggy Delaney and Director Kimberly Register of the Office of Planning and Budget to develop budget-related data that can aid decision making. This activity is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Many of the questions posed by AVPAA Berger were, in the opinion of CPB, premature in the sense that the answers required more clarity on the research themes to emerge from the SAP process. The nature of those themes would influence the extent of the investment in faculty, staff, and/or space necessary to pursue successfully the research and educational areas aligned with the themes. However, CPB reiterated its support for introducing a mechanism that returns to the center some fraction of faculty FTE provisions generated by separations. Doing so will provide greater flexibility to employ resources strategically in advancing our research and teaching missions.

Themed Academic Working Groups
The SAP process solicited broad input from faculty on potential research areas in a process that led to the formation of twenty-eight Themed Academic Working Groups (TAWGS), each of which submitted a short proposal outlining its objectives and resource needs, and any barriers to achieving its objectives. Each group consisted of faculty spanning several departments and often several academic divisions. Senate committees were asked to rank the TAWG proposals.

In its evaluation of the TAWGs, CPB stressed that identifying a small set of projects from among the twenty-eight proposals does not represent a Strategic Academic Plan (CPB to Senate Chair 5/21/18). The SAP, and the themes identified in it, should guide the choice of TAWGs to
fund initially. However, CPB felt that the number of cross-departmental, cross-divisional ideas that emerged from the TAWGs were extremely helpful in serving to define potential SAP themes. CPB noted several themes that were represented by multiple TAWGs.

Draft SAP and Implementation Playbook

In mid-July, CPB and other Senate committees received the draft SAP and Implementation Playbook.1 This document sketched out the SAP’s three academic priority areas and provided five design principles, together with goals meant to translate these design principles into reachable aspirations, and a five-year menu of initiatives designed to deal with campus structural barriers and enable us to reach those goals. It also identified a list of ten structural barriers that would be prioritized for reduction. Members of the committee held one meeting in August to discuss the draft SAP and Playbook.

CPB found the draft SAP and Implementation Playbook seriously inadequate as a document meant to express UCSC’s academic priorities in the immediate future and to guide decisions about resource allocations for research and teaching, including plans for hiring faculty. Rather than building on the campus-wide sense of energy and intellectual excitement that was generated by the TAWG process, committee members participating in the discussion found that the draft SAP confused design principles, goals, and objectives, failed to articulate the intellectual rationale for the chosen academic priority areas, and presented a long list of initiatives unconnected to the academic priority areas and that often seemed designed to give the appearance of achieving goals and removing barriers rather than actually doing so. Furthermore, the draft plan offered no guidelines for the resource allocation decisions that will be central to achieving campus goals, and issues of graduate education were notably absent, even though graduate growth, particularly enrollment at the Ph.D. level, has helped guide resource allocations and been a campus goal for the past several years.

In a detailed response to the draft, the committee offered six specific recommendations, listed below, meant to ensure a final SAP and a set of implementation procedures that will serve to guide and inspire the campus.

Recommendation 1: CPB recommends realignment among the categories of design principles, goals, initiatives, and outcomes. The design principles are the campus goals--namely, improving the central intellectual, creative, and educational work of the institution; the goals stated in the draft are superfluous and should be dropped.

This recommendation responds to a significant misalignment among the design principles, goals, initiatives, and outcomes. Most serious, we found that the SAP offered “goals” that redefined design principles focused on creation of new knowledge through research and teaching into lesser ambitions focusing on assessment and reputation. Consequently, “outcomes” were tied to achieving these lesser goals, diminishing the aims of the SAP and, CPB members feared, potentially compromising the buy-in of the UCSC community, especially faculty.

1 A link to the draft plan can be found at https://cpevc.ucsc.edu/academic-plan/index.html.
Recommendation 2: The rationale for the choice of *Earth Futures*, *Justice in a Changing World*, and *Digital Interventions* as the three campus academic priority areas needs to be explained to the campus in the SAP itself. A clear description of what each area will include and why these areas were selected must be articulated in order to help the campus community understand the historic strengths that feed these areas as well as our capacity to continue to generate high-impact research as we move forward.

The draft SAP’s descriptions of the three priority areas are brief and generic, and do not explain their conceptual range nor link them to specific TAWGs.

Recommendation 3: The SAP must articulate how the ten barriers selected to be addressed in the first year are related to promoting progress toward the Design Principle goals and the academic priority areas. While recognizing that the Implementation Working Group (IWG) established by the CP/EVC will further prioritize the ten barriers, the SAP needs to explain why these ten barriers are the most important ones to address initially.

Recommendation 4: Use the opportunity of the SAP to develop a budgetary framework that promotes transparency, facilitates decision making, reduces imbalances between the distributions of students and instructional capacity, and positions the campus to respond to new, emerging areas of intellectual excitement, potentially by allowing some separations to return to the Center.

CPB has articulated this recommendation both within and beyond its responses to various stages of the SAP process. A clear budgetary framework and method for communicating budgetary priorities is perhaps the most consistent ongoing need for the future work of strategic planning.

Recommendation 5: Each Design Principle (goal) should be associated with specific initiatives to be done in year 1, together with an articulation of how results in year 1 will be built upon in years 2 through 5. Initiatives should be actionable and linked directly toward achieving goals. The plan needs to show how the campus will make meaningful progress in achieving its goals (Design Principles).

Recommendation 6: For each academic priority area, the faculty leaders from the relevant TAWGs should help define and prioritize the menu of initiatives that will form part of the SAP implementation plan to ensure that the campus is clearly informed of the resource and infrastructure needs, as well as the barriers that must be removed, to realize success in each area. This process should also define the accountability measures that will guide assessment and allocation of future resources to the priority areas.

Under the direction of VPAA Herbie Lee, the administration plans to produce a revised SAP once Senate feedback on the draft has been received in September. Our hope is that the final version of the SAP will address the concerns raised by CPB members and other Senate committees and that it will provide the rationale for and a clearer definition of the academic priority areas as well as a better mapping between the proposed initiatives to be undertaken over the next five years and achieving progress on the five campus goals identified in the draft plan: (1) driving research and creative work that transforms our world; (2) creating enriching experiential learning and research opportunities for students; (3) engaging and supporting a
diverse faculty, staff, and student body; (4) supporting generative interdisciplinary connections in research and teaching; and (5) expanding excellence and innovation in areas distinctive to UC Santa Cruz, such as social justice, diversity and sustainability.

**Faculty FTE and CTOE Review**

CPB devoted significant effort this year to faculty FTE and recruitment planning, offering advice to the CP/EVC on the evaluation of the divisional proposals.

Faculty FTE allocation is one of the most important planning exercises of the year and transparency in the decision-making process is extremely important in an institution with shared governance. CPB believes that the process has been improving, and the clear articulation of campus goals and the establishment of accountability metrics have all been positive steps. Over the last three years, CPB has worked in collaboration with VCPB Delaney and the Office of Planning and Budget to develop quantitative and qualitative accountability metrics that can be used to help the campus evaluate progress towards its goals and guide resource allocation. If these metrics are going to be taken seriously by the Departments and Divisions, it is important that the rationale behind any resource allocation be clearly and explicitly tied to them.

CPB discussed the possibility of recommending one major change to the FTE allocation process. In our discussions with the deans it became clear that it would be beneficial for the campus to provide departments and divisions with additional flexibility to make multiple, simultaneous offers to fill a single position. Implementing such an approach is particularly important in disciplines where hiring is extremely competitive, as it would help minimize the number of failed searches. Implementing this recommendation would likely require that we move into a multi-year planning system that more clearly separates recruitment authorizations from approvals of budgetary increments, and a more robust tracking mechanism that enables the campus to adjust future hiring plans when multiple offers are accepted.

The Faculty Recruitment Call for 2018-2019 occurred in the midst of the campus’s SAP process. To allow the SAP to inform the future hiring and allocation of new FTEs, this year’s process represented a departure from that of previous years. Deans were directed to submit recruitment authorization requests using only existing, divisionally-held open provisions. Separately, deans were invited to nominate up to three “nationally/internationally recognized” candidates as “transformative Target of Excellence” (Competitive Target of Excellence or CTOE) hires.

CPB reviewed both the FTE requests to fill divisionally open provisions and the CTOE requests. In addition, the committee reviewed the vision statements and divisional plans submitted by each dean and met with each dean to discuss their requests, their divisional plans, and their CTOE requests. The Chairs of Graduate Council (GC) and the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) participated in our consultations with the deans and later met with CPB to provide their perspectives on the pros and cons of the divisional plans and the proposed CTOEs. We are grateful for their participation, and we incorporated their feedback in our evaluations of the requests and our ultimate recommendations. We also met regularly with CP/EVC Marlene Tromp and Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Peggy Delaney to discuss the proposals. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of all those who took the time to consult with us.
In its evaluation of faculty FTE requests, CPB kept in mind the priorities that the CP/EVC laid out in the Faculty Recruitment Call to the Deans: “1. Enhancing the research profile of the campus by supporting significant doctoral or MFA growth in existing programs or supporting new programs with high growth potential,” “2. Improving the educational experience of undergraduate students,” and “3. Increasing faculty diversity, to create a richly varied and robust research profile and pedagogical offerings.”

With no new centrally funded faculty FTEs to be allocated outside of the CTOE process this year, weighing trade-offs across divisions was not directly relevant. This meant that CPB’s discussion focused on the contributions of the proposed hires to the three priorities and their consistency with the divisional visions as articulated in the submissions. In addition, CPB generally looked favorably on requests that, in addition to contributing to the three campus priorities, created synergies across departmental or divisional boundaries.

**BSOE Reshaping**

In the spring, CPB reviewed the Baskin School of Engineering Reshaping proposal, which aims to reorganize the departmental structure of the School to enhance its research and teaching missions. The proposal represented a significant undertaking and CPB was supportive of the project’s overarching goal to create organizational structures that best support the university’s mission. We discussed the disestablishment of Technology Management and discontinuance of its graduate programs, but we primarily focused on the fate of the Applied Mathematics and Statistics (AMS) department and its current faculty, and on the merger of Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Electrical Engineering into two larger departments.

One major change envisioned by the proposal was the merger of Computer Science, Computer Engineering, and Electrical Engineering into two larger departments of Computer Science & Engineering (CSE) and Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE). CPB felt that the intellectual rationale for this new structure was reasonable, but also noted uncertainties in whether this restructuring would be resource neutral beyond the short term. The disestablishment of departments, whether CS/CE/EE or AMS, and the transfer of faculty may prompt some faculty to request transfers to other divisions at UCSC or even choose to separate from the School. In those cases, there may be implications for space and/or curricular planning, as well as financial costs (e.g. start-up funds) involved in hiring faculty to replace faculty who separated.

In the reshaping proposal, the AMS department was slated for disestablishment, with faculty in the applied mathematics (AM) fields being transferred to a new ECE department and faculty in the statistics fields forming a new department of Statistics. CPB disagreed with both of these proposals and, furthermore, disagreed with the rationale given for differential treatment of the AM group and Statistics group. Only the Statistics group was viewed in the proposal as having critical mass to form a department, but CPB noted that both groups had the same number of faculty (with the AM group actually being larger after accounting for administrative leave). Both groups face challenges in forming stand-alone departments, curriculum and resource related in the case of AM, and governance and intellectual breadth related in the case of Statistics. However, CPB felt that, in the long term, both an AM department and a Statistics department would be assets to the BSOE and the campus, although requiring additional resources for viability. That said, we also felt that neither group was prepared to immediately form a
department, and our preferred solution was for AM and Statistics both to exist as subject matter units (“an academic unit that administers program faculty, who in turn provide an array of courses that may or may not lead to a degree”) until they could demonstrate readiness to form departments. Regardless, CPB strongly felt that subsuming the AM faculty into ECE would be a mistake.

CPB was pleased that the CP/EVC decided to treat the AM and Statistics faculty in a parallel fashion although she did not adopt CPB’s suggestion of initially creating “subject matter units.” Instead, the CP/EVC approved the establishment of an Applied Mathematics department (AM) and a Statistics department (STAT). Both AM and STAT will undergo internal reviews during 2020-21 to assess their viability.

The reshaping process, when complete, may necessitate alterations to divisional hiring plans. The out-years of current divisional plans justified placement of FTEs into current departments, most of which will no longer exist. Establishment of new departments with different faculty configuration may also reveal new priority areas for hiring. CPB looks forward to consulting with the Engineering dean about future hiring directions, and to working with the campus administration to ensure successful execution of the reshaping process.

**Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC)**

In 2016-2017, CPB commented on separate proposals from the College Provosts and the Writing Program for revising the first-year curriculum. This year, committee members were pleased to see a joint proposal from the College Provosts and the Writing Program, and the efforts each put into developing an integrated first-year literacy curriculum was greatly appreciated. CPB devoted considerable time during the fall evaluating the Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC) proposal (with members Elizabeth Abrams and Jie Qing recused). Given CEP’s plenary authority over the curriculum, CPB’s focus was on the resource implications of the ALC proposal.

The committee appreciated the assistance of VPAA Lee, VPDUE Hughey, and the Office of Planning and Budget (P&B) in providing information that aided our analysis of the resource implications of the proposal. However, this information was not always provided in a format that made evaluating alternative budget scenarios simple and transparent. Hence, CPB developed its own budgetary framework that allowed the committee to estimate the cost of the ALC proposal and to assess the implications of alternative assumptions about such aspects of the proposal as average class sizes.

The committee advised CEP that the cost of the ALC fell within the budget envelope established by the administration. The budget envelope was useful in ensuring that in the process of developing and reviewing the ALC all participants balanced achieving curricular objectives with the need to keep within available resources. Because the budget analysis is based on a number of different assumptions, it will be important to monitor the ALC’s costs as it is implemented. Three areas were of particular concern to CPB: the distribution of students across pathways, the use of GSIs, and the basic budgeting model for the Writing Program and for the College Core.
Distribution across pathways
The number of classes a student must take to complete the ALC will depend on their placement into a specific pathway. Five pathways are laid out in the proposal; a student placed in pathway A needs to complete only one course (the College Core) to fulfill the ALC, while a student placed in pathway E will need to complete five courses. Costs per student will vary from under $300 for pathway A to almost $2000 for pathway E. The Council of Provosts and the Writing Program have made careful projections of the expected fraction of first-year students into each pathway. It will be important to track actual outcomes relative to these projections. If costs have been underestimated, the campus will need to devote more resources to the ALC; if costs have been overestimated, the budget for ALC should be reduced and redirected to other pressing campus needs.

Use of GSIs
A second area of concern for CPB is the assumption about the use of GSIs that is incorporated into the budget model used to fund the Writing Program. The Humanities Division receives a permanent allocation for the Writing Program based on 3150 budgeted frosh. This allocation is then adjusted (up or down) depending on actual enrollments. However, CPB estimates that under the current budget model the increase in funding for the Writing Program as enrollments rise would fall short of the increase in the program’s actual costs under the ALC, leaving the Humanities Division with a budget shortfall. One reason for this shortfall is that the actual allocation is based on the assumption that 20% of the Writing courses would be taught by GSIs when in fact, only about 7% of the courses are taught by GSIs. While the present model provides an incentive for the Writing Program to increase its use of GSIs, the budget model should reflect a more achievable goal for GSI usage. Of course, while greater use of GSIs reduces costs for the Writing Program, it increases the campus costs of the ALC as a GSI costs more than a Lecturer both in terms of direct costs and indirect costs that arise because those graduate students could be teaching courses in other programs and departments. The budgetary treatment of GSIs illustrates how focusing the campus discussion of ALC’s budget on the direct costs of the College Core and Writing Program does not provide a full picture of the resource implications of the ALC.

Basic budgeting model
CPB’s analysis indicates the ALC will require a shift of resources from the College Core budget to the Writing Program budget. Based on actual section numbers in 2015, 45% were UE/Core funded and 55% Humanities funded. Under the ALC proposal, the split becomes 38% UE/Core, 62% Humanities. Hence, the ALC will require significant reallocation of the overall budget devoted to Core/Writing. This redistribution of funds between UE/Core and Humanities provides an opportunity to revisit the historical, opaque model currently used to fund Core and Writing. Developing a more transparent model would promote clear lines of responsibility and facilitate accountability. The fact that the new proposal provides a sequential, interdependent curriculum of Core and Writing increases the benefits of employing a funding model that facilitates planning across both these central components of the first-year curriculum.

Graduate Growth Initiatives
During the 2017-2018 academic year, CPB provided advice on several graduate growth initiatives. One such initiative was the Centers of Excellence (CoE) proposal put forth by the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice Chancellor for Research. While CPB was
in general supportive of the overall goals of the proposal to increase external funding and the number of graduate students, the committee believed that the revised proposal fell short of making a convincing argument for the requested funds. The main justification for the request was based on the assertion that the five existing centers and institutes on campus bring in ~40% of the current research funds. However, in absence of data on the relative contribution of each center and the source of funds, CPB was unable to evaluate whether these entities serve as good role models for the expected gains, in particular when considering the decreasing federal support in the last several years. Furthermore, an evaluation of alternative uses of the requested funds was not provided, making it difficult for the committee to determine if the CoE represented the best use of significant campus funds, a total of $14M over seven years for a “minimum increment at steady state of at least 40 PhD FTE.” CPB recommended that a revised proposal provide details on the source of campus funds used to support doctoral students. CPB also expressed concerns about the ranges proposed for the seed and center grants; the proposal called for funding 25 one-year seed grants of $10,000 to $75,000 per grant (maximum of $1.875M), and up to 24 center grants of $50,000 to $500,000 (maximum of $12M). CPB recommended that a revised proposal include more realistic minimum and maximum ranges for the two sets of proposals as well as an assessment on how other UC campuses have increased external funding for doctoral enrollment.

CPB was undecided whether the obstacle hindering increased external funding was lack of support for existing fund-seeking efforts by centers, institutes and individual faculty, and recommended that faculty be asked whether they prefer funds be used for improving existing support-seeking efforts or the proposed CoE. CPB was not convinced that the projection of at least 40 additional PhD FTE represents a good return on the proposed $14M investment and pointed out that investing the $14M at 5% interest per year would generate $700,000, thereby enabling the funding of 12-15 doctoral students per year. The committee recommended that a revised proposal make a better case for the effectiveness of the CoE process and that other alternatives be considered as well. Importantly, CPB proposed that any investment in support of the CoE should be delayed until the outcome of the Strategic Academic Plan was clear.

The other two graduate growth initiatives involved central funding of GSI benefits, and supplementary TA-ships for large graduate courses. While CPB supported the goals of these initiatives, the committee believes that they are likely to have an incremental rather than transformative effect on increasing graduate enrollment. The main concern of CPB with both proposals was the lack of identification of funding sources for the initiatives. If the funding is reallocated from existing programs, it is unclear whether the new graduate support outweighs the use of the funds for existing programs. In the proposal, Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds were proposed as a possible funding source, but this could potentially have a negative effect on undergraduate education. In this context, it is uncertain whether the divisional TAS budgets would be reduced to offset the GSI tuition. The proposal also mentioned the summer session and Master Incentive Program funds as a possible source to support the GSI benefits and TA-ships; however, again it is unclear whether redirecting these funds from their current uses would negatively impact existing programs.
**Silicon Valley**

The Baskin School of Engineering (BSOE) is continuing to develop and launch graduate programs based in Silicon Valley, and during 2017-2018, CPB provided advice to Graduate Council (GC) on two M.S. proposals. The first, from the Computational Media (CM) department, was a revised proposal for Human and Computer Interaction (HCI). The second was a new interdisciplinary proposal to establish a M.S. degree program in Natural Language Processing (NLP). Both these programs include Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). HCI and NLP, in concert with CM’s existing M.S. program Games and Playable Media (GPM) and its soon to be launched (fall 2019) program in Serious Games (SG), are designed to contribute significantly to building UCSC’s presence in Silicon Valley.

CPB has been supportive of proposals for M.S. degree programs at UCSC’s Silicon Valley Center (SVC). The committee recognizes the importance of these engineering school initiatives in building a larger academic presence for UCSC in Silicon Valley. In advising GC, the Senate body with plenary authority over graduate curriculum, on specific proposals, CPB has strived to make suggestions designed to strengthen the proposals and ensure their successful launch. However, our review of new degree programs has raised general concerns pertaining to space, integration of faculty and graduate students across the main and SV campuses, and overall campus planning for Silicon Valley.

**Space**

It appears that there may be limited space available at the SVC for additional academic programs such as NLP, and CPB does not have any sense of how space needs for the NLP program will be coordinated with the HCI program or other M.S. programs such as SG and GPM, both in Silicon Valley and on the main campus. Our understanding is that, based on previous commitments of space at SVC (e.g., to UNEX and the SVLink Incubator) the campus may need to obtain additional space in Silicon Valley to accommodate new engineering programs such as NLP.

**Integration with the main campus**

As the campus hires more faculty whose primary teaching and research activities are centered at the SVC, departments will face challenges in ensuring these faculty are able to fulfill the expectations and obligations common to all UCSC faculty. It will be important that SVC faculty engage fully in teaching across the curriculum, thereby contributing to the undergraduate mission of UCSC, as well as participating in departmental and university service. Facilitating this full participation by faculty and ensuring SV-based graduate students also have access to Santa Cruz campus resources will require careful thought be given to transportation issues and that appropriate research/office space on campus be made available.

**Overall planning**

The current approach to expanding UCSC’s presence in Silicon Valley involves launching M.S. programs that are relatively small and quite costly. CPB questions whether this strategy will yield sufficient student numbers to allow SVC to become an intellectually vibrant and financially sustainable academic endeavor. We had hoped that the formation this year of the Silicon Valley Governance Group (SVGG), chaired by VCR Scott Brandt, would provide an administrative body that could take the lead in providing an overall plan for the SVC. Such a plan would
facilitate the evaluation of proposals for new academic programs at SVC, as well as address space and transportation issues.

In commenting on the revised HCI proposal, for example, CPB noted that the Silicon Valley Governance Group provides “the campus with a formal organizational structure and a responsible principal officer for addressing issues such as transportation, but for also developing, with Senate consultation, a sustainable strategic vision for UCSC’s academic activities in Silicon Valley.” Unfortunately, CPB was informed of just one SVGG meeting during 2017-2018 (in fall 2017), and after repeated inquiries CPB was unable to ascertain SVGG’s current status. It appears no progress in developing a vision for SVC has occurred.

The most recent Academic Plan for Silicon Valley (dated 2013) is in need of an update to reflect the development of programs such as GPM, SG, HCI and NLP. The plan should also address concerns related to the integration of SVC and the main campus and develop a space utilization plan that prioritizes academic and research programs at SVC that are linked directly to the mission of UCSC. In consultation with the Academic Senate, we hope to see the SVGG address these planning issues.

**Capacity Planning**

During 2017-18, CPB reviewed a revised version of the campus “Guide for Managing Curricular Capacity and Program Enrollment.” This policy document was the culmination of a working group convened by VPAA Lee during fall 2016. Members found much to praise about the current version of the guidelines, which took great care to incorporate earlier Senate feedback and the work of the original task force. However, overall, many members felt this revised version was a stopgap measure, and that moving to a general program of enrollment management, as practiced on other UC campuses, would be preferable, perhaps as part of, or as a follow up to the Strategic Academic Planning process.

CPB was critical of the amount of effort required to provide the vast array of evidence requested of departments who wish to be declared impacted. The committee suggested that the required data be readily available and provided divisionally or centrally, thereby ensuring that departments with statistically proficient faculty are not unfairly advantaged in seeking to deal with impaction pressures.

During fall 2018, and with members Flanagan and Larrabee recused, CPB discussed Computer Science’s (CS) revised request for impacted status, first reviewed in spring 2017. The committee strongly agreed that access to majors is a key principle at a public university, and the CS proposal raised some concerns in this context. However, despite these concerns, CPB recognized the challenges faced by CS in accommodating the extraordinarily rapid increase in majors and therefore supported a temporary declaration of impacted status.

CPB also recommended that CS impacted status should be re-evaluated on a yearly basis to assess the progress made on concerns raised during review of the proposal this year, including CS faculty progress toward meeting the department’s own teaching expectations and monitoring of the divisional plan for increasing FTEs and other resources allocated to CS to meet student demand. CPB expects to review such a status report during fall 2018.
Capital Planning
In 2017-18, CPB participated in the capital planning process via its representatives on capital planning committees, including the Advisory Committee on Campus Planning and Stewardship (CPS), the Academic Space Plan Task Force, the Kresge College Project Committee, Classroom Subcommittee, and new this year, the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Subcommittee. The CPB representatives provide a channel through which the committee can be kept informed of capital planning issues; the presence of a CPB representative on an administrative committee is distinct from formal administrative consultation with CPB. CPB’s reviews related to capital planning issues focused on the Kresge Classroom Project and the Capital Financial Plan (CFP) prioritization process.

During winter 2018, CPB discussed letters from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) to CP/EVC Tromp (1/31/18) and from CEP to Kresge College Programming and Building Committee Co-Chairs Berger and Latham (10/12/17) regarding the size of the large lecture room planned for the Kresge Project academic building. During 2016-17, CPB supported the creation of a 600-seat classroom at Kresge, an opportunity made possible by $50M in General Funds Financed (GFF) funds available to the campus from the state, plus $3M provided by the campus. By summer of 2017, the Kresge Project plans had changed, reducing availability of smaller classrooms. CEP conducted its own analysis of classroom needs, which CPB also reviewed. CEP’s analysis was the first detailed assessment CPB had seen of the actual need for a lecture room as large as 600 seats, the pedagogical implications of such a large classroom, the implications for time to degree, and the consequences for the quality of the undergraduate experience at UCSC. Upon review, and given that some smaller classrooms had already been eliminated from the Kresge project, CPB agreed with CEP that current needs would be better met by reducing the size of the largest classroom at Kresge to around 520 seats, enabling a classroom of 200-220 to be added, while also ensuring an adequate number of smaller classrooms could be included in the project.

After careful consideration of Senate recommendations, Chancellor Blumenthal and CP/EVC Tromp decided to move forward with the Kresge academic building as previously approved. CPB will continue to participate in the Kresge Project planning process through its representative, and through committee discussion as needed. CPB will also be monitoring the audit of campus space currently underway, which the administration has stated may identify additional capacity for smaller classroom space.

Late in spring 2018, the committee received a request to provide feedback on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) subcommittee’s proposed academic project additions to the 2018-28 Capital Financial Plan (CFP). CPB consulted with VCPB Delaney and Capital Planning and Space Management Director Karen Smith for clarification and context on the request this year, which was limited to the integration of two specific projects (BSOE 3 and BSOE Integrated Teaching and Learning Complex) into the CFP draft. CPB supported the inclusion of both projects on the CFP. CPB expects that it will participate in the full prioritization process for the CFP during 2018-2019, at which time a complete packet of information that can be used to help rank the academic projects on the list will be provided to CPB. The process this year did not work optimally, and CPB will work with VCPB Delaney to advocate for a consultation process next year that provides CPB with the needed information for a meaningful review.
Academic and Student Success Data Analytics

CPB has supported greater and more consistent use of quantifiable data and relevant metrics in decision making, particularly in FTE planning. During 2017-18 the committee discussed the campus use of services from Academic Analytics and a document from Vice Provost for Student Success (VPSS) Jaye Padgett laying out a proposal on “Data, Analytics, and Research for Student Success.”

In the fall, CPB consulted with CP/EVC Tromp concerning the campus contract with Academic Analytics. The committee understands the potentially positive role the tools provided by Academic Analytics can play. However, members also had significant concerns related to the potential use of the data in the personnel process, the reliability and accuracy of the data, and the overarching value of the service provided by Academic Analytics.

Members shared the unease, felt broadly among the faculty, over the potential for the data on individual faculty from Academic Analytics to be used in the academic personnel process. We support the EVC’s commitment to maintain a firewall between the use of the database and the academic personnel process.

Questions have been raised about the quality of Academic Analytics’ underlying data, particularly with respect to its ability to capture important dimensions of research productivity and how it varies across academic disciplines. Metrics can help frame discussions in useful ways, but if the data are poor, such framing can be detrimental to good decision making. CPB believes it will be important that departments/faculty have the ability to review the data employed in any decision-making process. This would not require giving departments access to the Academic Analytics system but might be achieved by sharing spreadsheets or reports produced from the system.

Faculty in departments across UCSC have a wealth of knowledge about their own fields that can help inform decisions about such issues as whether hiring at a senior or more mid-career level would contribute the most to boosting research and scholarly activity. External reviews can also inform these types of decisions. Thus, members questioned whether the potential added value of Academic Analytics will justify its cost, particularly as last year, in a January 18, 2017 letter to Interim CP/EVC Lee, the committee noted that, beyond identifying untapped sources of extramural funding, Academic Analytics did not seem to have been widely used on the campus. To encourage wider use of it in academic planning, CPB suggested the CP/EVC pose specific questions to the deans as a means of encouraging them to use the data from Academic Analytics. We requested that the Senate be consulted in formulating these questions. With the transition from Interim CP/EVC Lee to CP/EVC Tromp, this suggestion has not been pursued.

CP/EVC Tromp has emphasized to CPB that she sees the data obtained through Academic Analytics as an important input into, but not the driver of, decision making. CPB urged her to make this point consistently with other constituencies on campus as well. While the contract with Academic Analytics was extended, CPB has seen no evidence that the company’s data has actually been used this year.
The second data usage topic reviewed by CPB dealt with a draft document from VPSS Padgett and the Office of Planning and Budget laying out a vision and plan for the use of “Data, Analytics, and Research for Student Success.” CPB appreciated the careful efforts toward classifying and prioritizing access to data contained in the draft document. The document also raises the important question of ethical use of this information.

CPB believes the data plan must address the extent to which departments and individual faculty are obligated to act on data made available in formal standardized reports: will faculty be responsible for acting on pedagogical tips triggered by, for instance, demographic course data? This is potentially problematic. Some members were especially concerned that such data could unintentionally lead faculty to practice implicit or explicit bias. Such bias could easily be exacerbated in smaller classes: pedagogical tips based on demographic data could encourage faculty to assume that specific individuals fall into particular categories and then treat those individuals differently (perhaps even according to what the faculty member believes to be best practices based on the resources provided). Thus, CPB did not see the potential benefits of course-level data outweighing the potential risks of introducing unanticipated inequities and biases.

The draft document discusses the challenges associated with having to respond to ad hoc requests for reports or data, which undoubtedly represent a strain on staff time. One solution, as outlined in the report, is to provide standardized tools and reports. This solution is not likely to be the optimal way of supporting data-driven student success efforts, however. It would be better to provide as much raw data as possible, subject to student privacy considerations, enabling researchers and advisors to pursue more targeted or flexible data analysis. Student success efforts will often raise division- or department-specific issues that are not easily anticipated by pre-prepared tools. There is tremendous potential for leveraging the time and skills of individuals interested in student success, and therefore alleviating staff burden, if data can be made available in a useful format (it presumably already is in a relational database, which is exceptionally useful) rather than being locked away in pdf documents or obfuscated by reporting systems such as Infoview.

In response to the perceived need for clear policies and procedures governing data usage, CP/EVC Tromp established the Academic and Research Analytics Steering Committee (ARASC) in April 2018. Chaired by VCR Scott Brandt, the committee held its first meeting June 6, 2018. The chair of CPB serves as a member of ARASC.

**CPB Review of Second Hire and CAPM 101.000 Waiver Requests**

CPB developed guidelines to encourage the development and submission of consistent, informative, and complete proposals for CAPM 101.000 waiver of open recruitment requests (Target of Excellence and Spousal/Partner waivers) as well as for reviewing requests for approval of off-cycle second hire requests. The committee anticipates that the guidelines will clarify and make transparent the committee’s review process and criteria for evaluation. CPB’s guidelines for review of CAPM 101.000 waiver of open recruitment requests and second hire requests have been endorsed by CP/EVC Tromp, and have been disseminated to the divisional deans (July 26, 2018 and August 15, 2018).
In the case of special hires, CPB is concerned with the implications for hiring plans already in place, for future hiring plans, and for resources. Thus, in the case of TOEs and spousal/partner hires, it is important that CPB understands how the proposed hire meets the qualifications and requirements outlined in CAPM 101.000; in the case of second hires, CPB seeks evidence that the proposed hire represents a special opportunity for the department and division and aligns with top divisional and campus priorities. In all cases, CPB wishes to see the context for special recruitments: e.g., was there a failed prior special recruitment? Is there a related retention case? CPB also wishes to have an assessment how such incidents have affected or will affect the department.

Second hire requests are particularly in need of clear guidelines, as there is currently no existing campus policy guiding them. Second hire requests out of an initial authorized recruitment can leverage strong FTE recruitment pools containing a second candidate who also meets high priority and/or strategic needs in the department or division. CPB’s guidelines for second hires provide an update to its now outdated “Guidelines on Double Hires” (CPB to CP/EVC, 2/27/07) and are intended to encourage the development and submission of consistent, informative, and complete proposals from the divisions as well as to clarify the committee’s review process.

CPB sees requests of second hires as appropriate in two circumstances: (1) When the finalist pool happens to contain an exceptional candidate who, while not necessarily the first choice for the position originally advertised, would be a great fit for a future departmental need that has previously been laid out in departmental hiring plans and external review documents as being among the top two departmental priorities; (2) When a recruitment already authorized for a future year can be filled by a candidate in the current finalist pool.

With the support of the Senate Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) and Academic Personnel (CAP), CPB is in the process of working with APO to make changes to CAPM 101.000 to require that a departmental vote be taken on waiver requests. Under current policy, the Bylaw 55 vote occurs only if the waiver is approved and the department moves forward with an appointment file. This raises several concerns, including the possibility of a request for a waiver being made (and potentially approved) without clear evidence of widespread departmental support, particularly because once a waiver is approved and departmental representatives enter into serious conversations with the targeted hire, faculty may feel more constrained in their voting. The CPB chair met with Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Grace McClintock over the summer and learned that there is opposition to requiring a departmental vote on waiver requests. AVP McClintock has informed CPB that she is in the process of undertaking a complete review and revision of the CAPM and the committee will work with her during 2018-2019 to ensure CAPM 101.000 is revised in a manner that is consistent with CPB’s desire to have clear evidence of departmental support for waiver requests.

Data to Support CPB’s Advising Role
Throughout the academic year, and particularly in the context of a request for input from AVPAA Martin Berger on resource allocation guidelines for the SAP, CPB made a formal request to Planning and Budget for better-organized financial information. A subcommittee was formed to pursue this request.
After many delays, the CPB subcommittee was able to meet with Director Kimberly Register of Planning and Budget on May 22, 2018. The subcommittee members felt that this initial meeting led to a productive discussion in which the type of well-organized, usable financial information that CPB has been seeking was explained. Director Register was responsive. An initial draft of the financial operating summary information was provided to CPB for the fiscal years 2017 and 2018. However, P&B was unable to provide this data until August 9, 2018, making it too late for the committee to review or discuss the information provided. It does provide at least a starting point for developing more useful and transparent budget information. Continuing this effort in fall 2018 will lead to better informed decisions being made in allocating the campus’s resources, a development of particular importance as the campus moves to implement the final SAP.

Shared Governance and Consultation Process
Shared governance is the cornerstone of the University of California and represents the foundational belief that the university governance is strongest when faculty, staff, and students join with campus administration and systemwide leadership to shape, influence, and implement the university’s mission. As the Academic Senate committee with the broadest purview—campus planning and budget—and the most comprehensive understanding of how UCSC’s often competing priorities interrelate and affect each other, CPB takes shared governance very seriously. As such, the committee invites deans, vice provosts, and vice chancellors to meet with us in both structured and unstructured contexts: unstructured meetings generally provide opportunities for administrators to share their ideas and concerns with CPB and for CPB to understand the vision and priorities for various divisions, while structured consultations focus on specific topics, such as the deans’ FTE requests and proposals like the Centers of Excellence forwarded jointly by VCR Brandt and VPDGS Tyrus Miller.

In addition to meeting with deans and principal officers, CPB meets weekly with the CP/EVC, and these regular meetings highlight the positive and productive possibilities at the heart of shared governance. The committee is grateful for CP/EVC Tromp’s deep understanding of—and obvious commitment to—shared governance. We have benefited tremendously from the opportunity to converse and consult with her throughout the year, and we very much appreciate the seriousness with which she takes our opinions, perspectives, and questions, even especially when she makes decisions that differ from our positions. The committee is hopeful that the CP/EVC’s investment in shared governance, together with her ongoing collaborations with CPB and Senate leadership, will contribute to a campus culture in which shared governance is valued as one of the university’s most important and unique principles.

Regular Committee Business
New Program Proposals
CPB reviewed proposals for the establishment of undergraduate and graduate degrees, including: a B.S. in Environmental Sciences, B.S. in Anthropology, M.S. in Science Communication, M.S. in Human Computer Interaction with PDST (professional degree supplemental tuition), M.S. in MCD Biology, M.S. in Natural Language Processing (PDST), and M.F.A. in Environmental Art and Social Practice.
External Reviews
CPB submitted specific questions to supplement the universal charge for upcoming external reviews in Art, Chemistry and Biochemistry, and Linguistics. The committee prepared responses to the external review reports for closure meeting discussion for Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Earth and Planetary Sciences, History, and Music. CPB also reviewed mid-cycle reports and made recommendations on the length of review cycle for Electrical Engineering, Mathematics, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, MCD Biology, Microbiology and Environmental Toxicology, Economics, and Anthropology. The committee also reviewed a deferral request for the Languages and Applied Linguistics external review.

Three-Year Interim Reports
The committee reviewed three-year interim reports for the following programs: Rachel Carson College’s Sustainability Studies minor, Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES) B.A. program, and Scientific Computing and Applied Mathematics (SciCAM) M.S. program.

Off-Cycle FTE Requests and Waiver of Open Recruitment Requests
CPB reviewed and made recommendations on six second hire requests, one request for a second and third hire from a single search, two Presidential Postdoctoral hire requests, two Target of Excellence (TOE) waiver of open recruitment requests (this does not include the Competitive Target of Excellence—CTOE—divisional requests that were part of the 18-19 FTE call), and two Spousal/Partner waiver of open recruitment requests. In addition, CPB reviewed additional requests as follows: upgrade of an already authorized search to the full professor level, one request for allocation of an off-cycle FTE, and three requests for authorization to use divisionally held FTEs for off-cycle recruitments.

Local and Systemwide Issue Review
In addition to the issues discussed in earlier sections of the report, CPB reviewed and commented on the following issues and/or policies:

Local
- Request to Review One-Time Allocation for Housing Initiatives (October 2017)
- Art Design: Games and Playable Media B.A. Updated Charter and Bylaws (October 2017; February 2018)
- Review of APU (Academic Programs and Units: Policy and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment, and Change) (October 2017)
- Proposed Fee Renewal for the M.S. in Applied Economics and Finance PDST (October 2017)
- Industry Alliance and Technology Commercialization (IATC) Proposed Intellectual Property Draft Policies (November 2017; February 2018))
- Proposed Strategic Plan to Meet 2:1 Transfer Goal (November 2017)
- Intensive History Major Request (November 2017)
- German Studies B.A. Suspension Request (December 2017)
- Computer Science Impaction Request (January 2018)
- Proposal for Concentration in Accounting from the Economics Department (January 2018)
- Guidelines for Managing Curricular Capacity and Program Enrollment (January 2018)
Proposals and Reviews:

- Proposal to Discontinue the Science Education Concentration (January 2018)
- Proposal to Discontinue the Assistive Technology: Cognitive/Perceptual Concentration of the Bioengineering B.S. degree (February 2018)
- Proposal from Biomolecular Engineering to discontinue the Biomolecular Engineer concentration within the B.S degree in Bioengineering; change the name of the B.S. degree in Bioinformatics to a B.S. degree in Biomolecular Engineering and Bioinformatics, have two concentrations with the renamed Biomolecular Engineering and Bioinformatics B.S. degree (Biomolecular Engineering, Bioinformatics) (February 2018)
- Proposed Adjustment to Salary Increases: Further Above Scale Merits (February 2018)
- Kresge Classroom Project (February 2018)
- Computer Science: Computer Game Design B.S. Revised Charter and Bylaws (March 2018)
- Faculty FTE Transfer Request (October 2017)

Systemwide

- Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) (November 2017)
- Review of Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128 (January 2018)
- Review of APM 285, 210-3, 133, 740 (February 2018)

Continuing Issues for CPB 2017-18

- Strategic Academic Plan (SAP) Implementation
- BSOE Reshaping--monitor relevant aspects of implementation of the reshaping process
- Long Range Development Plan--review documents arising from the planning process
- Silicon Valley--monitor progress of programs being developed; space planning
- Campus Capital Planning Prioritization--continue to monitor and participate in the review process
- Division of Global Engagement--monitor planned strategic planning and ACE Lab participation
- Office of Planning and Budget data--continue to collaborate with VCPB on data needs to inform campus decision making
- University Relations--review of external review report

Respectfully submitted;
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Kimberly Lau, *ex officio*
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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. The Chair of CPB also serves, together with the Senate Chair and Vice-Chair, as a member of Senate Leadership. 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 meetings. All CPB letters and reports, unless otherwise noted, represent the consensus opinion of CPB.