



# **Davis Division Academic Senate**

## **Request for Consultation Responses**

### **2020 Task Force Report**

**January 22, 2013**

UPDATED DOCUMENT AS OF 11/5/12: Changes reflect corrected wording regarding admissions. You must upload the updated version of the report to whiteboards. The office will prepare a comparison document for those reviewers wishing to understand the admissions related changes to this report. I will be made available within a few days.//////////The report from the three 2020 Initiative task forces is provided for Davis Division review and commentary.

# **CAP Oversight Committee**

**December 13, 2012 2:31 PM**

## **2020 Task Force Report**

The 2020 Chancellor's initiative has been generated in response to projected fiscal shortfalls in operating expenses. The Chancellor has suggested that one option to address the projected deficit is through "planned growth" rather than further cuts. Such growth would be generated by increasing student numbers, from both within and outside California, with a particular focus on international students.

CAP is concerned that such growth is unlikely to be absorbed uniformly across all schools, colleges or departments, with some faculty experiencing substantially increased teaching loads. Such outcomes might hinder the faculty's ability to fully engage in scholarly or creative activities and to contribute to university service, both of which are significant for merit and promotion actions. In such cases, reviewing bodies might need to emphasize the contribution individual faculty members make to teaching, even if such activities might limit their contribution in other areas of endeavor.

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES)**

**January 3, 2013 1:04 PM**

The CBS executive committee was pleased to see that the 2020 report strongly stated that maintenance of quality in education was essential to the success of an increase in student enrollment. The Executive Committee supports the report's recommendations that additions to facilities and faculty necessary to accommodate the increase in students be front-loaded prior to the increase in student population. This is particularly important in areas (including the biological sciences) where a combination of an increase in majors and unreplaced retiring faculty have already led to severe straining of our ability to deliver classes to current majors in the College. The situation could reach crisis in the near future even with no increase in the student population. Despite the recommendation of such "front loading" we are concerned that time lags between release of FTE and arrival of new faculty may limit our ability to continue to deliver quality education if enrollment increases too quickly. Press releases report that the enrollment for UCD increased by 647 students (nearly 2%), but this was not preceded by a 2% increase in either faculty or facilities. While the university as a whole may have unfilled capacity, students may not assort themselves into this available capacity. For example, introductory classes across the life sciences have been over capacity for years, yet we suspect a significant fraction of new students will be interested in majoring in life sciences.

Given this likely trend, it should be clear that increasing the number of ladder faculty in the sciences in numbers sufficient to accommodate the proposed increase in student population will require a very significant financial commitment. For instance, the facilities available for laboratories and large introductory lecture courses in the biological sciences are already near saturation. New facilities (especially new large lecture halls) will therefore have to be made available upfront to accommodate even a modest increase in the student body population. In addition, given the research expectations for a UCD faculty member in biological sciences and the competitive nature of the job market for top talent, each new hire will likely necessitate provision of a large start-up package. Furthermore, it should be stressed that current, modern, laboratory research buildings are already near capacity. Given that we haven't been informed of any concrete plan to increase research space either through renovations or through construction, serious concerns are raised as to our ability to increase the number of ladder faculty in biological sciences.

One possibility that could partially mitigate these constraints would be for the campus to provide positions for lecturers with possibility of security of employment (PSOE). Such positions could be used to hire exceptional instructors to augment our teaching programs without the need for research space and startup packages. However, this does not represent a viable solution to the problem, as continued hiring of new young faculty is critical for the long-term success of our university.

Another concern is the need to aid foreign students in English language skills. Once again services for such students must front-loaded prior to their arrival. Failure to do this would affect the academic success of all students and increase the workload on our faculty.

Our concerns are largely consistent with the spirit of the current report, which we hope will be followed in the future. We remain very apprehensive of the manner in which the 2020 plan will be implemented given that an increase in the student population has already occurred in the absence of a corresponding increase in the necessary resources to support these students.

# **Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: HACCS)**

**January 29, 2013 11:46 AM**

*Response continued on next page.*

College of Letters and Science  
Faculty Executive Committee  
Consultation Report on 2020 Task Force Report

The L&S Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) appreciates the 2020 Task Force subcommittees' investment of time, energy and serious expertise in what we consider, still, to be mainly a thought experiment. Many concrete issues remain to be clarified and possible problems need to be resolved before we can determine whether or not to approve the path of significant enrollment expansion of non-CA residents.

The L&S FEC would like to emphasize one principle articulated in Task Force Report: "Ultimately, budget planning must not be the driving force in defining the goals and aspirations of the campus; rather, the campus should develop a strategic vision based on its aspirations, and then let that vision guide whatever actions may be needed to realize our goals" (19). The committee asks, absent financial incentives, what is driving this proposal? There is a weak case made for a more diverse student body, and little assurance is provided that there will be a large market around the world for a UC Davis education (not just China).

### **Historical Perspective**

Starting in the 1960s and continuing for 2-3 decades, the economic pie available to the University of California was growing. Out of this pie, the university campuses could fund infrastructure improvement and expansion, and based on the support for growth, the university could and did admit more and more students. However, during this period, the funds for growth preceded the increases in enrollment. In the current model (outlined in the report) funds are not increasing; instead, the funds are to come from increasing enrollment of students, which, if increases in enrollment are our only source of funds, will precede improvements in infrastructure. This results in a kind of catch-22: increasing enrollment to raise revenue is being carried out prior to improvements in infrastructure that are necessary to make increasing enrollment a successful strategy, especially given that much of the increases will come in the form of labor intensive foreign students. The most likely outcome is that faculty and staff workloads will continue to increase in order to meet the burden of increasing numbers of students with insufficient infrastructure support. In the end, the quality of undergraduate and graduate education cannot help but suffer.

### **Infrastructure**

The L&S FEC strongly agrees with the Task Force that "the infrastructure of the university is already under pressure from past growth and recent budget cuts and that there will need to be strategic investments up front to prepare for any growth that might be undertaken" (3). Many key foundational areas that would require strengthening are laid out in detail in the report. Where is the money for these significant investments going to come from in advance of enrollment expansion based on non-resident students? (see above)

To the concerns voiced in the report, we would add the real cost of many of the "solutions" being offered in the report. Specifically, we are concerned about "new approaches to pedagogy" when that means online courses. Online education would require a significant investment in order to be developed in a way that benefits the university. This would require expertise in the area and

substantial investments in personnel and physical infrastructure. Such courses will require approval through the course approval system—a system that is already woefully inadequate to meet the demands being placed on it. In addition to online courses, teaching in off-schedule times is mentioned. This suggestion fails to recognize work–life balance issues and the “cost” of implementing such strategies. Finally, we already face a significant classroom shortage that needs to be addressed. This problem has been mentioned for several years in discussions of the effects of enrollment expansion combined with pressures to graduate students within four years, yet nothing substantial has been done about it.

In addition to these issues, the L&S FEC raises the problem of courses that are already designated as “hot spots” (courses in which the wait list exceeds 10% of capacity). If the provost would like to see wait lists eliminated and more sections added in courses where we are not currently meeting demand, this will require a significant investment for large and small classrooms, labs, instructors, etc. In other words, if we cannot meet our goals with respect to demand now, how can we meet them with 5000 additional students?

The Task Force report emphasizes that a number of “key foundational areas” must be strengthened before growth commences (9). We strongly support this idea and question whether any realistic numerical values have been attached to the infrastructural changes. The FEC felt that 2020 may be too soon to be able to make the major investments required and assess when or if the project would be financially beneficial. The three phases outlined on p. 12 of the report would likely require more than 7 years to complete. If we do not proceed with caution in the expansion, there may be a real threat to the quality of the institution.

Finally, also in the area of infrastructure, the FEC underscores the need for additional courses in ESL, additional advisors, more staff in Dutton Hall, and other resources for international students outlined in the Task Force report (14). From a faculty perspective, we add the cost of teaching these students, who often require significant time in office hours and make other less tangible demands on faculty time. Some faculty find educating these students to be extremely challenging (especially those teaching reading and writing skills) and, at times, demoralizing.

### **Pattern of Growth/Disciplinary Distribution**

Significant concerns were raised about the pattern of growth. The Task Force projects from the current disciplinary distribution (13). While we recognize the need for this assumption when the 2020 report was being written, we urge the development of multiple, detailed models of disciplinary distribution before going forward. We need real numbers in order to be able to make informed judgments about what the costs will be of educating 5000 additional students.

Finally, we are concerned that the vision of the university’s future may be determined by student demand and the differential cost of instruction in different fields rather than by a vision shaped by faculty expertise and an educated assessment of what the future holds for different disciplines and/or the needs of society. We agree with the Task Force that the issue of appropriate FTE allocation is a complex one in the context of a research university (35). We reiterate our support for the principle cited at the outset of this response that “the campus should develop a strategic vision based on its aspirations, and then let that vision guide whatever actions may be needed to realize our goals” (19).

# **Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**

**January 22, 2013 2:29 PM**

*No response at this time.*

# Faculty Welfare

**January 22, 2013 4:50 PM**

Response of the Faculty Welfare Committee to the 2020 Task Force Report:

The members of the Faculty Welfare Committee recognize that the long term decline in State funding has created a structural budget deficit for the UC system and the Davis campus. We believe that the 2020 plan represents an innovative means to raise more revenue by admitting more non-resident students and simultaneously expand the diversity of the Davis campus by substantially increasing the number of international students.

The task force presented a range of options to achieve this fiscal relief that included some scenarios in which the number of California students would actually decline. We are not in favor of addressing our budget problems by reducing the number of California students Davis currently instructs. We recommend, instead, that Davis should pursue either scenario M2 or M4.

Our support, however, is conditional on one additional issue. The Task Force pledges in its Report that the admission standards for enacting any of the 2020 scenarios will be higher than the minimum demanded for resident students. Our Committee is concerned that the desire to admit large numbers of international students will weaken the requirement that they have sufficient command of English to participate effectively in their education from day one. Some Committee members believe that many international students who have been recently admitted lack the requisite background in English to take full advantage of the educational opportunities Davis offers. We strongly urge that should the Chancellor move forward with the 2020 initiative the admissions process require multiple indicators of English proficiency (more than the Toefl test alone) to ensure that any failings in the past will not be repeated.

# **Graduate Council**

**December 10, 2012 3:32 PM**

*Response continued on next page.*

December 10, 2012

## **RFC: 2020 TASK FORCE REPORT**

Graduate Council reviewed the Joint Report of the 2020 Task Forces (November 1, 2012) at its December 7, 2012 meeting. Council commends the individuals who put a great deal of time and effort into this report at a time when budget difficulties make it particularly difficult to articulate a clear path for the future of the institution, and endorses the overall conclusions of the report with one major caveat. Committee members were quite concerned about the absence of any substantive consideration of graduate education. Specific mention of graduate education was limited to observing that an increased number of faculty members provides opportunities to expand graduate education and noting that facilities planning must take the needs of graduate education into account.

Graduate education must be integrated into UCD's strategic planning. Graduate education both enriches and is enriched by its interrelationships with undergraduate education and research. Campus goals in these areas must be set jointly, not separately. Graduate Council would like to see that any implementation of the recommendations in this report be coordinated with the implementation of any recommendations in the Graduate Education Taskforce Report and the International Advisory Committee Report. All three reports address aspects of graduate education and should be considered jointly.

It appears that neither the revenues associated with graduate student enrollment nor the costs associated with graduate instruction were considered in the alternative enrollment scenarios presented in Table 1 in the report. An increased number of faculty members due to undergraduate enrollment growth would lead to increased graduate enrollment commensurate with the mission of a major research university. In the absence of graduate enrollment growth it would be more difficult to attract and retain outstanding faculty members.

There are additional financial issues regarding international graduate students in particular. Unlike undergraduates and professional students, NRST for academic doctoral students does not generate many new revenues for the institution as a whole. It simply redistributes revenues among campus units. Not considering graduate enrollment means that this difference is not recognized in the projections.

Sincerely,



Rachael E. Goodhue, Chair  
Graduate Council

/vm

c: Gina Anderson

# Joe Kiskis (Write-in)

**January 22, 2013 4:00 PM**

Comments on the 2020 report

Joe Kiskis

Jan. 22, 2013

Overall the 2020 report is well written, balanced, and thorough. The pros and cons of additional growth are carefully discussed.

I am in strong agreement with the principles of the conclusion:

- (1) That the campus should adhere closely to the Academic Senate (BOARS) doctrine of “compares favorably,” i.e. that the admitted national and international students will compare favorably to admitted California residents at each campus.
- (2) That the campus should ensure that the quality of the student experience will be enhanced by the growth in student enrollment and that necessary investment in staff, faculty and facilities should be made in a timely fashion to ensure this outcome.
- (3) That growth in enrollment should only proceed if a model can be developed that results in increased financial stability of the university while adhering to principles 1 and 2.

I would like to add a few additional comments on the current context to which the report relates.

- A) It is important to note that the UC system has put into place a funding streams model, but an essential element of that is still being developed, i.e. the enrollment management plan. Consideration of growth at UC Davis should be discussed in the context of a systemwide enrollment management plan.
- B) The political and economic landscapes of the state and nation have improved since the possibility of large growth for UC Davis was suggested. The people of California passed Proposition 30. Additionally the Governor has worked with the University and proposed a multiyear funding plan. If it is implemented and if UC Davis receives a proportionate share of the benefits, our base budget of State funds will increase by about 19% or about \$57.7 million per year in the base. This exceeds the \$50 million per year estimated for the most advantageous model in the 2020 report. These developments call for at least a modest reevaluation of the motivations, assumptions, and modeling in the report.
- C) Even without a well articulated intention to grow, student enrollment has increased modestly, but steadily, even through severe budget cuts. It is now over 32,000. In addition, the overall complexity of the campus has increased as additional functions and units are accreted to our operations while few are removed. I see an increase in mistakes in our operations both very small and very large that give me a sense that the campus is dangerously close to being, or already is, too big to manage effectively.

# Planning & Budget

January 22, 2013 2:28 PM

The purpose the 2020 report is to evaluate the proposal to consider growth as an approach to the continuing financial concerns that grip the state, UC system and our campus. The goals are to honor our past, maintain a diverse community of scholars, maintain adherence to the California Master Plan's requirements for admission of California resident students, and establish a more secure financial foundation. The key areas listed below deserve the Senate's attention. Some important questions for the Senate to consider during this process are as follows:

- Where shall we grow, where do we maintain our strength and in what areas might we "withdraw"? To what extent should faculty FTE allocation "follow" student interest and enrollment? Should we hire more Lecturers to teach lower division classes, leaving ladder-rank to preferentially teach upper division and graduate level classes?
- Should tuition (or additional Course Materials Fees) be determined by major or by courses of instruction? We are disproportionately a "science-based" campus; should this ratio remain stable as we grow? How do we finance "expensive" majors? Should we invest more in humanities/social sciences?
- Are classrooms and laboratory facilities (both teaching and research) adequate for today and for continued growth? These issues will definitely require Senate input.
- Is Information Technology as currently constituted adequate to the new/proposed classroom space or for the increased number of students? This will be especially critical as the Senate considers growth in use of modern technology, including on-line formats of instruction, to increase quality and efficiency of instruction.
- One topic that is missing completely from the report is graduate education. CPB has serious concerns that graduate education was not included as part of the report as planning for undergraduate education has obvious implications to graduate education (e.g., TA resources). CPB strongly recommends that the Senate remind the Chancellor and Provost that this topic is an important component of overall enrollment management planning.

## Classroom Space/Physical Plant

CPB has significant concerns about the additional classrooms and instructors that will be needed to accommodate 5000 additional undergraduates. In light of enrollment growth over the past decade, the campus already has a critical shortage of classroom space, especially for large-enrollment classes, labs that accompany those courses, and upper-division classes with enrollments less than 25. Many of our classrooms are in poor condition and are not being well maintained. Most of our classrooms have not been modernized to accommodate increasing interest in podcasting audio and video from lectures and to facilitate small-group learning experiences—even for large-enrollment courses. We strongly endorse the report's contention that we must build additional large (500 seat) classrooms as soon as possible. We share the report's skepticism that we will attract full-fee-paying students by producing predominantly online courses. We support the need to provide additional resources for online-supplemented courses and for courses that incorporate student-student interactions. Classroom needs are generally well summarized in the report, and we concur with the conclusion that there is little enthusiasm among faculty or students for evening or weekend courses. We would supplement the report's recommendations by suggesting the creation of special-purpose classrooms that facilitate specific teaching styles, such as podcasting or small-group interactions. We are strongly supportive of asking the Registrar to make long-term assignments of rooms to specific courses that have special needs in terms of enrollments and/or facilities.

Additional faculty hires will be needed to accommodate higher enrollment. The campus is already at capacity in terms of current available space for ladder-rank faculty. Hiring significant numbers of additional faculty with research labs would require building several new research buildings, which seems financially impossible. In addition, faculty hires in science and engineering now often require start-up packages on the order of a million dollars. One way to accommodate significant additional enrollment, including students in engineering and the sciences, with relatively little investment would be to establish a campus-wide policy for a small fraction of faculty (say 5-10%) that would be PSOE lecturers (lecturers hired with potential security of employment). PSOE hires could be from a national/international pool of candidates evaluated for both their topic-area expertise and their dedication and skill as teachers.

### **Online Education**

CPB notes that among the suggestions for handling the increased teaching load as the campus grows is a recommendation for study of increased use of on-line education modalities. We would encourage current and future students to explore the possibilities in this area, including whether credits earned by completion of specific on-line courses offered by fully accredited universities, including UCD, would be accepted by UC Davis for course credit, to fulfill prerequisite requirements for UCD courses, and/or to substitute for required or elective UCD classes. We would encourage development of a database by the departments or the administration of specific courses on-line that would be accepted for course credit by UC Davis. Such a strategy could reduce the demand for additional classroom space and faculty and facilitate graduation within four years were impacted classes offered as on-line courses.

### **Summer Quarter**

One major issue with increasing student enrollment is ensuring academic success including access to required courses without increasing the time to degree. CPB realizes that there are significant pros and cons including cost issues associated with offering full quarter classes over the summer in parallel with the current summer sessions. However, this may allow students to take prerequisite courses during summer sessions, especially impacted courses.

### **International Student Enrollment**

Increasing the number of international students incurs significant costs including additional advising staff, additional ESL and language courses, and additional classroom space. These costs should have a truly positive impact on the campus. CPB is concerned about these costs and other issues facing international students that choose to come to UC Davis. To ensure that these students enjoy academic success and a positive experience during their education at UC Davis, it will be essential that the campus undertake a significant planning effort and make significant investments to support those needs.

However, enrolling large numbers of international students may also benefit our in-state student by enhancing the opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges. The recommendation in the recent report from the International Advisory Committee set high goals for involving UCD students in international programs. A larger number of international students on campus will expand the possibilities for an enhanced cross-cultural experience here on campus.

### **Conclusion**

CPB endorses the Task Force's recommendations for planned enrollment growth of student numbers at UC Davis. We appreciate the effort of the task force to create a framework to guide such growth. As is often the case in proposed policy change, the devil is in the details. However, many questions arose during CPB's discussion regarding specifics and details that could not be answered from the information provided in the report. There are obvious financial implications of growth, both on the income and expenditure sides of the ledger, as discussed in the report. We urge the

development of an ongoing process that engages the administration and Senate Faculty to monitor the occurrence of potentially unforeseen impacts of increased numbers of students at UCD, for example adequacy of existing physical plant and classroom space, adequacy of numbers of T.A.s and staff, and maintenance of desired student-faculty ratios, to insure that the quality of education being delivered to the increased number of students is maintained at current levels or better.

# Research

**January 22, 2013 2:29 PM**

*No response at this time.*

# Undergraduate Council

January 29, 2013 8:29 AM

Undergraduate Council supports efforts to place the university on a more solid financial footing, but the council is concerned that pursuing the enrollment scenarios outlined in the 2020 report may detract from UC Davis' historic commitment to the State of California Master Plan for Higher Education. That is, we hope that the 2020 initiative will not hinder UC Davis' ongoing efforts to provide access to qualified students from California and to hold the State Legislature accountable to their commitments under the Master Plan. We see no inherent conflict between increasing international enrollment on the one hand and seeking sufficient funding from the state to maintain or increase enrollment for qualified Californians. Both goals should be pursued simultaneously. We support the move to increase undergraduate enrollment only to the extent we can maintain quality undergraduate instruction.

The Undergraduate Council would have liked to see greater attention in the 2020 Commission Report to the following:

1. Other UC campuses have experienced growth in the proportion of international students. How does their experience, both their successes and their failures, inform the strategies to be undertaken at UC Davis? How does UC Davis compare to other non-UC-campuses?
2. To what extent does the pursuit of international students increase financial risk to the campus? How do those risks compare to the risk of doing nothing? Since the 2020 initiative is a long-range plan that may influence facilities and staffing for decades, then financial risk from changing conditions in any one country can be reduced by recruiting international students from as many different countries as possible. In particular, the campus should consider capping the percent of international students from any one country – for instance to no more than 25% of the total.
3. What efforts will be undertaken to create demand for UC Davis programs among international students? It is critical that new recruiting efforts do not lead to decreases in the academic qualifications of admitted students. Undergraduate Council assumes that building excellence across the campus will provide strong incentives for international students to matriculate here versus many other available institutions in the USA. For instance, international students might be attracted by a program that provides strong English language instruction. Have specific programs been targeted for investment and what evidence do we have that those investments will produce increases in national and international student enrollment? In considering programs to highlight for their potential appeal to international students, what measures will be taken to ensure that such programs represent the full spectrum of divisions on campus?
4. To what extent will UC Davis attempt to recruit national and international Master's degree students? In terms of contributing to the financial stability of the campus, these students will likely have a more immediate positive impact than other types of postgraduates.
5. What impact will new recruiting efforts have on the University Library? The library has been negatively affected by recent budget cuts. What plans are in place to direct new resources towards rebuilding the library?
6. English language proficiency and related issues require careful attention. Increasing the proportion of international students will increase the contact hours for faculty and staff across

the campus, but especially for those instructors in courses that involve written work. Advising, too, will be affected by increased numbers of international students, as these students are likely to require more help with basic academic issues, in addition to help with cross-cultural and assimilation issues. In fact, the integration of the new international students should be carried out carefully to avoid conflicts and tension between different groups of students.

7. Given that the new budget model is still evolving, to what extent will the proportion of international students within colleges and programs lead to adjustments in the resources flowing to those units? Since some of the majors favored by international students are already impacted, the budget model related issues need to be dealt with before rather than after the 2020 students have arrived. For instance, some impacted programs have ongoing difficulties maintaining undergraduate lab facilities. Increased enrollment in those programs without investment in facilities may be counter-productive.