Preface

The time has come to update the Division’s academic plan.

Our most recent plan is dated October 2007. It remains posted, together with individual departmental plans, at http://humanities.ucsc.edu/about/dean/ten-year-plan.html. These documents emerged in response to a Call whose roots go back before 2004 and which resulted in a campus Strategic Academic Plan (http://planning.ucsc.edu/acadplan/docs/AcadPlan.Feb08.pdf). This plan was published in February 2008, just as the current financial crisis was unfolding. The guiding principles and the section on the Humanities Division in this plan are provided in Appendix II.

The departmental academic plans are dated December 2005; they are influenced by the rhetoric of the campus-level Call but are intended to provide the Faculty’s internal vision and assessment of options for development.

We have now moved in time beyond the plan’s nominal vision date of 2010-11. More importantly, circumstances have carried us well outside the framework of resource assumptions that shaped the documents. This alone is sufficient reason to undertake a thorough review and strategic reflection for our own purposes. Two additional factors make it both opportune and urgent that we do so this year.

First, the opportunity: there is currently no campus-level Call for an updated plan. Since 2008, the budget crisis has focused administrative attention on tactical responses. It has been impossible to provide sound planning assumptions to frame a general update. Previous department and division plans have understandably tailored their rhetoric, and in part their substance, to fit the perceived expectations of the campus-level Call. This year is our opportunity to describe our vision of how our departments, programs, and the Division as a whole will develop based on our own realistic assessment of existing strengths and potential.

Now the urgency: It is clear that as soon as feasible, the administration will revisit the 2008 strategic plan and update it. Hence a Call is in our near future. The Social Sciences Division has already published an updated plan1 tailored to the current circumstances. My goal is to have a comparable document for Humanities in the latter half of this academic year. This interim version will be the basis for a timely response to a campus Call when it does appear.

But more importantly, it will allow us to align decisions about the allocation of core resources and the development of extramural support with principles and analyses
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1 Cf. http://socialsciences.ucsc.edu/about/administration/division-docs-policies/five-year-strategic-academic-plan.pdf
of issues that have a degree of common understanding and acceptance within the Division.

We are not starting from scratch: there is a great deal of value in the existing planning documents, both the Divisional plan and the 2008 campus strategic plan. Many things envisioned in the 2005 departmental narratives have now been accomplished. Other elements of those plans have not come to fruition. Which of those have sufficient merit and support to influence the reuse of existing resources as they become available? Those do not have current support or relevance must be updated or set aside.

I request that each department provide an updated academic plan in December as part of its response to the annual Call for Faculty Recruitment proposals.

Effective strategic plans require dialogue between the “bottom up” departmental vision and “top down” questions that reveal opportunities for collaborative themes, prioritize goals that are inherently trans-departmental, and reveal gaps to be addressed.

Assumptions and Objectives of Departmental Plans

The plans developed this year will guide decanal decisions through 2014-15, giving it a nominal scope of 3 years. However because 2014-15 recruitment requests will be the basis for new faculty appointments that begin in 2016-17, the effective range for these plans is 5 years.

The Division’s updated plan will assume a senate faculty size of 100. Support of undergraduate instruction involves additional non-senate faculty and graduate student instructors. However senate faculty size is the major determinant of the Division’s profile in graduate education and research.

This assumption is “steady state” relative to current resources. Given the anticipated July 2013 permanent budget reduction, it is the most reasonable optimistic assumption. If it becomes possible to restore funding to some of the faculty provisions surrendered to budget cuts, priority will be to advance more rapidly toward the goals of these updated plans and to stabilizing undergraduate curriculum through temporary academic staff.

The primary objective of this planning process is to ensure that each department and program has a shared vision and a realistic understanding of the range of faculty that will be available to support that vision. All proposals for new faculty recruitments will be evaluated within the context of these updated plans.

A secondary objective is to ensure that the Division can convey—to external constituencies and campus colleagues as well as ourselves—a compelling vision of the distinctiveness and effectiveness of our academic programs.
The template for departmental plans is provided in Appendix I. The plans should address the prompt questions within a report of no more than 10 pages. Each department will receive an individualized “charge” letter providing more specific planning assumptions and suggesting issues to be addressed in the plan.

Responses should be drafted with the understanding that they will be circulated within the Division for discussion. There will be an opportunity to revise them in the winter, subsequent to consultation and the circulation of the draft Divisional plan. The revised plans will be posted on the Division’s public website as components of the updated plan.

Survey of Previous Divisional Plans
As background, it is instructive to review the most recent Divisional plans:

1. The 1999 Hankamer Intermediate Range Academic Plan
2. The 2001 Godzich Ten-Year Plan
3. The 2006 Lease Interim 5-year Plan
4. The 2007 Van Den Abbeele Revised 5-year Plan

The planning assumptions and objectives set by the central administration influence the content and the rhetoric of each of these plans. Together they illustrate a fateful arc of ambitious optimism about the expansion of campus academic programs based upon new resources funded through enrollment growth. The optimism of budget assumptions declines consistently across this arc. The focus on new program development gradually gives way to a rhetoric of retrenchment and stabilization.

Changing Budget Assumptions
The first two plans are responses to Calls for the Divisions to articulate priorities for use of new resources earned through enrollment growth and for new “initiatives” that would compete as candidates for differential investment at the campus level. As a consequence, they focus on assigning priorities for additional faculty positions, with little attention to how implementing the plans might affect the shape of existing faculty configurations. Though articulated in very different circumstances, both plans can inform our current discussion by revealing longstanding concerns and priorities, particularly those that shed light on needs and gaps in programming.

The Hankamer plan was formulated subsequent to 1990’s budget crisis, which left the Division with a large structural deficit that was successfully eliminated. This plan focuses on faculty renewal and expansion following a period of contraction through retirements. The central administration’s estimates of new resources seem generous by current standards, but still fell short of the level that would be needed to fully build out the good ideas generated within the Division. The subsequent Godzich plan, which is more ambitious in framing initiatives, is frank in its
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acknowledgement that achieving the plan would require effectiveness in raising substantial funds through extramural grants and gifts.

Then came the 2004 budget cuts, which reduced the new administration's assessment of the new faculty resources that would be generated by enrollment growth.

The Lease Interim plan of 2006 provides a “candid assessment” of the limitations on the Division’s aspirations. The 2007 Van Den Abbeele plan describes itself as an addendum to the Lease plan, though it contains substantive revisions and includes a discussion of Divisional thematic strengths that contributed to the 2008 campus Strategic Academic Plan. The campus plan appeared in its final form just as the current budget crisis arrived, and constitutes the baseline for the current update.

The optimism of previous planning assumptions explains why the primary implementation challenge of the last 5 years has been to manage a distressing but necessary deflation of expectations about future faculty size. My primary aim over the last two years has been to respond as humanely as possible to the predicament of programs whose aspirations, perhaps reasonable under earlier over-optimistic assumptions, have been thwarted.

The current update will complete this arc by providing the Division’s first “steady state” academic plan. We must consciously set aside the customary assumptions and rhetoric that focus academic planning on new resources and growth—in the sense of expansion. We must still “grow,” but in the sense of evolving through incremental and developmental change—in response to changes in our fields and the needs of our students. The pace of that development may be slower and less predictable in timing than that envisioned by past plans. But I hope that it will thereby acquire a persistence of accomplishment that might have eluded us in the past. By bringing optimism and new initiative into formulating a steady-state plan, I believe that we will position ourselves to take advantage of any new resources to enhance our effectiveness and achieve some of our aspirations for excellence.

Retrospective of Priorities, Initiatives, and Accomplishments
It is informative to review the priorities articulated in the various Divisional plans. In many cases, Divisional and departmental goals have been achieved. Some aspirations persist across the plans; others are more ephemeral. To provoke thought in this respect, here is a high-level survey of the substantive objectives and initiatives from the plans.

The 1999 plan puts forward the following priorities for planning:

1. Rebuild core programs most heavily damaged by VERIP retirements.
2. Increase undergraduate enrollments.
3. Sustain existing graduate programs.
4. Extend faculty opportunities for graduate teaching.
5. Sustain and create excellence in all programs.
The Divisions highest priorities were:

- An Institute for Humanities Research that would provide cost-effective infrastructure for research support, increase extramural funding, and facilitate interdisciplinary research clusters.
- Difference and Citizenship: An initiative in Ethnic and Gender Studies. Build an interdepartmental faculty in gender and ethnicity studies in support of general campus curriculum for which there is high demand and to support the longstanding goal of a graduate program in comparative American Studies.

The plan envisions new Ph.D. programs in Philosophy and in Comparative U.S. Studies and notes the creation of the designated emphasis program in Feminist Studies as advancing the priority of extending faculty opportunities for graduate teaching.

Increasing undergraduate enrollments was noted as a necessary condition for new faculty resources. The dean suggested that “we must scrutinize every new FTE commitment with regard to its probable effect on future enrollment in the division, in addition to consideration of curricular coverage [and] intellectual coherence of a program” and that the Division “should develop one or two programs with an applied emphasis to balance our more general and theoretical emphases…”

The uneven impact of faculty retirements gave attention to hiring priorities in Philosophy and Literature. In addition, the plan notes the concern that History of Consciousness needed a long-range plan for faculty renewal because of anticipated retirements “toward the end of the next decade.”

The plan also notes the need for a Humanities building to provide faculty with spaces “in which to engage in communication with colleagues, to work on enhancing both research and pedagogy by technological means, and to work with students…in a context which provides the necessary spaces and technological support” (e.g. a distance learning facility and a humanities technology center).

Finally, the plan mentions “preliminary discussions” of possible undergraduate programs in Classical Studies, Communication and Rhetoric, Pre- and Early Modern Studies, Italian Studies, Jewish Studies, and a major in Spanish with emphasis on preparation for teaching as well as an M.F.A. in Creative Writing.

The 2001 plan sets a goal in broad intellectual terms: “to refocus the work of the division on the task of the humanities in this new century.” In context, this is a call to consider how academic work can contribute value to society and how that work emerges from the interplay between bounded disciplinary and collaborative multidisciplinary modes of inquiry and knowledge production.

“Societal demand for what the humanities can provide is not diminishing. If anything, it is dramatically increasing. It is not turning to academic humanities for answers because academic humanists are not addressing these demands by and
large.... The need for the humanities is as great as it has ever been, but we must concede that most humanists do not presently address this societal demand.” (p. 2)

“The disciplinary organization of knowledge favors disciplinary questions, and tends to shunt aside broader and more complex problems.... A multidisciplinary approach... assumes that the type of knowledge we need is forged where different concepts, methods, [and] modes of thought meet and argue their own case.... The humanities are constructed around three fundamental disciplines: philosophy, literature, and history. Their strength is required for the profitable pursuit of the interdisciplinary. .... The current organization of the division must not be taken for granted. Departmental boundaries may well need to be redrawn....” (p. 3, 5)

The plan assumes that the IHR will play a facilitating role in the development of initiatives and prioritizes the goal of a graduate group in Comparative American Studies, with the American Studies department as a major stakeholder. It notes the need for Philosophy to develop a research focus that will provide a distinctive basis for its graduate program and the important role that Philosophy should play within the division in interdisciplinary collaborations. The plan discusses development of a full graduate program for Feminist Studies and the challenge of renewing the History of Consciousness faculty by hiring in clusters. It also raises the prospect of departmentalization of the Language and Writing Programs by developing research foci that would lead to ladder faculty appointments affiliated with those programs.

Written in a context that anticipated the allocation of new resources based upon enrollment growth, it emphasizes the need to implement an effective enrollment strategy at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It also lists 12 initiatives that might be undertaken in the coming decade:

1. Master's in Public Humanities, a professional degree leading to careers in the public or private sector.
2. Science, Medicine, and Technology Studies.
3. Major and M.A. in Liberal Arts, to “prepare the graduate for a full and rich intellectual and professional life and for responsible local, national, and global citizenship.”
5. Human Health Major.
6. Center for Mind and Language.
7. Jewish Studies.
8. South Asian Studies Center.
9. Graduate Group in East Asian and Asian Diaspora Studies
10. Graduate Group in Comparative U.S. Studies
11. Pre- and Early Modern Studies
12. Institute for Advanced Feminist Studies

The plan provides two primary measures as accountability milestones: student/faculty ratio and graduate enrollment, noting that these drive key resource allocation decisions. It also lists several indicators as measures of the Division’s
productivity and impact, including degrees granted and the levels of extramural funding received from gifts or from contracts and grants.

This plan represents the zenith of ambitions for expansion and notes that implementation would require substantial (in the millions) of new dollars from the campus and from divisional fundraising for graduate support, staff support, and programming.

The January 2006 submittal of a Draft Academic Plan for 2010-11 was formulated under diminished expectations for resources, and consequently “argues for a genuine setting of priorities, not simply a listing of everything that is deemed important or desirable.” It is framed by a prioritized list of problems to be solved:

- The need to live within the Division’s resources
- The need to resolve the funding of the curriculum in Writing and Languages
- The vision of access to graduate work for all ladder faculty
- The goal of preserving the quality of the strongest programs

Its preface notes:

“We must learn to exist and thrive within the emerging restrictions of our resources, we must seek out new sources of financial support, and we must do a better job of communicating with the public... and with our colleagues in other disciplines.... Our challenge is to organize our curricula and our departments in ways that are achievable and sustainable given the resources available.”

The resources assumed to be available include an allocation of several new faculty positions from the center and several from the Division’s reserve. Hence the plan focuses on the distribution of new faculty lines to increase the Division’s ladder faculty from 100 to about 120.

The plan assumes that new initiatives (such as Comparative US Studies and the Feminist Studies graduate program) will be delayed and that Writing and Language Programs would be held at their current levels of staffing and instruction, and that “future growth and change in the Division will only be achieved by reallocation of existing resources.” In that context, it proposes the following priorities for the allocation of available resources:

1. Build out and stabilize the underdeveloped programs in the Division: American Studies, Feminist Studies, and Philosophy. Otherwise we must contemplate the elimination of at least two of these.
2. Stabilize and strengthen the Division’s small but highly rated programs now facing almost wholesale transition in their faculty bodies: History of Consciousness and Linguistics.
3. Hold at current levels of strength the Language and Writing Programs. At the same time, a way must be found to meet the UC-bargained costs that will reduce the programs by up to three FTE every four years.
4. The Division’s large and stable programs (History and Literature) will be forced to live chiefly off their replacements.

In Fall 2006 Humanities 1 opened its doors and the central administration had updated (and lowered) its estimate of the future faculty size of the Humanities division. The campus level planning process looked for thematic threads that would unify the various divisional plans into a more coherent academic plan for the campus.

In October 2007 the Division’s current Academic Plan was submitted. As noted above, it incorporates some of the assumptions (and prose) of its predecessor. But it moves beyond it in several important respects. Its audience is shifted more to the general campus, especially in its introductory essay and the thematic description of the strengths of the division. It also works to connect the theme of the interplay between “disciplinary strength and interdisciplinary reach” to practical issues of academic organization and resource allocation.

As this plan represents the basis for our current process, I will segue toward themes for the update by calling attention to the following points implicit the 2006 plan:

- Divisional strengths and a gap: The plan identifies four themes of divisional strength (World Cultures & Civilizations, Languages & Literacies, Philosophy of Science & Technology, and Gender & Sexuality). It also a gap in Religion & Society that deserves attention. (p. 12)
- Reinvigoration of the Graduate Environment: While the various graduate programs are de jure independent of each other, there is a rich set of de facto networks and clusters that connect students in HisCon, Literature, Feminist Studies, and Philosophy with each other and with students in programs in other divisions. There are potential advantages of making this richness more visible to prospective students and to our administrative support for graduate education and resource allocation decisions. (p. 15)
- The outcomes of graduate education in the Humanities: Frank and thoughtful consideration need to be given to how our graduate programs prepare students for life after the degree. Consideration should be given to professionalization for both academic and non-academic careers. (p. 16)
- Plans for the future must take seriously manage enrollment targets and curriculum capacity. (p. 22)
- While a traditional departmental organization works well for a “maintenance organization,” we need more flexibility for the “adaptive organization” to shape the research agenda, graduate education, and innovation in undergraduate education. (p. 13, 23)

These issues remain relevant and should be addressed in the Division’s updated plan.
Reflections to Guide the Update

This history provides useful guidance as we undertake a new planning process. With respect to specific goals and proposals, it should give a sense of accomplishment to review the ones that have been achieved. Correspondingly, reflection on the ones that have not been achieved should guide how—or whether—they are incorporated into the updated plan. Reflection on general trends and the strategies adopted in the various plans also provides some object lessons.

Accomplishments and Unachieved Aspirations

The Division’s accomplishments since 1999 include the building of the Humanities complex, the creation of the IHR, the extension of the range of ladder faculty engaged in graduate education by the programs in Philosophy and Feminist Studies, the creation of interdepartmental undergraduate degree programs in Jewish Studies, Classical Studies, Italian Studies, and German Studies. The development of a ladder faculty in Languages has initiated departmentalization of the Language Program. A proposal for a major in Spanish Studies is ready for Senate review. The Linguistics department’s plan for faculty renewal has largely been accomplished.

Three goals from these plans were not been achieved despite considerable effort and investment on the part of faculty and the Division.

Renewal of the History of Consciousness program’s departmental faculty in the face of retirement demographics was not accomplished. This priority has therefore evolved into the question of how best to rebuild a Faculty able to support the kind of high impact doctoral education for which the program has been renowned.

The effort devoted to developing graduate education in American Studies over this period ultimately did not succeed. As foreseen in the 2006 plan, American Studies is no longer a separate department. The future of the undergraduate degree program in American Studies remains to be resolved.

The 1999 plan’s priority initiative in Difference and Citizenship shows that the need to support ethnic studies is not new to the Division’s planning. That initiative influenced intervening developments in American Studies and Feminist Studies. Programs in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies should remain a priority issue in this planning process.

Object Lessons

A “steady state” plan should focus on the priorities and objectives that will enable departments and the Division to determine the best use of resources that become available. These priorities must be grounded in the realities of resource allocation (e.g. enrollments, degree production) and strong cases for potential impact.

It might seem that the assumption of a steady state senate faculty size of 100 creates a radically different context for Divisional success. But consider the following
profile of the Division over this period, in terms of permanent budgeted faculty, degree production and enrollments at the undergraduate and graduate levels:\footnote{Data drawn from the annual Instructional Load Summaries at http://planning.ucsc.edu/irps.}

1999-00: 99 faculty FTE, 504 BAs, 2,124 UG FTE, 165 graduate majors.
2001-02: 101 faculty FTE, 500 BAs, 2,401 UG FTE, 173 graduate majors.
2005-06: 103 faculty FTE, 669 BAs, 2,786 UG FTE, 204 graduate majors.
2007-08: 100 faculty FTE, 664 BAs, 2,678 UG FTE, 200 graduate majors.
2011-12: 93 faculty FTE, 650 BAs, 2,536 UG FTE, 165 graduate majors.

The reality through this period has been that the Division has been largely steady state around 100 in the size of its permanent faculty. Through 2007-08, the Division had successfully increased degree production and enrollment at both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Since then, undergraduate enrollment has declined slightly; graduate enrollment has declined substantially, returning to the levels of 1999. One of the primary issues to be addressed by the updated plan is how to reverse the decline in graduate enrollment and to return to earlier levels of undergraduate enrollment.

Finally, this retrospective calls to our attention to two general issues:

How will the Division make faculty allocation decisions and organize its academic support to ensure both “disciplinary strength and interdisciplinary reach”?

What steps will we take to address the concern that the value and impacts of academic work in the humanities are not always visible or appreciated by broader audiences?

I hope that these remarks will provoke productive conversations at the Chairs retreat.

WAL

Appendix I: Template for Departmental Plans
Appendix II: Humanities section and general principles from 2008 Campus Plan