

January 28, 2013

DEAN KAMIENIECKI  
DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Dear Dean Kamieniecki:

Please find below the final report for the Future Fit and Form of the Social Sciences Committee.

Sincerely,

Ken Kletzer,  
Chair, F3S2 Committee

## **Committee on the Future Fit and Form of the Social Sciences Report**

### **Introduction**

The Committee was charged with considering the future of the Division of Social Sciences at UCSC following the budget reductions of the past five years. Our discussions found their focus on the allocation of academic human resources to, and within, the Division. In this context, we discussed priorities and principles for allocating faculty FTE within the Division, and the implications of faculty attrition for maintenance of research excellence and meeting the curriculum. The Committee also discussed whether the academic organization and curricular coverage of the division needed to be reconsidered in light of budgetary pressures, and how the Division ought to respond to the immediate consequences of the budget cuts on faculty numbers.

The central issue for planning in the Division is how to manage the shrinkage of the size of the faculty over the last five years. In 2007-08, there were 159.5 permanent faculty FTE in the Division, including eight FTE in Community Studies. At present, there are 138.5 FTE including current open recruitments for July 2013 appointments and two Social Science appointments previously appointed in Community Studies. Subtracting off the eight faculty FTE previously appointed in Community Studies, the net loss of permanent faculty FTE allocated to the Division is 13.

Social Sciences suffered more than half of the reduction in permanent faculty FTE for the campus since the peak in 2008-09. Yet, the Division grants 48% of the degrees awarded by the campus and carries 29% of the student FTE workload with 27% of the campus permanent budgeted faculty FTE. The difference between the share of total student enrollments and degrees is due to two factors. General education requirements explain most of the difference arithmetically. The movement of students away from intended majors in the sciences and engineering to the social sciences is another factor. The high percentage of degree recipients indicates the Division has a disproportionately higher upper division instructional workload than the rest of the campus. Upper division and graduate curriculum is more intensive in ladder faculty time so that both numbers must be considered for evaluating instructional workloads for permanent faculty. Within the Division, large faculty losses were concentrated in departments with already exceptional workloads raising the disparity between those departments and the rest of the campus further.

The reduction in the State contribution to the UC budget requires reconsideration of priorities for meeting UCSC's research, education and public service mission. The place of UCSC in the University and academic community depends on the quality of its research and graduate programs. Moreover, the UC is emphasizing graduate enrollments in the distribution of resources to campus. Thus, we think that the health and growth of graduate and research programs are essential for the Division and the campus. These are what distinguish a research university from other higher educational institutions. The first strategy for building the strength of graduate and research programs is to avoid losing

currently strong programs. This should be a campus priority as well as a divisional one. Maintenance is less expensive than rebuilding. The second step for the Division is to improve programs that are not as strong. The Division needs strong programs across the board and at the same time cannot let core programs decline.

Many times, campus administration has said that instructional workloads will no longer determine faculty resource distribution. Instead, the emphasis on graduate and research programs will be paramount. Instructional workloads and research programs are not independent of each other. Extraordinary instructional workloads impede research and graduate advising. Deciding that instructional workloads will not determine resource allocation is simplistic and ignores the most important reason for addressing extraordinary workloads: the cost these impose on faculty research and graduate programs.

The exceptional burden of recent faculty attrition without replacement for departments that already had extraordinary instructional workloads and successful graduate programs in the Social Sciences must be a concern for the campus. We believe that the current and future objectives of the campus are best served by bringing the total FTE for the Division back to the number held by the existing eight departments before replacement of faculty departures and retirements was halted. Not doing so would mean losing well-reputed research programs that offer degrees to a large percentage of UCSC's students.

## **Background**

The distribution of the decrease in permanent faculty FTE across departments is illustrated in Table 1. The FTE counts in Table 1 include recruiting allocations for each of the two academic years. For example, there were 7.5 ladder faculty FTE in LALS in 2007-8 plus 3 budgeted recruitments which were filled that year.

The table reveals the disparities in the loss of FTE across departments. The largest absolute and percentage loss of faculty occurred in Economics. These FTE were taken away from the department instead of being opened for recruitment following departures and retirements during the years of budget cutting. Psychology had a series of retirements and departures that began before the University's budget cuts. The department was allowed to fill some of these positions, but suffered a net loss of FTE. Psychology lost an additional two FTE at the end of 2006-07 so that a more accurate count of the decrease in the number of faculty in the department is 4.5 FTE. Education and Sociology have both experienced larger percentage decreases in faculty FTE than did Psychology. The three FTE added to Environmental Studies were transfers of one FTE each from LALS, Politics and Sociology. These transfers within the Division do not represent net losses of FTE for the Social Sciences. Politics lost two FTE accounting for 13% of the faculty. Two departments, Anthropology and Environmental Studies, grew.

The instructional workload of the division provides additional quantitative background. Campus data allow different ways to measure instructional workloads. Table

2 reports three representative measures of workloads across departments and between the Social Sciences and the rest of the campus.<sup>1</sup> The numerator for the first column is total student annual FTE enrollment divided by permanent faculty FTE. The numerator for the second column is total student enrollment (headcount) in courses taught by permanent faculty divided by permanent faculty FTE. This measures the actual instructional workload of ladder faculty because it excludes students taught by temporary lecturers and graduate student instructors. The third and fourth columns report the ratio of majors and of degrees granted to permanent faculty FTE. Counts for majors are misleading because these include the intended majors of lower division students that are frequently abandoned in favor of majors in the social sciences. Degree counts report actual rather than intended majors, and the ratio of degrees to faculty FTE provides a good measure of upper division and graduate instructional loads. The denominator, budgeted faculty, is chosen because it measures the total permanent faculty FTE allocated to each department. It does not include unfilled FTE held outside the department or full-time equivalents filled by temporary lecturers. The ratios for actual permanent faculty instructional workload (second column of Table 2) and the degree to permanent faculty ratio (fourth column) are the most relevant measures of ladder faculty workloads.

## Discussion

Dean Kamieniecki suggested that the Committee consider a future of the Division with a total of 140 FTE instead of the approximately 152 FTE in the eight current departments in 2007-08 (this subtracts the FTE in Community Studies). A target of 140 FTE leaves only 1.5 FTE to add to the Division. Such a permanent reduction in FTE would impede research and instructional programs in the most impacted departments for a long time and hamstring departments launching graduate programs. A second round of consequences could follow if retirements in other departments are used to save the currently most affected departments. The age distribution of ladder faculty is not uniform across departments as depicted in Table 3. Reallocating FTE within the Division as they become available through departures and retirements to achieve a planned reallocation of fewer total FTE could take many years.

Our starting point for thinking about strategies is to consider why the status quo is undesirable. The Division is at a real risk of losing successful Ph.D. programs, motivating the exit of productive and prominent research faculty and reducing or eliminating undergraduate teaching by ladder rank faculty. Some programs may be near a tipping point at which declining faculty numbers accelerate and graduate program reputations are lost. We see this course as counterproductive for the overall research prominence, teaching and service missions of the Division and campus. We think that maintaining and building the vitality of graduate and research programs should be a priority of the Division.

Meeting this goal also means providing departments with adequate faculty resources for undergraduate instruction. High instructional workloads for ladder faculty impede faculty effort that can be applied to research and graduate advising. Extraordinary

---

<sup>1</sup> All data are from Course Audits and Instructional Load Surveys, Office of Planning and Budget, UCSC.

instructional workloads can interfere with research productivity and funding, with adverse consequences for UCSC's excellent scholarly reputation in the social sciences. The quality of undergraduate curriculum and instruction is also enhanced when students are taught by an engaged research faculty. Undergraduate involvement in faculty research has long been a hallmark of the UCSC undergraduate experience. Faculty research, graduate advising, and undergraduate experiential learning will continue to be damaged if the ratio of undergraduate majors to ladder rank faculty FTE is too high.

The wide variation in faculty losses is largely due to the idiosyncratic timing of retirements and departures, rather than to intentional policy decisions. The budget cuts increased instructional workloads in departments that already had, by substantial margins, the highest workload ratios on campus. The distribution of vacated FTE that were not returned to departments for recruiting increased the variance in workloads and hit departments with strong faculties and thriving graduate programs.

One approach for dealing with a permanently smaller faculty is to reduce the cost of delivering undergraduate teaching. This could include eliminating courses, offering fewer sections of required courses and restricting entry into majors further. Offering online lower division courses is not necessarily a cost savings option, although it could be considered. We do not prioritize these possibilities.

The budget cuts resulted in a substantial decrease in lecturer funding. There is a need for lecturers in some of our programs. For example, specialized lecturers are needed to teach courses in clinical psychology, accounting, teacher training and geographical information systems. These lecturers are essential for the undergraduate curriculum, but they are not substitutes for research faculty. Funding sources are needed for lecturers, but ladder faculty FTE should not be sacrificed to fund lecturer appointments in the near term.

## **Recommendations**

The Committee foremost recommends that the Division seek to recover the lost faculty FTE since 2006-07. This represents a minimum of 13 FTE accounting for the disestablishment of Community Studies. This number would allow an approximate return to the allocation of permanent faculty across the eight departments in the Division. The three FTE held in Social Sciences divisional appointments would eventually become allocated to departments. The current allocation of FTE to the Division poses long-term damage to the campus by severely reducing faculty in some of the most successful research and graduate programs on campus that offer the most popular undergraduate degree programs at UCSC.

The Committee discussed reconfiguring the Division along lines other than its current form of eight departments. We do not see reorganization as a solution that could maintain strong research programs and meet our undergraduate teaching needs with a smaller budget. We do not recommend merging faculties or reconfiguring the form of the

Social Sciences at UCSC as a way to create economies in undergraduate or graduate teaching.

Further, we do not recommend eliminating a department to spare FTE for others. Each of the five disciplines in the Division is a core area of the social sciences; Environmental Studies and LALS are important interdisciplinary departments for the University; and Education is an applied social science research domain of its own and fills a high priority for California by preparing teachers and other educators. In the course of our meetings, we considered the health of the social science Ph.D. programs as evidenced by retention, degree completion, placement and external review committee reports. We recommend against cutting any Ph.D. programs in the Division.

The Committee proposes a set of criteria for allocating faculty resources within the Division. Graduate training is a priority that distinguishes the University from other higher educational institutions. Maintaining a high quality Ph.D. program requires adequate research faculty to staff and advise the program and to meet the instructional workload of undergraduate education. Factors that should guide the allocation of FTE across departments however the budget outlook may evolve over the next several years include, in no particular order, the

- instructional workload
- academic strength of faculty
- quality of graduate program
- service to State of California priorities and public benefit
- opportunity for distinction (for example, new programs or strategic plan for building academic strength)
- and organizational health

of each department. An overriding principle is that these criteria be applied in the same way to all departments, whether they currently have massive workloads, established graduate programs, strong research reputations, or not. A department in distress should be treated how a department that did not lose faculty would wish to be treated if roles were reversed. We ask that the dean apply these criteria in allocating resources over both the near and longer term as the Division's resources evolve.

The Division faces an immediate concern in the large decrease in faculty in Economics. As Chancellor Blumenthal has said, "Economics is a poster child for the budget crisis." Economics has a successful Ph.D. program and grants the most undergraduate degrees on campus (across its three majors). It is difficult to conceive that the campus would choose to squander a strong well-reputed program that serves a large undergraduate population. We think that this is an immediate concern of the Division that should be attended to by the EVC and chancellor as well.

Economics poses an additional concern for the Division. Simply borrowing FTE from the future to replace losses in Economics clearly shifts the problem to other

departments in the Division. This would be treating the crisis for Economics as part of a game of musical chairs.

The extraordinary workloads and faculty size reductions for other departments in the Division are important. Psychology's Ph.D. program is impacted by faculty losses compounded by the Department's extraordinary instructional workload. The consequences of the faculty reductions for research and graduate advising in Politics and Sociology should be evaluated and considered.

Workload numbers are not as useful for measuring the impact of faculty losses on Education. Education cannot offer an undergraduate major and offers a professional licensing program requiring clinical supervision which is staffed and structured differently from undergraduate programs. The ratios of majors and degrees to permanent faculty should be interpreted in light of these differences. The Education program at UCSC has lost the second largest percentage of faculty in the Division and faces the largest number of potential retirements over the next several years. Its need for faculty resources should be determined by the department's contributions to research, graduate advising and teacher training for the State.

Workloads are an important guide for allocating resources even if only research and graduate programs matter. They also affect the quality of undergraduate education. The curricular demands on each of the departments in the Division for teaching and advising undergraduates are similar. Each discipline or interdisciplinary program should be assigning papers or similar writing and grading intensive projects. The capacity to do this depends on faculty workloads and the availability of qualified graduate students. Departments with high workloads do not need a smaller faculty to do the same job. Instead they make do with fewer faculty so that all programs have adequate resources to sustain a healthy Ph.D. program.

## **Summary**

The changes in faculty FTE across all departments of the Division need to be evaluated in light of the impact on graduate programs and the research productivity of the Division. The unevenness of faculty FTE losses in the Division poses a thorny problem for the Social Sciences not faced by other divisions at UCSC. For example, Physical and Biological Sciences did not suffer disproportionate FTE losses and faces fairly uniform prospective retirements. In its proposed plan to reduce FTE through attrition, PBSci can simply reduce the faculty of each department by one FTE over time and maintain the status quo distribution of faculty across departments.

Social Sciences lost more FTE during the budget crisis than it would in the bad case scenario expected before the passage of Proposition 30. The return of 1.5 FTE, however, will hardly ameliorate the concentration of the FTE losses. These losses impact high-workload departments and pose immediate peril for programs that make major contributions to UCSC's research reputation. It is imperative to deal with the present crisis in some departments, but equally important to avoid sacrificing other outstanding

programs. We do not see a strong future for the Social Sciences at UCSC if we stay on the current trajectory, which will lead to a couple of strong programs at the expense of the others with an overall decline in research productivity, external research funding, graduate program strength and the quality of undergraduate education.

Respectively submitted,

Mark Anderson  
Kyle Eischen  
Jean Fox Tree  
Kenneth Kletzer, Chair  
Michael Loik  
Jo Ann McFarland  
Brad Olsen  
Eleonora Pasotti  
Hector Perla  
Craig Reinerman

January 28, 2013



**TABLE 1**

	Budgeted FTE 2007-08	Budgeted FTE 2012-13	Budgeted FTE plus active recruitments 2012-13	Five-year Change	Percentage Change
Anthropology	20	20	21	1	5.0
Economics	27	18.5	20.5	-6.5	-24.1
Education	18	14	14	-4	-22.2
Environmental Studies	16	19	19	3	18.8
Latin American Latino Studies	10.5	9	9	-1.5	-14.3
Politics	15	12	13	-2	-13.3
Psychology	27.5	24	25	-2.5	-9.1
Sociology	17.5	14	14	-3.5	-20.0
Community Studies	8				
Social Sciences		3			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>159.5</b>	<b>133.5</b>	<b>138.5</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-8.2</b>

**TABLE 2**

	Student FTE Enrollment per FTE (2011-12)	Enrollments taught by Senate Faculty per FTE (2011-12)	Majors per Faculty FTE (2011-12)	Degrees per Faculty FTE (2011-12)
Anthropology	22	180	20	9
Economics	44	324	38	20
Education	22	134	7	7
Environmental Studies	35	219	40	20
Latin American Latino Studies	23	241	13	6
Politics	27	207	37	20
Psychology	45	293	40	23
Sociology	35	262	24	15
Social Sciences Division	34	233	29	16
Campus excluding Social Sciences Division	30	175	17	6

Source: Instructional Load Survey 07-08 – 11-12, Office of Planning and Budget, UCSC, November 2012 and Course Audits, 2011-12, Office of Planning and Budget, UCSC.

**TABLE 3**

	Percentage of Faculty over 60 as of 7/1/12
Anthropology	25
Economics	32
Education	44
Environmental Studies	17
Latin American Latino Studies	10
Politics	8
Psychology	15
Sociology	36