

ANOTHER 6,000 PLANNED

UCSC's goal of increasing enrollment has a far-reaching impact

UCSC - Growth
What's good for the state of California just may not be good for those who live on the Westside of Santa Cruz.

On this page, readers will find a lengthy explanation of how UC Santa Cruz may grow



TOM HONIG

Editor

over the next 15 years. It's being reproduced here to give readers a deeper understanding of how a special committee has arrived at a goal of some 21,000 students by 2015.

As most people know, the pressure

on University of California campuses is intense these days: the pressure to grow, the pressure to serve a new generation of students and the pressure to overcome financial problems to remain the premier public research university in the world.

Yet how do those lofty concerns help the resident of Santa Cruz's Westside? It's that person who gets stuck in traffic or who can't find a place to park. It's that person who moved to Santa Cruz to find a little peace of mind and who now must deal with big-city crowding.

There's little question that UC Santa Cruz has had a big impact on Santa Cruz life. And most Santa Cruzans say that impact has been a good one.

Yes, there are problems associated with growth. There's more traffic and less water. But there's also a huge economic benefit. A university also means ancillary research facilities and even light industry, something



The construction of College Nine allowed UCSC to accommodate a greater number of students. Some 6,000 more are planned.

Kruger as UCSC opened in 1965. He predicted that the university would change the area, but that Santa Cruz would never be simply a "university town."

Twenty years later, when I was city editor, I wrote a follow-up column speculating about what the next few years

Yes, there are problems associated with growth. There's more traffic and less water. But there's also a huge economic benefit. A university also means ancillary research

avoids the main issue that some local people face. Bringing in 6,000 new students and support staff over the next 15 years will have a tremendous impact on traffic and housing.

It remains to be seen how the City Council will respond to this growth. The city

3-28-04 What do you think?

■ Will growth be unmitigated bad news? What about the benefits? Should the local community fight the growth plans, or should it ask its city leaders to provide better roads? Should the eastern access be built?

■ Send your comments to thonig@santacruzsentinel.com.

only hurt Westside residents. The city has had ample opportunity and develop a second entrance to UCSC — the so-called "eastern access" — but has steadfastly refused to do so. Even worse, the current City Council has refused to even open up a discussion on the subject.

Those affected by UC Santa Cruz growth and by decisions made by the City Council too often aren't asked for their opinion. And that's what I'd like to hear.

How do you feel about UC Santa Cruz's plans? Will growth be unmitigated bad news? What about the benefits? Does Santa Cruz, as host city, have a responsibility to the rest of California?

Should the local community fight the growth plans, or should it ask its city leaders to provide better roads? Should the eastern access be built? Even with the growth, has UC proven to be a good partner? After all, UCSC remains one of the smallest campuses in the system. And it houses more students on campus than any other UC site.

Tell me what you think. I'll be happy to publish as many responses as possible.

What do you think? Please send your comments by e-mail to thonig@santacruzsentinel.com. Or, put your thoughts in

from which a cash-strapped city of Santa Cruz can benefit.

Inside this section, the Sentinel is presenting two historical views of the impact of UCSC. The first was written by then-City Editor Jim

had in store. I was nowhere near as prescient as Kruger had been; my discussion of the future role of the university all but ignored the impact that the computer would have.

But much of this dialogue

facilities and even light industry, something from which a cash-strapped city of Santa Cruz can benefit.

to this growth. The city over the past generation has not planned well for growth, preferring a policy of not supplying city services in hopes that the lack of infrastructure will discourage growth. Such lack of foresight has

writing, and send them to me in care of the Sentinel, 207 Church St., Santa Cruz, CA 95061.

Contact Tom Honig at thonig@santacruzsentinel.com.

Nuts, bolts of UCSC's Long Range Development Plan

EDITOR'S NOTE: This letter was written to the UC Santa Cruz community. Professor Gary Griggs is chairman of the Strategic Futures Committee, one of two panels charged with working toward the campus Long Range Development Plan.

Two committees have been appointed as part of the campus process to update the UC Santa Cruz long-range development plan. As one of its tasks, the Strategic Futures Committee — charged with considering possible enrollment



GARY GRIGGS

trajectories for UCSC over the next fifteen years — has been asked to recommend an on-campus enrollment scenario for the year 2020.

This scenario will initiate an iterative consultative process between the Strategic Futures Committee and the Long Range Development Plan Committee designed to evaluate the land-use implications of such an enrollment level, to understand its implications for campus quality of life, and to explore ways in which the campus and the community can work together creatively to ensure that university and community growth and development is planned synergistically to the benefit of both parties.

It was this latter expectation

that prompted the university to synchronize its LRDP planning horizon with that of the next Santa Cruz General Plan.

From the perspective of its first four decades, UCSC is now looking 15 years into the future with its fifth Long Range Development Plan. As we sought to arrive at a working number, foremost in our thinking was the balance between how much the campus wants to grow in order to implement its academic vision and how fast the campus and the community could reasonably accommodate that growth. Over the last 15 years, the campus grew at an average annual rate of nearly 4 percent; we believe that over the next 15 years, the campus should grow at a slower rate — perhaps averaging half that of the previous period.

The challenge we now face collectively is to plan intelligently for the decade-and-a-half ahead, using the best available information, data and input, listening to all of the varied viewpoints, but also retaining flexibility for the unknown opportunities of the future.

All academic institutions evolve over time in response to changing demographics, societal needs and values, and technological developments, as well as external challenges, economics and employment opportunities. This fact has been recognized in each of the campus' previous physical plans.

The first LRDP, completed in 1963, recommended, "the campus should retain

All academic institutions evolve over time in response to changing demographics, societal needs and values, and technological developments, as well as external challenges, economics and employment opportunities. This fact has been recognized in each of the campus' previous physical plans.

flexibility." The subsequent 1971 plan stated that physical development should be phased to the paced growth of the academic plan such that adequate space and flexibility were retained for future growth and change.

Seven years later, the 1978 LRDP affirmed, "The LRDP will change as issues change. Its intent is to guide growth and development at Santa Cruz until it, like earlier plans, needs changing to reflect future needs."

Similarly, the 1988 LRDP set aside inclusion areas and campus resource lands to address those changing needs — including growth and development beyond 2005. It is anticipated and expected that all future long-range plans will need to be updated periodically to keep up with a changing world and society. The 2005-2020 LRDP is no exception and will need to be crafted to accommodate that requirement.

A number of internal and external factors will influence the analysis of campus enrollment growth. The Strategic Futures Committee focused its attention on three primary factors and organized itself into subcommittees to analyze each:

■ The campus' aspirations — including its desire to enhance the distinction of its academic programs and, in particular, the quality and effectiveness of its graduate programs — require that the campus make provision for sufficient numbers and breadth of faculty to fully develop its existing and newer programs as well as be competitive in emerging fields and have the flexibility to support new research activities;

■ The opportunities and potential for new graduate programs, research centers and professional schools in emerging or new disciplines, consistent with the campus' existing strengths, future opportunities and regional connections; and

■ The University of California's responsibility to the people of this state to provide higher-education access requires that the campus accommodate its share of California's growing number of academically prepared and increasingly diverse high school graduates, community college transfers and those requiring post-baccalaureate (graduate or professional) education.

Recognizing, however, that this pressure for significant growth through 2020 and

beyond needs to be balanced by countervailing academic principles, the Strategic Futures Committee created a team to articulate a vision for the UC Santa Cruz of 2020 with a special emphasis on those qualities that will affect a sustainable quality of life for faculty, staff, students and the surrounding community.

This fourth subcommittee reviewed existing campus strategic and vision documents to identify the values, principles and qualities of UC Santa Cruz that must be preserved as the campus considers growth associated with the next stage of its development.

External factors beyond our control include the numbers of UC-eligible graduating high school seniors, the number of community college transfer applicants, as well as the economic health of the state and, therefore, the resources available to the university to meet these enrollment demands.

Factors internal to the campus include achieving the balance between graduate and undergraduate enrollment and the rate of new student enrollment that can be supported and sustained — which, in turn, is influenced by the hiring of new faculty, time required to develop and gain approval for new graduate programs and professional schools, construction of facilities, adequate staff and infrastructure.

We feel strongly that flexibility for change and growth beyond 2020 needs to be maintained in campus planning.

Based upon its deliberations and consultations thus far, the Strategic Futures Committee is committed to a growth rate that is careful, responsible and strategic, and consistent with an emphasis on quality and campus values — including the campus' desire to work with the Santa Cruz community to seek practical solutions to the inevitable challenges of change and growth.

Therefore, the Strategic Futures Committee is forwarding this initial recommendation to the chancellor and campus provost and to the LRDP Committee that the campus' 2005-2020 LRDP accommodate a three-quarter-average on-campus enrollment of up to 21,000 students — a greater proportion (15 percent) of which are graduate and professional students. This more conservative scenario represents growth of 400 new students a year, on average, and equates to a growth rate of 2.7 percent in 2005, falling to 1.9 percent in 2020 — a significant reduction from the average annual growth rate of 7.3 percent for the last five years and 3.8 percent for the last 15 years.

The Strategic Futures Committee sees this step, the recommendation of a growth rate and enrollment scenario for 2020, as the end of Phase 1 and the beginning of Phase 2 of the planning process. We look forward to reviewing the land use, environmental and community implications of our suggested 2020 enrollment.

Gary Griggs is a professor of Earth Sciences at UCSC and director of the Institute of Marine Sciences.