

MEMORANDUM TO THE UC COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE

FROM THE UC ACADEMIC COUNCIL

August 13, 2010

Re: Senate Response to the Second Round of the Working Group Recommendations

The second round of recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future Working Groups was circulated to all committees of the Academic Senate on each campus and to the systemwide standing committees for evaluation and comment. Because the recommendations were released after the end of the academic year, many committees did not comment, and the divisional responses do not represent formal review, since full consultation with all Senate bodies was not possible at most campuses. However, nine divisions and four committees (BOARS, UCAAD, UCEP, UCFW) did respond. In addition, Chair Powell asked the two faculty co-chairs of the Working Groups, Cynthia Brown (Size and Shape) and Keith Williams (Education and Curriculum) to convene as many of the faculty members on the Working Groups who were willing to review the recommendations, drawing upon their significant expertise. They submitted formal written comment. All comments were discussed by the Academic Council at its July 28, 2010, meeting. This memorandum to the Commission summarizes the commentary and reports the position of the Academic Council. The response is organized thematically by addressing related recommendations from different Working Groups together.

Overview of the Working Group Recommendations

Council observed that many recommendations are similar to prior recommendations and felt that the Working Group recommendations address issues in a far more thoughtful, detailed and comprehensive manner than the Expanded Recommendations or the recommendations from the Council of Vice Chancellors. Several Senate agencies expressed discomfort with the lack of information about the provenance of the Expanded Recommendations. UCSD notes that this “makes the process look secretive and could imply some hidden agenda by the Commission or by the administration.” At the very least, the commonalities between the Working Group recommendations and parallel Expanded Recommendations should have been identified, and reasons been given why the parallel recommendations were put forward.

Respondents were concerned that many of the proposals would undermine ordinary processes of University governance (UCB). The proposals often imply establishing systemwide structures and reporting, which can threaten local autonomy and can become inflexible unfunded mandates, straining diminishing administrative resources (UCB, UCSD). Council is wary of excessive centralization, and asks that specific plans for systemwide initiatives be reviewed once they are developed.

Senate agencies noted several omissions. While the recommendations generally support graduate education, they do not explicitly address the funding of graduate education or its role in the University (UCD, UCSF). Council is very concerned that the rising cost of non-resident tuition adversely affects graduate education. UCD notes, “The erosion of doctoral student financial support [and rising non-resident tuition] seriously affects our ability to compete for the best students and have sufficient numbers to ensure the quality, quantity and breadth of our research enterprise.” Second, UCAAD is concerned that the proposals do not portend well for increased diversity. They state, “Numbers of URM [under-represented minorities] both among students and faculty are below national average; further decreases would possibly have a negative impact on retention and climate.” Also, UCD notes that there

are no recommendations concerning the importance of international education. In a global world, this is a serious omission.

Finally, UCFW expressed disappointment at the scope of the recommendations. UCFW notes, “Rather than focus on the real fiscal problems that need to be fixed, the Commission deals largely with simple problems that can be fixed administratively.” They argue that UC needs to “tackle issues that impact the future existence of the University.” UCB concurs that the recommendations should focus on “transformative (as opposed to incremental) change.”

Strategic Planning/Systemwide Coordination

Size & Shape Recommendation 6—Strategic academic planning in a systemwide context; easier cross-campus enrollment and curricular collaboration. *Conditionally Agree.*

Expanded Recommendation 1—Collect information on effectiveness of academic program reviews including (1) the elimination of unnecessary program duplication, (2) intra-and inter-campus program consolidation, and (3) programs discontinued due to low enrollment, low degree production, and/or quality concerns, and those not responsive to state need or student demand. *Disagree.*

Expanded Recommendation 2—Collect information on policies to ensure effective curricular design and planning, including curricular offerings, and alignment of faculty course assignments with workload policies. *Disagree.*

All three of these recommendations address issues in the purview of the Academic Senate. Moreover, many respondents noted that the Senate has in place very effective, regular, and thorough procedures for academic program and course reviews (UCI, UCM, UCSD, UCEP, AdvGrp). While Senate agencies conditionally agreed with many of the recommendations outlined in Size & Shape 6, they strongly disagreed with Expanded Recommendation 1, and questioned the need for Expanded Recommendation 2. Some members were offended that the recommendations assume that academic units are not meeting core teaching requirements. Others felt that this information already is available and an extra layer of reporting is unnecessary (UCI, UCLA, AdvGrp). However, they would support a mechanism to collect existing information, as long as it does not increase the burden of reporting requirements (UCSB, AdvGrp). Some took issue with the notion that homogenizing the curriculum is desirable, arguing that curricular diversity across the system is a strength (UCB, UCSD). Requiring cross-campus collaboration (especially extending automatically granting course credit beyond the scope of SR477 and SR544) would stymie innovative curricula and ignore different approaches to disciplines and course content. They particularly questioned the meaning of the phrase “unnecessary program duplication.” Who determines this, using what criteria? (UCSB, UCEP, AdvGrp). We note that each campus must maintain a core academic program and be allowed to develop a full range of disciplines (UCM, UCSB) and that programmatic funding priorities should not be made based on a short-term assessment of labor market demand or student interest (UCSD). Finally, low enrollment or degree production are not sufficient criteria for disestablishment, and decisions regarding program elimination should be determined by those qualified to render such judgments, that is, the Academic Senate (UCSD, AdvGrp). Council prefers the approach in Size & Shape 6 and Education & Curriculum 4. The Regents have delegated authority over the curricula to the Senate, and Senate bylaws clearly assign power to the divisions to approve and supervise all courses and curricula (UCLA, UCEP). While campus autonomy must be maintained, Council favors collaboration initiated by the campuses and developing mechanisms to share (but not impose) best practices. To that end, UCEP recommends establishing a task force to facilitate cross-campus

registration and to remove administrative roadblocks. UCEP also references a [survey](#) of campus undergraduate program review practices that it completed in 2007-08. UCEP and the Faculty Advisory Group recommend that degree audit and good academic advising systems should be in place so that campuses can adjust their resources to meet changing demands, and they commend UCLA's Challenge 45, aimed at keeping upper division units in a major to reasonable limits as a model for curricular planning.

Expanded Recommendation 4 and COVC Recommendation 7—Convert to a systemwide semester calendar. Disagree.

Senate agencies strongly disagreed with this recommendation. Respondents argued: 1) the financial benefits have not been demonstrated via a cost/benefit analysis (UCI, UCSD, UCEP, AdvGrp); 2) no information was presented showing the ways in which transfer is impeded by the calendar (UCEP, AdvGrp); and 3) this project should not proceed or be allocated funds at a time of constrained resources (UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCSF, UCEP, AdvGrp). Moreover, the increased burden on faculty workload would negatively affect faculty morale. Some noted that since eight campuses are on the quarter system, synergies already exist (UCSD, UCEP, AdvGrp).

Research Strategies Recommendation 5(a)—Improve ability to create and support multi-campus and systemwide research programs and training. Agree.

Senate respondents agreed with this goal, providing that such efforts are initiated by the campuses and are not imposed top-down (UCB, UCI, AdvGrp). The structures should encourage collaboration with any university, not just within the UC system (UCI). UCD urges that the role of MRUs and ORUs in graduate education should be stressed (UCD). The Faculty Advisory Group notes that this recommendation complements the emphasis on cross-campus collaboration in Size & Shape 6.

Expanded Recommendation 9—Establish systemwide efficiency measures in administrative and financial practices. Conditionally agree.

Expanded Recommendation 10—Implement UC Strategic Investment Program to fund systemwide initiatives. Conditionally agree.

COVC Recommendation 2—Adopt a single payroll system; eliminate redundancies in human resource systems. Conditionally agree.

Council agrees with these recommendations to achieve efficiencies, as long as faculty are consulted on specific plans for implementing systemwide initiatives (UCI, UCLA, UCM, AdvGrp). Details of implementation on any project should be carefully vetted, particularly ones funded by taking on debt (the savings should be demonstrated in the proposal, and the risk should be low). Generally, Council opposes large-scale projects and top-down management, preferring that UCOP acts as a facilitator, and that initiatives be sufficiently flexible to accommodate campus needs. Support for these recommendations should not be construed as an endorsement of centralizing functions at UCOP or for conducting large-scale, costly initiatives (UCLA). We refer you to Council's [response](#) on page 10 to Size & Shape 5 and Funding Strategies 2 in the first round of recommendations.

Enrollment/Expanding Instruction

Size & Shape Recommendation 8—Recommit to the Master Plan; increase nonresident admissions to meet campus capacity; reaffirm the 60:40 ratio of upper division to lower division; move towards a

1:2 ratio of community college transfers to freshmen if the state increases funding; address excess time to degree; maintain or increase graduate student enrollment; support self-supporting terminal Master's degrees; encourage studies of UC professional schools. [Conditionally agree.](#)

Expanded Recommendation 3—Increase income from self-supporting and part-time programs. [Disagree.](#)

Council conditionally agrees to most elements of Size & Shape 8. Council supports the Master Plan, but notes that the University's commitment to the Master Plan should be contingent on the availability of state funds, as well as on the strength of the transfer pool (UCB, UCI, UCSB, AdvGrp). UCI questions whether a 60:40 upper to lower division ratio allows for a 1:2 ratio of transfers to freshmen. UCM comments that some community colleges are not adequately preparing students, and UCEP notes that more information on the progress of transfers is needed. Finally, the state should provide greater funding for upper division students before UC increases the number of transfers (UCEP). Council expressed strong support for maintaining or increasing graduate student enrollment. While supporting incentives for improving time to degree, respondents cautioned that there are legitimate reasons for students to take more than four years to graduate, and advised focusing instead on the total number of units taken (UCI, UCSB). Finally, some Senate agencies are uneasy about differential levels of non-resident enrollment by campus and suggest pooling a portion of non-resident tuition to support all campuses (UCSB, AdvGrp).

Council strongly disagreed with Expanded Recommendation 3, although it does support the targeted expansion of self-supporting terminal Master's degrees. Concerns include: 1) [Use of University resources](#). Council cautions that self-supporting programs usurp campus resources and should not be built on existing courses and infrastructure (UCD, UCSB). An analysis of potential competition between self-supporting and state-supported programs must be part of the approval process of any self-supporting program (UCD). 2) [Costs and revenues](#). As with online education, the proposal would divert resources to new endeavors that are outside the core of the University based on the sometimes dubious assumptions that they will generate revenue. But the revenue goal is unrealistic, as it is based on high-cost MBA programs. The University is unlikely to generate ten times the annual net revenue by expanding to other areas. Choosing an arbitrary revenue target is not good academic planning (UCI, UCLA, UCEP). The University must document sustained demand before starting new programs (AdvGrp). At the undergraduate level, given that such courses are more costly than what UC already offers, who will comprise the market? Council members also expressed concern that these programs privatize graduate education because they do not have a return-to-aid component. Self-supporting programs often do not meet their projected revenues, and do not contribute their fair share to core programs (UCSB). The University must ensure that these programs are truly self-supporting and produce revenue (BOARS, AdvGrp). Council notes that Education & Curriculum 3 suggests a more reasonable approach for expanding self-supporting programs and documents the cost of existing programs (AdvGrp). 3) [Faculty oversight](#). Faculty are opposed to Extension playing a role in approving courses, admissions or degree programs, although it can play an administrative role. Senate faculty should provide oversight (UCD, UCSD, BOARS, AdvGrp). 4) [Teaching staff](#). A main concern is the diversion of faculty from research and teaching in regular University programs (UCB, UCI, BOARS). How will teaching in self-supporting programs be integrated into the merit system? (UCSD) The APM should clarify responsibilities of participating UC faculty (AdvGrp). The alternate scenario is that large numbers of lecturers and Ph.D. students will be hired, which leads to questions of ensuring quality (UCI, UCSD, UCEP). 5) [Quality](#). What distinguishes UC from other state institutions is that we are a research university, with research faculty teaching the undergraduate curriculum; Extension programs generally are not taught by research faculty and therefore can not offer a "UC education." The Faculty Advisory Group notes that the Expanded

Recommendation does not mention quality at all, and this principle must be central. 6) Pedagogical appropriateness. Council endorses expanding self-supporting Master's degree programs. It strongly objects to offering self-supporting bachelor or doctoral degrees as pedagogically inappropriate for a research university. New programs should be faculty-driven and generated by a demonstrated academic need (UCEP, AdvGrp).

Expanded Recommendation 6—Accelerate and broaden online pilot. Strongly disagree.

Expanded Recommendation 7—Initiate planning for a coordinated approach to delivery of online instruction. Disagree.

COVC Recommendation 3—Provide online courses to satisfy transfer articulation agreements in GE. Continue “timely exploration” of online instruction. Disagree.

Council reiterates its opinion expressed in a May 11, 2010 [letter](#) to Provost Pitts and Vice Provost Greenstein endorsing a pilot project on online instruction, and in its [response](#) to Education & Curriculum 2 of the first round of recommendations (see page 12). Council supported the pilot project as an opportunity to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of online courses and to address the many concerns raised by faculty. Please note that Council's endorsement “is contingent on the procurement of external funds and that Council does not endorse the redirection of existing funds to this effort.” We also refer you to the Senate's [response](#) to a report by the Special Committee on Remote & Online Instruction & Residency. Given the significant effort and thought that the entire Senate has devoted to this issue, Council was dismayed that none of the Senate's previously expressed concerns are addressed in this recommendation (UCSB). We reiterate that before proceeding beyond the pilot project, the University must evaluate course quality and cost effectiveness (UCLA, UCSD, UCSF). The proposed timetable and scale in this recommendation are unrealistic and incompatible with a rigorous process of evaluation (UCB, UCI, UCEP, AdvGrp). Similarly, while we restate our opposition to undergraduate online degrees pending evaluation of the pilot project and further consideration by the Senate, we will not restate our concerns about the appropriateness of online instruction in the UC context. Please refer to the documents noted above and to the attached divisional and committee comments on this set of recommendations. We note that in its response, BOARS enclosed regulations it has adopted for online providers of a-g courses. The issues it outlines should be considered.

Regarding Expanded Recommendation 7, Council believes that it is premature to initiate extensive planning before the evaluation of the pilot program is completed (UCSF, UCEP, AdvGrp). Initiating planning presupposes a positive outcome of the pilot project. “We oppose substantial investment of time or money in online education beyond the pilot program until more is known about its efficacy and quality at UC and until the Senate has had a chance to deliberate its potential benefits and failings based on the pilot study.” (AdvGrp)

Finally, Council has grave concerns about funding the pilot project through private loans due to potential conflicts of interest and more importantly, financial risk (UCB, AdvGrp). Council opposes borrowing money to fund the project; this approach constitutes a redirection of future University resources. As numerous failed efforts by other universities show, there is no guarantee that online education will produce revenue, rather than drain it from the system. UCEP cautions “the promise of profit all too often distorts the decisions necessary to produce it.”

Regarding COVC Recommendation 3, Council emphasizes that the use of online general education courses to achieve articulation has not been vetted by the appropriate Senate committees (UCM, UCEP). Developing such a system would require enormous resources and faculty time and would be different

on each campus (UCEP). We note that there is no data, planning, financial analysis or input from CCC or UC faculty in this recommendation (UCSD). Until there is further analysis of this complex issue, Council can not support the thrust of this recommendation. Council does support continuing “timely exploration” of online instruction through the pilot project.

Campus and Systemwide Funding

Size & Shape Recommendation 7—Maintain undergraduate student aid at same level at all campuses; endorse flat assessment on all funding sources, with campuses retaining all revenues they generate and base funding formulas are adjusted; do not apply increases automatically to grad students.

Conditionally agree.

COVC Recommendation 1—Adopt a campus-based budgeting model in which OP is funded through campus assessments. Conditionally agree.

COVC Recommendation 4—Rename “fees.” Allow campuses to retain all fees they generate. Institute a multiyear fee schedule with fee increases of no more than 10% each year. Conditionally agree.

Council conditionally agrees with this set of recommendations for restructuring the ways in which campuses and the central office and systemwide priorities are funded. Council strongly supports the principle of revisiting the bases upon which funding is allocated, and commends the administration for undertaking this complex project. If done well, it will bring unprecedented transparency to UC’s budgetary process and will help the University clarify its priorities. Senate agencies naturally are apprehensive about the details of the new funding model and look forward to participating in the “rebenching” process. The methodology should be clearly stated, agreed to, and periodically reviewed with faculty participation (UCSF, AdvGrp). UCSF suggests that a mechanism be created for campuses to request adjustments. Some Senate agencies are concerned about allowing campuses to retain income from non-resident tuition because it may increase cross-campus disparities and it seems to contradict a systemwide approach to costs and revenues (UCD, UCM, UCSB, AdvGrp). Faculty also seek assurances that there will be a check on central funding. The Faculty Advisory Group notes, “There is a fundamental problem with the idea that the entity that sets the assessment receives the money.” They suggest that a fixed-dollar assessment based on central needs would be a more appropriate way to fund systemwide operations and priorities than a percentage of total campus income.

Senate agencies agreed that it would be desirable to set a multiyear fee schedule, as long as UC has the flexibility to respond to unplanned budget shortfalls (UCLA, UCEP). UCI recommends the adoption of a multiyear tuition schedule by fall 2012 with the level of tuition set as needed to fulfill Master Plan. However, Council rejects the arbitrary maximum of a 10% increase as a promise that can not be guaranteed and could be disastrous for UC’s public relations (UCEP, AdvGrp).

With respect to the other recommendations in Size & Shape 7, Council strongly supports protecting graduate students from automatic fee increases (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCSB, UCSD, AdvGrp). Many respondents endorsed the current system of financial aid distribution, but UCB expressed concern that redistributive financial aid will create disincentives for the pursuit of private support.

COVC Recommendation 5—Pursue increases to indirect cost recovery; ensure fair reimbursement for federal grants and contracts. Conditionally agree.

The Senate has previously commented on similar recommendations. See our [response](#) to Funding Strategies 3 and 4 and Research 1A in the first round of recommendations (pages 8-9).

Expanded Recommendation 8—Increase faculty salaries from non-state resources. No consensus.

Senate agencies were split between rejecting and conditionally agreeing with this recommendation. Because of this lack of consensus, and because the recommendation is not well-specified and a task force will be issuing a report on the subject shortly, Council opted not to take a position at this time. Instead, the Senate will send any detailed proposal that is released for systemwide review. However, we note grave concerns about creating salary inequities, undermining the merit system and faculty morale, and distorting faculty incentives (UCB, UCLA, UCEP). Respondents worry that it may reduce pressure on the state for funding salaries at an adequate level (UCSF, BOARS, AdvGrp). They are concerned that it could “push...scholars into seeking sources of support that may not further their research programs but provide short term financial gains” (UCD) and lead to “mission conflict,” disrupting the balance between teaching and research (UCSB). At one campus, “significant teaching and curricula development activities are being led by non-Senate faculty” as a result of this system of funding salaries. Many respondents urged the University to recommit to the salary scale system and to achieving parity with comparison institutions (UCLA, UCSF, AdvGrp). The Faculty Advisory Group suggests that if it is implemented, it should include a redistribution mechanism. Many respondents are concerned about the stability of non-state funds and the ability of general campuses to generate revenues to cover shortfalls, and about the burden on departments to predict salary needs and to conduct annual individual negotiations (UCEP, AdvGrp). Finally, respondents worry about its effects on diversity and on funding for research and graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. A Council member observed that the incentive for the faculty member to use part of his or her grant for this purpose would have to be carefully structured, and that the number of faculty members to whom it may apply is likely to be small. Another commented that some life sciences departments view it as a way to keep faculty who otherwise would leave. Council members did see the wisdom in charging grants for the portion of state-funded salary that is devoted to grant work, but was hesitant to endorse creating a new salary device separate from the existing process, particularly without the details of the plan.

Quality

Ed & Curriculum Recommendation 5—Changes to curriculum must enhance quality; identify guidelines and measures for quality (including access and affordability) and assess periodically. Conditionally agree.

Research Strategies Recommendation 5(b)—Ensure that academic structures maintain quality of research. Agree.

Respondents had few comments on Research Strategies 5(b); it is axiomatic of being a quality research institution. Senate agencies largely agreed, with caveats, to Education & Curriculum 5. Council concurs with UCEP that all recommendations emerging from the Commission should be considered in terms of their effect on quality. Respondents expressed concerns about unfunded mandates to monitor goals that already are being implemented at the campus level, directing scarce resources away from core academic programs. They note that there may be conflicts between locally defined assessment and a systemwide framework (UCSF), and that more discussion of the value of outcomes assessment is needed (UCSB). UCI disagreed with including access and affordability as components of quality, while UCAAD advocated for explicitly including diversity and equity, as distinct from access and affordability. Respondents suggested several measures of quality, including the achievement of the faculty (UCI), the amount of time that undergraduates devote to academics (UCSD), analytical skills and critical thinking, longitudinal data tracking alumni, WASC assessments of learning outcomes, and cross-campus

assessments of quality (UCEP). Please see the Senate [response](#) to the report of the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force for a more detailed analysis of assessment measures. However, UCSD's Committee on Educational Policy vigorously objected to the notion of measuring quality. They asked what metrics could be used and noted, "A high quality liberal arts education prepares students to ask questions, develop a habit of learning, and gives its graduates many tools and approaches to bring to a labor market." They warn against adopting proxies for quality that then drive the curriculum, but could be detrimental to a true quality education.

Transfer

Ed & Curriculum Recommendation 6—Publish lower division pre-major requirements for transfers. [Conditionally agree.](#)

Size & Shape Recommendation 8—Move toward a 1:2 ratio of transfers to freshmen if the state increases funding for upper division. [Conditionally agree.](#)

Expanded Recommendation 5—Increase community college transfers. [See discussion below.](#)

While Council endorses the goal of increasing successful community college transfers, it declines to comment on Expanded Recommendation 5, as it has few implementation details. Council notes that it prefers the approaches in the recommendations from the Size & Shape Work Group. Please refer to the discussion of Education & Curriculum 6 and Size & Shape 8, below, as well as to the Senate [response](#) to Size & Shape 2 and 3 in the first round of recommendations (pages 9-10).

Transfer is an extraordinarily complex issue; the recommendations on the whole contain laudable goals, but do not address these complexities. Council endorses the goal of increasing successful community college transfers in principle, but it notes a number of overarching concerns. First, the "problem" remains undefined and its extent is unclear. We have no data on the number of students who desire to transfer but were prevented from doing so by bureaucratic roadblocks. We emphasize that until we define the problem, we can not devise appropriate solutions. Second, we note that there must be a limit to the number of transfers we accept, particularly in a budget crisis. Increasing our upper division enrollment is costly to the University, as upper division courses are more expensive to provide than lower division ones. The unexpectedly large yield of transfer admissions this year will place a significant burden on certain campuses. Third, we strongly disagree with the statement that the value of a UC education resides in its upper division course offerings. This abdicates responsibility for ensuring student preparedness and ensuring that lower division education meets UC standards (UCB, AdvGrp). Moreover, UCEP argues that UC should not "offload lower division education to the community colleges. We believe UC brings a particularly unique quality to lower division education." Fourth, curricula vary across campuses because the emphasis and content of majors can be substantively different. Some fear that creating uniform transfer requirements could stifle curricular development and may even put accreditation at risk (UCB, UCSD). Council stresses that departments must determine which courses apply to their major. The transfer pathways at some campuses are very well developed (UCLA). Education & Curriculum 6 describes a web-based process that could help make this more transparent and Council conditionally agrees with this recommendation. The Faculty Advisory Group notes that UCSC's website showing which courses qualify for a major is a good model. Fifth, we should not presume that lower division courses fulfill major requirements since UC has no control over the quality of courses offered at the community colleges. Indeed, the quality varies greatly (UCI, AdvGrp). We caution that the C-ID project spearheaded by the community colleges may not easily solve the issue of course transfer. Course descriptors should not be used in place of articulation, as they do not contain the level of detail in a course outline. However, we endorse UC participation in C-ID, as well as a process to identify

commonalities across UC campuses as first steps toward simplifying transfer. Sixth, given these complexities, any discussion of an Associate transfer degree is premature. We first must resolve articulation and quality issues (AdvGrp). Lastly, tighter review and better preparation, mentoring, and advising all must contribute to increasing successful transfers (UCSD).

Student financial aid/funding education

Size & Shape Recommendation 7(a)—Allocate undergraduate financial aid based on student need; maintain the undergraduate student self-help component of financial aid at the same level across all campuses; and (d)—Do not automatically apply education fee increases to academic graduate students. Agree.

Senate agencies overwhelmingly supported both 7(a) and (d).

Access & Affordability Recommendation 7—Allocate undergraduate systemwide financial aid funding to equalize expectations for student borrowing and work across all students at all campuses. Agree.
Access & Affordability Recommendation 8—Provide financial support to middle-income families. Conditionally agree.

Access & Affordability Recommendation 9—Provide campus flexibility in fund source to meet financial accessibility while improving accessibility for middle-income students. Conditionally agree.

Senate respondents agreed with Access & Affordability 7. UCD and UCSF inquired whether this policy also should apply to graduate and professional students.

Senate agencies supported the notion of providing greater financial support to middle income students, but had some questions. UCI stated that the University needs a better definition of “middle income.” Respondents requested data on the effect of rising fees on middle income students, whether financial aid allocation influences middle income students’ decision to apply, and the impact on lower income students of redistributing financial aid funds (BOARS, UCEP, AdvGrp). BOARS also expressed concern that undergraduates will finance graduate education (BOARS). Divisions were concerned about the source of funding for any such initiative. Gift income will not be sufficient, and the use of gifts and endowments must follow the intent of the donor (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCSD).

Other Forms of Student Support

Research Strategies Recommendation 1—Collaborate with foundations, businesses, industries and national laboratories to provide internships/fellowships. Agree.

Respondents agreed with this recommendation, if the costs are not significant (UCB). UCSF noted that we must ensure that the programs’ quality meets UC standards and UCSD noted that such programs should not interfere with academics or be pursued solely to gain work experience (UCSD).

Research Strategies Recommendation 6—Implement mentoring, career and professional development opportunities for graduate and professional students and postdoctoral fellows. Agree. (No comments)

Research Strategies

Research Strategies Recommendation 2—Adopt a systemwide research mission statement. Agree.

While some respondents (UCB, UCI) found that the statement did not distinguish UC from other top research universities, on the whole, they endorsed it. Council requests that the words "research, scholarship, or creative activity" be added to the statement to recognize work in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Arts to better capture the entire range of scholarly production.

Research Strategies Recommendation 4—Maximize library system’s capacity to support research. Agree.

Council notes that this recommendation deserves special attention, as no other group has addressed the critical role of the libraries in the University.

Advocacy

Research Strategies Recommendation 3—Engage the public with results of research. Agree.
COVC 6—Develop a multi-year advocacy campaign. Agree.

Council endorses these recommendations. It would like to ensure that all types of research and scholarly and creative productivity across the disciplines and campuses are highlighted (UCI, UCSD, UCSF), and that the contributions of graduate students in research are explicitly acknowledged. UCSD suggests that a plan for engaging the public be integrated into outreach requirements for grants.