It could be thought immodest of me, as the leader of the Academic Senate, to talk about the importance of the UC system to the state of California, so I will instead quote the Editorial Board of the Sacramento Bee: “The University of California may be the Golden State’s greatest public institution. It offers a pathway for talented people of modest means to vastly improve their circumstances, fosters innovation, and in many ways drives the economy.”

This “pathway for talented people of modest means” has been well-traveled over the decades. That pathway has, in fact, been a golden one for many, providing UC students access to some of the best faculty in the world. But the budget cuts of the past two decades, which culminated in the catastrophic cuts triggered by the 2008 financial crisis, are a long way from being restored, and have battered that pathway at a time when it is more critical than ever for California.

Times have changed since I arrived at UC Irvine as an assistant professor in the early 1980s when UC’s 96,000 students were overwhelmingly White and Asian (87%) and tended to be middle class. Their tuition was $0, although fees totaled around $525 per year. There was little need to focus on financial aid or student loans. Today, the UC system enrolls 239,000 students and last year received about 150,000 applications and admitted 87,000 California residents. 35% of undergraduates admitted for 2014 are from underrepresented minority groups and 37% of admitted students have low family income. Three UC campuses are now designated as Hispanic Serving Institutions.

Clearly, more Californians than ever before want to experience the quality of a UC education. UC has continued to meet its Master Plan obligation to admit the top 12.5% of California’s public high school graduates who apply, despite receiving no funding for enrollment growth in recent years. And, while tuition has increased, so has financial aid, such that half of California residents pay no tuition and nearly half leave with no student debt.

But our promise of a world-class education is shakier now than in the past. The student-faculty ratio has crept up, faculty remuneration has fallen farther behind our comparators, and deferred maintenance has eroded our infrastructure. A cynic might ask whether these threats to quality show that California is less committed to a more diverse student body than it was to the middle-class students of my early years at UC.

For more than a century, the state of California has allocated significant dollars to the UC system, but that money is now viewed by some officials as a “cost” or an “assessment” rather than an investment in social mobility, innovation, and economic growth, even though the return on that investment has been excellent. UC leverages taxpayer contributions with revenues...
In February, President Napolitano attended a Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) meeting to emphasize the importance of the work and to ask for the faculty’s help and support. BOARS endorsed the process and its members helped gather information about the appropriate faculty, academic administrators, and/or staff responsible for determining the pre-major preparation expected of transfers students in 21 popular majors.

The President wants the University to establish agreements for ten pathways by fall 2015, with eleven more the following year. She has emphasized that state officials are following UC’s efforts to strengthen the transfer process. Officials are concerned about the difficulty prospective transfer students face to clearly identify and then complete multiple sets of campus-specific preparation requirements. Some have pointed out that UC lacks an “SB 1440” transfer degree guarantee.

California Senate Bill 1440, signed in 2010, guarantees holders of Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADT) admission to CSU (though not to a specific campus or major) and a bachelor’s degree upon completion of 60 upper division units.

On April 7, the Life Sciences groups agreed on a set of lower division pre-major courses that will represent UC’s best collective advice for CCC transfer students who want to prepare simultaneously and be competitive for admission into the four majors across all UC campuses. The Life Sciences pathway will work for at least four majors – Biochemistry, Biology, Cell Biology, and Molecular Biology – and campuses have the option of bringing other, similar majors under the umbrella of the pathway. The April 16 and 22 meetings resulted in similar agreements for Chemistry, Physics, Math, Anthropology, Economics, and Sociology.

It is expected that completion of a given pathway will ensure a transfer applicant is competitive for admission and prepared to graduate from a UC two years after matriculation. Campuses may exercise discretion as to whether or not they require applicants to complete all courses in a given major pathway and may institute a minimum GPA for courses.

A systemwide mechanism to implement the goals of transfer streamlining is already embedded in Senate Regulation 477. This regulation provides that when four or more campuses agree to accept a course or set of courses as transferable preparation for a major, they will be considered transferable for the same major on all campuses unless a department announces within a year that it will opt-out of the agreement.

Chair Gilly says she hopes the meetings will...

The policy implementation also includes an online mechanism that allows Senate authors to opt-out of the open access license through a waiver or to request a temporary embargo for any publication, should it be necessary.

These new deposits join over 80,000 other publications in eScholarship, where they are openly discoverable by researchers across the world via academic indexes and search engines. To date, open access publications in eScholarship have reached over 25 million views, significantly amplifying the global impact of UC research. (All authors receive monthly usage reports from eScholarship, detailing the number of views and downloads of their articles.)

The existing policy applies to Senate faculty only, but a proposed Presidential Open Access Policy would extend its provisions to non-Senate UC authors. The Senate endorsed that policy in February, after a systemwide review.
Council Issues Statement on Academic Freedom and Civility

The Academic Council has issued a Statement on Academic Freedom and Civility, emphasizing the preeminent value of academic freedom in campus speech in response to concerns that recent efforts to encourage civil discourse on campus have the potential to chill free speech.

The statement was originally drafted and proposed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF).

Senate Chair Mary Gilly has asked Senate offices to disseminate the statement to faculty and make it available on Senate academic freedom committee websites. Her letter to Senate directors and chairs also notes that it would be beneficial to make the statement available for distribution as a supplement to similar statements issued by campus chancellors each fall.

“Council hopes the Statement will help provide faculty and others on campus with a principled basis for further discussions about academic freedom and civility,” she said.

The statement was not without controversy on Council, where there were challenges to the view that academic freedom has “preeminent” value in speech on campus where instances of uncivil behavior have erupted in demonstrations and interchanges around specific issues. However, Council was ultimately persuaded by the argument that free speech can make people uncomfortable for a variety of reasons, and that academic freedom should not depend on the extent to which speech is defined as “respectful.” Concerns about civility are important, and indeed, the statement starts by noting that discourse should always begin with an aspiration to civility, but those aspirations should not trump academic freedom nor constrain one’s ability to express views in an impassioned way.

Assembly Approves Revamped Charge for Computing Committee

Senate leaders hope a new bylaw and charge for a moribund systemwide Senate committee will help increase the faculty’s role in technology policy discussions.

In February, the Assembly of the Academic Senate approved a substantial revision to Senate Bylaw 155 for the former University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC)—now known as the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC).

The new charge is a major reversal for a committee that only two years ago had been recommended for disbandment by the Academic Council, based on poor functioning. The Assembly pushed back on Council’s recommendation and instead asked the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) to update the UCCC bylaws to revitalize the committee and render it more directly useful to the Senate and the University. The new bylaw broadens the committee’s mission to include issues arising at the interface of computing technology, education, and research – including online education, intellectual property, accessibility, security, and privacy.

Academic Senate Chair Mary Gilly says the UCACC will be expected to bring technology concerns forward from the campuses, share best practices, and advise President Napolitano and Chief Information Officer Tom Andriola about emerging issues.

“Council felt the old bylaw was out of sync with the technology issues the University is dealing with today,” Chair Gilly said. “But it is clear that there are issues to be discussed and that UCCC can be a place for productive, ongoing discussion about issues that are important to all faculty.”

Under Senate Review

Click here for a comprehensive list of current and past review items and check the Tracking Log for the progress of all issues.

- Final Review - Proposed Revisions to APM 210-1-d (Comments due May 21, 2015)
- Proposed Revisions to APM 360 and 210-4 (Comments due May 15, 2014)
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 (Comments due May 15, 2015)
- Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Accept Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services (Comments due May 15,
Fiat Lux, Mary

UC’s promise is extended to future generations.

For decades, California invested in its “orchard” – the University of California – by establishing ten campuses and providing the ongoing support necessary for access, growth, and quality. Similar to an orchard that produces high-quality fruit after many years of care, the state’s investment in UC has paid off. California is now the only state with six public university campuses with membership in the prestigious American Association of Universities. UC’s graduates, including Governor Brown, have made enormous contributions, and its cutting-edge research has changed the world and been a primary driver of the California economy. During the Great Recession, the state was understandably short on resources; and although UC suffered, it coped. But as the economy recovers and state revenues rise, we are now at a critical decision point: do we continue our neglect of the orchard and risk losing the value of California’s investment, or do we resume investing to cultivate future payoffs in access, innovation, economic growth, and social mobility.

During another financial downturn ten years ago, a previous governor directed that students shoulder a greater portion of the cost of their education, and he crafted a budget that called for 10% annual undergraduate fee increases for three years, and even greater increases for graduate academic and professional school students. UC’s increasing reliance on tuition was shaped by that agreement. The Senate welcomes Sacramento’s new emphasis on affordability, but faculty are also on the front lines where we see exactly how educational quality is compromised by inadequate funding. Faculty know what it takes to offer a world-class education at a premiere research university, and we know that it cannot be done with what amounts to less than 2% annual increases in UC’s overall budget.

The state’s unwillingness to tend to its orchard is discouraging, but I am particularly saddened that the historic quality of a UC education is threatened just at a time when UC is welcoming a more diverse California population to the University. We have an obligation to these students, and it would be wrong to allow UC’s quality to erode just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive. I agree with President Napolitano when she said, “We have a moral imperative to serve the rising generations just as they arrive.

To be sure, the Senate supports efforts to obtain the funding needed to meet this obligation to the state and to its students. I recently asked campus Senate offices to disseminate letters from the President to the Systemwide Senate to inform UC faculty about the activities of the Senate. Your comments are welcome: senatenews@ucop.edu
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