

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 13, 2011
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met in person on Wednesday, April 13, 2011. Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the December 10, 2010 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Simmons noted that the only action item before the Assembly is the election of the 2011-12 Vice Chair of Assembly and Council. However, the president and his senior managers will discuss the budgetary issues facing the University. President Yudof will make brief remarks and respond to questions. Patrick Lenz, Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources, will give a presentation on current and projected budget and alternative scenarios which he presented to the Regents in March. Provost Pitts will share current proposals to reduce funds for systemwide programs in order to reduce the amount of the budget cut to campuses. Assembly will also hear an update from CCGA Chair James Carmody on CCGA's guidelines for approving new self-supporting graduate programs.

Chair Simmons provided updates on the following items discussed at the December Assembly meeting: (1) The Council convened an Implementation Task Force of a subset of Council members who are creating an actionable plan based on the recommendations of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC (the "Powell Committee"). The task force chair, James Chalfant, who also chairs UCPB, will brief the Assembly on the progress of this task force. He stated that we must protect every campus' aspiration to succeed as a major research university without doing harm to the excellence of the established campuses. (2) Council issued a statement supporting the funding streams proposal, but raised questions about its impact on enrollment. It provides campuses with an incentive to increase non-resident enrollment without setting central limits and it raises questions about UC as a system. Council's response also emphasized that rebenching the allocation of state general funds per student is a necessary element of funding streams. Responding to Council, the provost convened the Rebenching Committee, which includes five Chancellors, several EVCs and Vice chancellors of Planning and Budget, and Senate participants Chair Simmons, Vice Chair Anderson, UCPB Chair Chalfant, UCLA divisional chair Ann Karagozian and UCSC divisional chair Susan Gillman. (3) A joint work group led by Vice Provost of Academic Personnel Susan Carlson is developing a proposal to implement a new faculty salary plan. President Yudof continues to advocate for 3% annual salary adjustments for faculty, as well as regular merit increases.

Chair Simmons stated that the Academic Council has voted to establish a new Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources, similar in structure and purpose to its Special Committee on the National Laboratories. ANR receives \$130M in central funding. The committee will include the chairs of UCPB, UCORP, and CCGA, and three at-large members, one of whom will come from a non-ANR campus. He reported that he and other Senate leaders participated in UC Advocacy Day on April 5 and will attend another advocacy day hosted by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, which brings together the Senate leaders from all three segments of public higher education. He encouraged faculty to advocate against an all-cuts budget. Finally, he noted that the online

pilot project has received a \$748,000 grant from Next Generation Learning project, funded by the Gates and Hewlett Foundations, and that the administration announced that they have authorized a no-interest loan of up to \$6.9M to fund the pilot project. Council had endorsed online pilot project with the caveat that it be funded with external funds. The Academic Council will discuss the implications of this change in the funding model at its meeting in late April. The pilot project has solicited proposals from faculty and accepted 29 courses for development. Many details still must be resolved. Chair Simmons stated that the Senate should approach the project with a healthy dose of skepticism, but that it could be beneficial to the University.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

President Yudof reported that UCOP is cutting its own budget by \$50 M. These funds will reduce the amount of the budget cut allocated to the campuses and will provide greater monies for basic operating expenses. In addition, UCOP is cutting its support for centrally funded research programs by \$30 M. Campuses may choose to continue funding these programs, but there is no rationale for centrally funding them. He also reported that his meetings with Governor Brown suggest that the governor understands the critical importance of UC to the state and its economy. The Speaker of the state Assembly also publicly spoke against an all-cuts budget. However, he stated that he expects continued budgetary paralysis, possibly through the fall. Given this situation, the University is going to adhere to the budget presented to the Regents, which assumes a \$500 M reduction, 3% merit increases for faculty and non-represented staff, and an 8% fee increase. In addition, UCOP has been developing a 5-year plan that makes varying assumptions about the level of state support. If the state cuts UC's budget by another \$500 M, all of the other factors will double annually. The budget scenarios set the stage for the alternatives should the state increase or decrease its support. The most optimistic scenario includes 8% annual increases in tuition. If the state reduces its support, tuition could easily rise to \$16 to 20 K per year. The projections assume modest enrollment growth, since cutting the student body would not save much money immediately, and would be detrimental to our commitment to preserving access. UC may have to change its method for administering student aid if tuition rises precipitously. UCOP also is trying to increase revenues. The budget office estimates modest annual growth of indirect cost recovery rates of \$20 M. The president is trying to raise \$50 M per year in scholarship funding, particularly from corporations and corporate foundations.

Q&A

Q: Can you describe the worst case scenario?

A: The worse case would be if the University's budget is cut by an additional \$500 M and funding stays flat for 5 years or even is reduced. That would lead to double tuition increases. Many of the things we have done to control costs were one-time solutions.

Q: If fees increase for graduate students, it will have a big impact on faculty research. Would you protect graduate students from tuition increases?

A: We previously shielded graduate students from increases, but can no longer afford to do so. We will try to raise scholarships for graduate students through the corporate sector, however.

Q: The governor previously said that to the extent that the University raises its fees, the state contribution will be reduced by the same amount.

A: That is a risk, but there has been continual disinvestment in UC over a long period of time.

Q: When you talk about changes in student enrollment, you did not address faculty. Will faculty lines decrease in the next five years?

A: If we were to enact the 5-year plan, we would maintain the current number of faculty.

Reducing the size of the faculty is not a good idea. We would probably lose in research funds more than we saved in salary. We really should be expanding the size of the faculty. In some of the budget scenarios, that would be possible in years 4 or 5. However, these are campus decisions.

Q: At our campus, there have been discussions about the state wanting to change the pension system. Do you have any promising information on this subject?

A: President Yudof stated that he does not know the governor's current thinking on the subject. While some of the proposals floated in the press pose some risk to UC, we already have revised our pension system in ways that many in the state government are advocating. That could shield us from further changes imposed by the legislature.

Q: What is being done to convince the legislature of the importance of UC to the state?

A: There is a very active advocacy campaign. Over 400,000 people have signed up to be UC advocates. Last week we contacted them to oppose an all-cuts budget. I invite broader faculty participation. We also have been using YouTube and other social media networks to get our message out, and we have cooperated with CSU and CCC.

Q: What are we getting from the state that allows them to strangle us?

A: Currently, we are getting \$2.5 B. Without this funding, we would have to impose a \$10 K student fee increase. The state's contribution simply can not be replaced by philanthropy.

Q: The governor released a press release on pensions. While it does not include UC or current employees, it suggests limits on the size of pensions to no more than \$106,800, the social security wage base. The unions, except for the nurses association, won't fight it because it won't affect them. A large number of faculty would reach that point in their mid-50s and retaining them would be difficult, so it is important to communicate this problem to the governor.

A: We will do so, and I would assert our constitutional autonomy to determine our own policies to the point of a lawsuit.

Patrick Lenz, Vice President of Capital and Budget, made a presentation on the budget that he previously presented to the Regents. The aim of the 5-year plan is to define the revenue we need to be the university we want to be. He noted that historically, on average, UC received 7 to 8% annual budget increases, hence they chose to model 8% annual increases in the 5-year budget plan. He pointed out in comparison that from 1990 to the present the corrections budget increased by 244% while UC's budget increased by only 18%. In 1990, the corrections budget was smaller than UC's budget. Today, it is larger than funds allocated to CSU, UC, CCC combined. He encouraged faculty to attend one of the local presentations being held by the state's Senate Budget Committee and to speak in support of adequately funding UC.

Q: By cutting the Discovery grant program by \$30 M, UC is relinquishing up \$20 M in industry matching grants. Is this smart?

A: This was a painful decision. Faculty who receive Discovery grants have more access to external funding than other faculty. Also, the submissions were less competitive in terms of the number of submissions and their quality than some of the other research grant competitions. We may revive the program when we have more money, but at this time, we had to make difficult choices to cut some programs.

Q: Can the UC system do anything to improve the prison system to save money?

A: Last year Jack Stobo, the SVP of Health Sciences and Services, proposed a way to save \$1.3 B in prison health care. The legislature attributed \$850 M in savings to this program in the budget, but did not implement it. We continue to offer the University as a resource in the best interest of the state.

Provost Pitts stated that as part of the funding streams project, UCOP has examined its own budget. A great deal of the budget is spent on programmatic initiatives (e.g., the California Digital Library). He noted that a group of programs have been funded historically as pet projects with money earmarked by the legislature. UCOP has asked the legislature to stop earmarking funds, and instead allow us to distribute the funds to the campuses to reduce the magnitude of the cuts and to allow those programs to be evaluated like all other research programs on the campuses. We need maximum flexibility to deal with the cuts. The proposed cuts in centrally funded programs followed a rationale. Those closest to instruction or support of faculty research have greater protection, while programs in the service arena have less protection. The cuts are not reflective of the quality of the programs. Provost Pitts also addressed the incorrect perception that the number of faculty is decreasing. Rather, there has been slight growth, but we compare it to years of continual growth, it does not measure up. However, the median faculty age has risen and we need to prepare for retirements.

Q: I noticed that the Senate has been cut by 8%. What will be cut?

A: Executive Director Winnacker stated that the cut is borne by the systemwide office, and will mostly be accomplished by greater use of teleconferences. We have also allowed an open position to be reduced to 60%. That said, the Senate's role is to meet and deliberate, and we will look for ways to ensure the quality of deliberations.

Q: I have been at UC through prior recessions, and have never experienced such a degree of demoralization among the faculty. How can we give them a sense of a positive future?

A: Provost Pitts stated that the president has included annual increases in his budget proposal. It is a statement that it is important to maintain the quality of faculty even in bad times. The faculty remains the best; the number of awards and research productivity are still high and retention remains around 75%. UC will grow selectively in areas of opportunity. For example, it is funding "proof of concept" grants to help faculty innovations move from patent to market and we are continuing to invest in grant competitions. We are trying to look toward a positive future.

Q: Are benefits for active employees going to stay the same?

A: We will continually examine the quality of benefits that we offer and their costs, since they are major cost drivers. We believe we need high quality health benefits, with lower cost options. There are no plans to dramatically change the benefits, although there may be raises in co-pays, etc.

Q: In the new funding streams model, why did you decide to assess expenditures rather than net revenue? Extramural funding is not fungible; it is locked into specific purposes.

A: UCOP performs a set of central functions that cost a set amount of money and requires a predictable source of revenue. While it is true that campus revenue fluctuate slightly, it does not fluctuate wildly.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. 2011-12 Assembly Meeting Schedule (information)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.b.](#), the following dates for the 2011-12 Assembly meetings were set in consultation with the President of the Senate and the Academic Council: December 7, February 15, April 11, and June 6.

VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. CCGA's Guidelines for Self-Supporting Programs [information]

▪ James Carmody, CCGA Chair

In anticipation of an increase in proposals for self-supporting programs as a means to generate revenue, CCGA's chair James Carmody reported that it has recently issued guidelines for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in the review of proposals for new self-supporting programs. Its aim is to protect existing programs, particularly doctoral programs. The review guidelines state that departments can not create a new SSP by cannibalizing graduate programs. The main area of concern is on-load versus off-load teaching. The more off-load teaching a faculty engages in, the less time he or she has for research and mentoring graduate students. The review process will be conducted on the campuses, rather than at CCGA, to ensure high level review and extensive discussion of resources. An Assembly member asked whether CCGA is insisting that financial aid be set aside for students in SSPs so they will not privatize graduate education. Chair Carmody responded that CCGA has asked proposal proponents to demonstrate that they generate resources for existing students, e.g., through TAships. While the guidelines require a discussion of financial aid for students in SSPs, they do not require that financial aid be provided. He also noted that the new SSP policy precludes doctoral programs from being self-supporting and precludes the requirement of an SSP master's degree as a prerequisite to doctoral program.

Chair Carmody also expressed great concern about fee increases for graduate students. Many departments already are not able to make competitive offers to graduate students, and therefore do not attract the best graduate students. This could eventually erode UC's ability to attract top faculty and could have a huge impact on UC's quality.

B. Report from UCPB [information]

▪ James Chalfant, UCPB Chair

James Chalfant, UCPB's Chair, outlined the main concerns of this committee this year. He stated that they worked on post-employment benefits and faculty remuneration (including ideas about offering alternate compensation plans), the funding streams project, and are now focusing on the work of the Implementation Task Force about which he reported earlier. The report of the Special Committee was largely aspirational and articulated the values of the Senate, outlining what should be protected. The Implementation Task Force is currently focusing on a formula for rebenching the allocation of state general funds to each campus, introducing a common state subsidy per student across UC campuses. It also proposes a new way of determining the true number of students the state is funding, in order to make recommendations on enrollment management. Next, it will turn to graduate student funding, and also will address a proposal to define a new faculty job title that requires more teaching and less research.

C. Report from BOARS [information]

▪ Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair

BOARS' Chair Bill Jacob reported on several issues that BOARS has been working on this year. He provided an update on 2011 freshman admissions offers, and explained that in January the Regents passed a resolution calling for all campuses to use the single score holistic review process used at UCLA and Berkeley to review applications for admission, while allowing campuses the flexibility to pursue alternative approaches if they meet certain goals. He stated that BOARS is examining ways to improve transfer admission, focusing particularly on admission to specific majors. He stated that the new freshman admission policy to take effect in Fall 2012 will entail shared review. BOARS is making recommendations on adequate funding for the new admissions process.

D. Academic Council

▪ **Daniel Simmons, Chair**

1. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2011-12 Assembly [action]

Chair Simmons noted that Robert Powell of UC Davis served simultaneously as departmental and divisional chair at Davis and has done a superb job in both positions. He has a long history of Senate service at both the campus and systemwide levels. The Assembly had a confidential discussion and then elected Powell to be Vice Chair of the 2011-12 Academic Assembly.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [information]

▪ **Joel Dimsdale, UCFW Chair**

UCFW's Chair Joel Dimsdale reported that the state budget situation has resulted in heavier workloads for faculty with less salary support and deteriorating compensation. Research at UC is in jeopardy, due to cutbacks in federal funding and funding from UCOP, and increasing demands to increase teaching to the detriment of research. He noted that pensions are under attack nationally and there are several state proposals that the committee is tracking. He reported that UCFW members feel that the administration has provided inadequate notice on several issues, including the new retirement plans, to allow the faculty to meaningfully participate in shared governance. The committee has urged the administration to minimize cost increases in health benefits and is working with Human Resources to address issues with access to care at certain campuses. Salaries continue to lag and total compensation is decreasing due to the onset of employee contributions to UCRP. The committee is closely watching the increase in contingent faculty. In a more positive vein, he reported that UCFW has had some success in pressing the University to ensure that the compliance and regulatory requirements are more user-friendly. UCFW also has been working with the administration to provide flexibility for faculty in the mortgage origination program. UC Berkeley has established a back-up emergency childcare program and the University is considering instituting it systemwide. UCFW plans to focus more on the concerns of younger faculty.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 13, 2011

Appendix A – 2010-2011 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 13, 2011

President of the University:

Mark Yudof

Academic Council Members:

Daniel Simmons, Chair
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair
Fiona Doyle, Chair, UCB
Robert Powell, Chair, UCD
Alan Barbour, Chair, UCI (in at 11 am)
Ann Karagozian, Chair, UCLA
Evan Heit, Chair UCM
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR
Joel Sobel, Vice Chair, UCSD (alternate for Frank Powell)
Robert Newcomer, Vice Chair, UCSF (alternate for Elena Fuentes-Afflick)
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Susan Gillman, Chair, UCSC
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS
James Carmody, Chair, CCGA
Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD (absent)
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UCAP (by telephone)
David Kay, Chair, UCEP
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCFW (by telephone)
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, UCORP (absent)
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Steven Beissingar
Ralph Catalano (absent)
Robert Jacobsen (alternate for Mary Ann Mason)
Paula Fass (alternate for Bernard Sadoulet)
Theodore Slaman

Davis (6)

Richard Grotjahn
Joel Haas
Joseph Kiskis
Brian Mulloney (absent)
Terence Murphy (absent)
Krishnan Nambiar

Irvine (4)

Luis Aviles (absent)

Ulysses Jenkins (absent)
Tahseen Mozaffar (absent)
Charles Zender

Los Angeles (8)

Paula Diaconescu
Malcolm Gordon (absent)
Jody Kreiman (absent)
Timothy Lane
James Miller (alternate for Duncan Lindsey)
Susanne Lohmann
Purnima Mankekar (absent)
Joseph Nagy

Merced (1)

David Noelle (alternate for Ignacio Lopez-Calvo)

Riverside (2)

Thomas Morton
Albert Wang

San Diego (5 – 2 TBA)

Timothy Bigby (absent)
Lorraine Pillus
Peter Wagner (absent)

San Francisco (4)

Farid Chehab
David Gardner
Deborah Greenspan
Wendy Max

Santa Barbara (3)

Ralph Armbruster (absent)
Gayle Binion
Vickie Scott (alternate for John Foran)

Santa Cruz (2)

Joseph Konopelski
Marilyn Walker

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson