

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
 BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE
 SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ**



**NOTICE OF MEETING
 ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
 WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 2010
 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM
 California State University, East Bay
 Oakland Professional Development & Conference Center
 1000 Broadway, Suite 109, Classrooms 2 & 3 (OPDCC2)
 Oakland, CA 94607
 Tel. #: (510) 208-7001/987-9143**

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----------|
| I. | ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS | 3 |
| II. | MINUTES | |
| | Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of April 21, 2010 | 4 |
| | Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, April 21, 2010 | 7 |
| | Appendix B: Remarks of President Yudof | 8 |
| III. | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR | 10 |
| IV. | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT | 10 |
| V. | SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE] | 10 |
| VI. | REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [ACTION] | |
| | A. Academic Council | |
| | 1. UCR&J ruling on Senate Regulation 474 [INFORMATION] | 10 |
| | 2. Nomination and Election of 2010-11 UCOC Vice Chair [ACTION] | 10 |
| | 3. Ratification of Council’s recommendation for Senate parliamentarian | 11 |
| | 4. Ratification of 2010 Oliver Johnson Awardee | 11 |
| | 5. Announcement of Senate representative to UCRS Advisory Board [INFORMATION] | 11 |
| | 6. Notification of apportionment of 2010-11 Academic Assembly Representatives [INFORMATION] | 12 |
| | 7. 2010-11 Assembly meeting dates [INFORMATION] | 12 |
| | 8. Academic Council Recommendation to UC Commission on the Future [DISCUSSION] | 12 |
| | 9. Los Angeles Division’s recommendation [ACTION] | 15 |
| | 10. Discussion of Senate response to the Commission on the Future | 19 |
| VI. | REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE] | 20 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------|
| VIII. | UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE] | 20 |
| IX. | PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE] | 20 |
| X. | UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE] | 20 |
| XI. | NEW BUSINESS | 20 |

Roll Call of Members
2008-09 Assembly Roll Call June 16, 2010

President of the University:
Mark Yudof

Kenneth Chew
David Kay

Academic Council Members:

Henry Powell, Chair
Daniel Simmons, Vice Chair
Christopher Kutz, Chair, UCB
Robert Powell, Chair, UCD
Judith Stepan-Norris, Chair, UCI
Robin Garrell, Chair, UCLA
Martha Conklin, Chair UCM
Anthony Norman, Chair, UCR
William Hodgkiss, Chair, UCSD
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, UCSF
Joel Michaelsen, Chair, UCSB
Lori Kletzer, Chair, UCSC
Sylvia Hurtado, Chair, BOARS
Farid Chehab, Chair, CCGA
Ines Boechat, Chair, UCAAD
Alison Butler, Chair, UCAP
Keith Williams, UCEP
Shane White, UCFW
Gregory Miller, Chair, UCORP
Peter Krapp, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (9 - 1 TBA)

Paula Diaconescu
Malcolm Gordon
Jody Kreiman
Timothy Lane
Duncan Lindsey
Susanne Lohmann
Purnima Mankekar
Joseph Nagy
Natik Piri

Merced (1)

Nella Van Dyke

Riverside (2)

Manuela Martins-Green
Albert Wang

San Diego (4)

Salah Baouendi
Timothy Bigby
Sandra Brown
Stephen Cox

San Francisco (3)

David Gardner
Deborah Greenspan
Sandra Weiss

Santa Barbara (3 – 1 TBA)

Gayle Binion (alternate for Richard Church)
Henning Bohn (alternate for Chuck Bazerman)

Santa Cruz (2)

Mark Carr
Marc Mangel

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck

Berkeley (6)

Daniel Boyarin
Suzanne Fleiszig
James Hunt
Anthony Long
Mary Ann Mason
Pablo Spiller

Davis (6)

Joel Haas
Brian Morrissey
Brian Mulloney
Krishnan Nambiar
John Oakley
David Simpson

Irvine (4)

Hoda Anton-Culver
Luis Aviles

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 21, 2010
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Friday, April 21, 2010 via teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Henry Powell presided and called the meeting to order at 10:30 am. Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the February 26, 2010 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- Henry Powell

Chair Powell noted that the June 16 Assembly meeting will be held in person in Oakland. He stated that at this time there is no news regarding next year's budget. He and Vice Chair Simmons will visit all of the divisions in April and May to discuss and hear concerns about possible changes in the University's post-employment benefits plans. President Yudof has stated that he will not take any proposal to change post-employment benefits to the Regents before the Senate has an opportunity for full review. Chair Powell noted that today's agenda includes time to discuss informally the first round of recommendations of the Commission on the Future Working Groups. A second set of recommendations will be released in June. He stated that he and Vice Chair Simmons continue their advocacy efforts on behalf of higher education. In March Chair Powell testified before the Joint Committee on the Master Plan. Next week, he will chair an ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates) meeting that will include visits with multiple legislators and two hours with staff from the Legislative Analyst's Office who work on higher education issues.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Please see Appendix B for President Yudof's remarks.

VI. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]**VII. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]****VIII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [NONE]****A. Academic Council**

1. Nomination and Election of the 2010-11 Vice Chair of the Assembly

The Academic Council nominated Professor Robert M. Anderson of the Berkeley Division for Vice Chair of the Assembly in 2010-11. Chair Powell asked the Berkeley Division to request that Professor Anderson leave the room. No other written nominations were received, and no one made a nomination from the floor.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously elected Professor Anderson to be 2010-11 Assembly Vice Chair.

2. Proposed Repeal of SR 764

The proposal to repeal Senate Regulation 764 was initiated by UCEP and approved by Council. It also has been reviewed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and found to be consistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Senate.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously endorsed the repeal of SR 764.

3. Discussion of the Recommendations of the Commission on the Future Working Groups

Chair Powell noted that this meeting provides an opportunity for a larger group of representative Senate members to engage in conversation about the recommendations. He emphasized that the discussion does not preempt the formal review process. Rather, it is a valuable opportunity to share perspectives among faculty across the University. Each division commented on the recommendations that are generating the most discussion on their campuses and outlined their approach to responding to the review.

Recommendations on Curriculum: The recommendation to increase online education is causing concern about changing the quality of a UC education, the character of the University and the collegiate experience. A member noted that UCOP's Academic Planning unit hopes to develop pilot courses that will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of online courses in different disciplines. Such courses would have to be approved by local Committees on Courses. A member advocated developing a definition of "UC Quality" and using it to weigh each recommendation.

Similarly, faculty expressed concern about the recommendation to create more transfer pathways in high-demand majors. This would require a uniform lower division curriculum across the university, which would infringe on the purview of professors to determine educational content.

Some divisions stated that offering three year degrees would put stress on academic planning, particularly in science and engineering. Keith Williams, Chair of the Education and Curriculum Working Group and a member of the Assembly, clarified that three year degrees would be targeted to specific majors that are conducive to a shorter program. He stated that students who arrive with many college credits could finish earlier, providing access to other students. A member noted that currently 3% of undergraduates complete their degrees in three years, and this initiative would simply make it easier for them to do so by increasing the use of summer school and other strategies.

Recommendations on Access and Affordability: Several divisions questioned the impact of the recommendation to increase the proportion of non-resident students on the University's mission to provide access to Californians. In addition, continual tuition increases would represent a fundamental change in the state's educational system. Several divisions expressed concern about instituting differential fees by campus because they believe it would result in tiering of campuses. As alternatives to raising revenue by accepting more non-residents, a member suggested charging students who exceed time-to-degree limits higher fees, as well as charging a laboratory fee for impacted majors that would be used to finance more sections. One division warned against adopting a multi-year fee schedule because of the public relations peril of breaking such a promise. Given that the state is an unreliable partner and budgeting is done year by year, how could the University keep such a promise?

Other: Some divisions noted that the proposals on research overhead are controversial; many laboratory faculty view them as an additional tax.

A member stated that some of the recommendations are not consistent with the subsequent text, and that some valuable suggestions in the text are not in the recommendations.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

Attest: Henry Powell, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 21, 2010
Appendix B – Remarks of President Yudof to the Assembly of the Academic Senate

Appendix A – 2009-2010 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 21, 2010

President of the University:

Mark Yudof (absent)

Kenneth Chew

David Kay

Academic Council Members:

Henry Powell, Chair

Daniel Simmons, Vice Chair

Christopher Kutz, Chair, UCB

Robert Powell, Chair, UCD

Judith Stepan-Norris, Chair, UCI

Robin Garrell, Chair, UCLA

Martha Conklin, Chair UCM

Anthony Norman, Chair, UCR

William Hodgkiss, Chair, UCSD

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, UCSF

Joel Michaelsen, Chair, UCSB

Lori Kletzer, Chair, UCSC

Sylvia Hurtado, Chair, BOARS

Farid Chehab, Chair, CCGA (absent)

Ines Boechat, Chair, UCAAD (absent)

Alison Butler, Chair, UCAP

Keith Williams, UCEP

Shane White, UCFW

Gregory Miller, Chair, UCORP

Peter Krapp, Chair, UCPB (absent)

Los Angeles (9 - 1 TBA)

Malcolm Gordon

William Grundfest (alternate for Jody Kreiman)

Timothy Lane

Susanne Lohmann

Purnima Mankekar (absent)

James Miller (alternate for Paula Diaconescu)

Joseph Nagy (absent)

Natik Piri

Dottie Wiley (alternate for Duncan Lindsey)

Merced (1)

Jan Wallender (alternate for Nella Van Dyke)

Riverside (2)

Manuela Martins-Green

Albert Wang

San Diego (4)

Hans Paar (alternate for Salah Baouendi)

Timothy Bigby

Sandra Brown

Stephen Cox (absent)

San Francisco (3)

David Gardner (absent)

Deborah Greenspan

Sandra Weiss

Santa Barbara (3 – 1 TBA)

Henning Bohn (alternate for Chuck Bazerman)

Richard Church

Santa Cruz (2)

Mark Carr

Marc Mangel

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Peter Berck

Berkeley (6)

Daniel Boyarin

Suzanne Fleiszig

Fiona Doyle (alternate for James Hunt)

Theodore Slaman (alternate for Anthony Long)

Miryam Sas (alternate for Mary Ann Mason)

Pablo Spiller

Davis (6)

Joel Haas (absent)

Brian Morrissey (absent)

Brian Mulloney

Krishnan Nambiar

John Oakley (absent)

Jeffrey Williams (alternate for David Simpson)

Irvine (4)

Hoda Anton-Culver

Luis Aviles

Appendix B – Remarks of President Yudof to the Assembly of the Academic Senate April 21, 2010

The President is traveling and unable to personally address the Academic Assembly and offers these brief written remarks.

State Budget Update

Budget hearings have begun in the Legislature and will continue through the end of May. The Governor will release his May Revision to the budget around May 14, each house of the Legislature will then conclude its deliberations, and a conference committee made up of members from both houses will form to resolve major issues. In some years, the “Big Five” (the Governor and the party leaders from each house) meet as well to resolve issues. They will aim to have a budget in place with the start of the new fiscal year on July 1, but in most years, they have been unsuccessful in meeting this deadline. Through this process, the University is continuing to advocate for support of the Governor’s Budget, resumption of employer contributions to the retirement system, and funding for capital outlay projects. We are also continuing to educate legislative leaders on the implications of recent budget cuts and the need to restore adequate funding for UC and all of higher education if the state of California is going to succeed in jump-starting its economy.

Termination of Furlough Program

This is to reaffirm that I will be terminating the furlough program at the end of one year. As I have stated publicly many times, the furlough program was designed to provide temporary relief to the campuses as a result of the dramatic cuts in state funding this year. This program allowed campuses time to develop and implement strategies to achieve permanent budget reductions and mitigate layoffs.

Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion

At the March Regents’ meeting, I announced that I would take steps to directly address campus climate issues at UC. I have requested that each Chancellor appoint a multi-constituency Advisory Council to evaluate campus climate conditions, practices and policies; promote the identification and sharing of best practices that promote the goals of inclusion and community; and monitor and evaluate the implementation of new practices and policies, and progress on each campus.

The Council will include a number of individuals with substantive expertise in diversity matters, and the represented constituencies will include, among others:

- Faculty selected by the Chancellor in consultation with the Division Senate;
- Students selected by the Chancellor in consultation with leaders of various student organizations, ensuring representation of those groups most vulnerable to problems of climate and tolerance—LGBT students and students from racial and ethnic minority groups;
- Alumni and community members; and
- Staff and administrators

In addition, I will appoint, in consultation with the Chancellors, a multi-constituency systemwide Advisory Council. The members will include:

- At least one member drawn by the President from each Campus Council;
- Representation of the Academic Senate;
- Some individuals with substantive expertise in diversity research and practices; and
- Other individuals as appropriate

The principal purposes of the President's Council will be to:

- Develop metrics that will monitor and evaluate the progress of each campus in creating a climate and culture of inclusion;
- Identify good and bad lessons that can be learned from the experiences on UC campuses, and ensure that those lessons are shared throughout the system;
- Work with UCOP staff to see that appropriate institutional research is conducted by the campuses or UCOP itself

The Regents are also discussing the formation of a new committee to provide oversight for diversity issues and campus climate.

Post Employment Benefits Plan Revisions

The Post Employment Benefits Task Force is expected to finalize recommendations this summer, at which time they will be forwarded to the Academic Senate for customary review and comment.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Henry C. Powell**

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- **Mark G. Yudof**

V. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **Henry Powell, Chair**

1. UCR&J Ruling on [SR 474](#) (information)

According to [Bylaw 206.II.A](#), “Prior to issuance of a ruling, the position of the committee as to what such ruling should be shall be submitted to the Academic Council for consideration and comment. After considering such comment, the committee shall issue its ruling and report it to the Assembly for its information.” UCR&J was asked to clarify SR 474 regarding the locus of authority for approving credits for enrolled, continuing students who take courses at other institutions, as requested by UCD. Council considered the ruling and declined to comment.

UCR&J Legislative Ruling 3.10

Regulation 474 only applies to transfer credit for entering students, not for students who have already matriculated. This is evident from the title of Chapter 4 of the Regulations, "Admission to Advanced Standing." The charge for the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) in Bylaw 145.B is restricted to entering students; any policies regarding transfer credit approved by BOARS or any delegation of authority to implement such policies only applies to entering students. As per Bylaw 311.D and 312.A.1 read with Bylaw 311.C, decisions regarding curricula offered within the jurisdiction of only one Division are supervised by that Division. With a narrow exception for courses prefixed XCal, even courses offered by University Extension that earn UC transfer credit require approval by the corresponding Divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction or equivalent according to Regulation 792 and 790.

Thus decisions regarding transfer credit for students who are already enrolled in the University (such as students in the Education Abroad Program) clearly rest with the individual Divisions and their appropriate committees, which may delegate this authority as they see fit. The customary practice in many Divisions, where the evaluation of transfer credit for previously enrolled students is done through departments, colleges or Registrars and not Admissions, is consistent with this.

2. Election of the Vice Chair of the UCOC for 2010-2011 (action)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 150.A.1. Commitees](#), “...the members-at-large are to be named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. Each at-large member will serve as Vice Chair in the first year and shall normally succeed as Chair in the second year.” At its meeting on May 26, the Academic Council recommended that UCOC Vice Chair Jan Talbot become Chair and that Professor Stanley Awramik (UCSB) be named as Vice Chair.

ACTION REQUESTED: Elect the 2010-2011 UCOC Chair and Vice Chair

3. Ratification of the Appointment of the 2010-13 Secretary/Parliamentarian (action)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 15](#), at its meeting on May 26, the Academic Council approved the appointment of Professor Jean Olson (UCSF) to be Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Assembly for a three-year term commencing September 1, 2010, subject to ratification by the Assembly.

ACTION REQUESTED: Ratification of Assembly Secretary/Parliamentarian

4. Ratification of 2010 Oliver Johnson Awardee (action)

The Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the academic Senate is given biennially to a member of the UC faculty who has performed outstanding service to the Senate. Its broader goal is to honor, through the award to the recipient, all members of the faculty who have contributed their time and talent to the Senate.

Nominations for the award are made through Divisional Committees on Committees to the Universitywide Committee on Committees (UCOC). UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council. George Blumenthal (UCSC) was chosen as the awardee by the Academic Council at its meeting on April 28. The Assembly is asked to ratify the Academic Council's choice of recipient of the 2010 Oliver Johnson Award.

ACTION REQUESTED: Ratification of 2010 Oliver Johnson Awardee

5. Announcement of Senate Representative to UCRS Advisory Board (information)

According to the Bylaws of the UCRS Advisory Board, the Academic Council appoints two active Senate members to serve staggered two-year terms, which may be renewed once, as representatives of the Senate on the UCRS Advisory Board. The two must be from different divisions. A member whose status is active at the time of appointment may complete his or her term if he or she transitions to emeritus status during the term. Professor Robert Anderson (UCB) is completing his second two-year term. Professor John Oakley (Davis) has a year remaining in his term. The Academic Council appointed Professor Ross Starr (UCSD), a member of the Task Force on Investment and Retirement, to the position being vacated by Professor Anderson.

6. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2010-11 Assembly (information)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 105.A.4](#), the Academic Council approved at its May 26 meeting the apportionment of the 40 Divisional Representatives for 2010-11. On the basis of Divisional Academic Senate membership as of March 2010, the Webster Method of Calculation was used to determine the number of Divisional Representatives as follows:

| DIVISION | NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES/DIVISION |
|---------------|------------------------------------|
| Berkeley | 5 |
| Davis | 6 |
| Irvine | 4 |
| Los Angeles | 8 |
| Merced | 1 |
| Riverside | 2 |
| San Diego | 5 |
| San Francisco | 4 |
| Santa Barbara | 3 |
| Santa Cruz | 2 |

7. 2010-11 Assembly Meeting Dates (information)

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3b.](#), the following dates for the 2010-11 Assembly meetings were set in consultation with the President of the Senate and the Academic Council: December 1, February 16, April 13, and June 8.

8. Academic Council Recommendation to the UC Commission on the Future (discussion)

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Recommendation: The Commission on the Future should adopt as a guiding priority the maintenance of the quality of the University of California research and teaching faculty, which is the driving force of the University of California's contribution to the State of California. Implementation of this recommendation includes the following elements:

1. The University of California is one of the world's premier research universities. The value and prestige of all of its degree programs stems from the high quality research faculty at each of the University's ten campuses. At the undergraduate level, the University of California uniquely offers an undergraduate education at a high quality research university to qualified students from the diverse public of the State. The University must not be reduced to an institution focused solely on the throughput of undergraduates to a bachelor's degree regardless of quality, nor shall the University of California strive to be a competitor of for-profit universities that enroll large numbers of students in online courses with high fees.
2. The maintenance of a quality faculty requires remuneration that is competitive with peer institutions. Competitive remuneration consists of a combination of current compensation, current health and welfare benefits, deferred compensation that offers secure retirement income to faculty who have maintained a long career with the University, and adequate retirement health programs.

- a. A competitive world class research faculty also requires a highly qualified professional staff, with competitive compensation, to assist in teaching and research endeavors and provide direct administrative support to the teaching and research missions.
3. In the face of the current financial shortfalls:
 - a. The University should take all possible steps to increase revenues. The sources are State funding, federal funding, increased research contracts and grants (including indirect cost recovery), and fees imposed on the recipients of all aspects of the educational program. As painful as it may be, increased fees are the only source of revenue under UC's direct control that is available to replace shortfalls in other available funding sources.
 - b. The University must operate at a size that is affordable. This means downsizing the University over the short term by reducing the size of the faculty and reducing administrative and other staff. Downsizing includes limiting replacement of faculty lost due to retirements, terminations or other separations.
 - c. Until stable revenues are secured, the University should forego new building and capital projects that are not absolutely essential for safety. Where state bond funding is available for projects that are necessary to maintain the core academic program of the University the projects should be pursued. However, in undertaking any capital project, the campuses must be required to assure that operational funding is available for the support and maintenance of space and that operational funding is available for activities undertaken within expanded space.
 - d. In the event new academic programs are established, the Chancellor of the campus must identify a funding stream that guarantees stable and appropriate funding and specify how diversion of funds will affect existing programs, or identify offsetting cuts in positions or programs that are required to fund a new program
 4. These measures are a tactical response to a short term economic crisis, but should not distract the University and the State of California from understanding the strategic need for growth in response to growth of population whose needs for higher education, consistent with the Master Plan, can only be effectively met by a state supported public sector.

Rationale:

- In the absence of research quality the University's contribution to the economic well-being of California through 140 years of discovery and innovation will be lost.
- In the absence of the high quality research faculty, the value of the UC degree in comparison with other public and private institutions will be vastly diminished.
- The quality of education at the University of California is fundamentally derived from two key components: the background and expertise of the faculty and students; and the rich research-based environment inherent in the system of ten top-tier public land-grant research institutions. To maintain quality at the highest level the quality of faculty must be assured.

- The current shortfall in budget support from the State of California is forcing the University into difficult choices, all of which require adjustment to the three pillars that have sustained the University over its 140 year history: A high quality teaching and research faculty, access to a high quality education program for the diverse student population of California, and access to an affordable high quality education at a campus of a leading research university.
- The loss of affordability or access can be remedied over a short period, either through increases in financial aid, fee reductions, re-opening classroom space, and hiring additional faculty.
- If the quality of the faculty is lost, the prestige of the University, the quality of the University, and its continued research productivity will not be recoverable for decades, if ever.
- The problem with expansive capital projects, even those funded from external sources, is that capital budgets do not provide for the salaries of persons hired to occupy new facilities, they do not provide for the equipment necessary to use new facilities, nor do they cover the increased costs of service and maintenance for new facilities. In the absence of stable revenue sources to eliminate these strains on operational budgets, capital projects must be rejected.

Impact on Quality:

- This recommendation is focused on protecting in the long-term the quality of University of California teaching and research programs by maintaining a high quality faculty.
- A reduction in the number of creative faculty supported to do first class research will have an economic impact as fewer new discoveries come to a market that is dependent on technology now that industrial manufacturing has migrated overseas.

Impact on Access:

- This recommendation focuses on maintaining access to a high quality educational program at one of the world's top research universities.
- Maintaining the size of faculty that the University can afford in terms of competitive remuneration may require reducing the size of the University and may also result in a reduction in the number of students who have access. A reduction in faculty while maintaining current enrollment levels reduces the value of the access for enrolled students by reducing the quality of the education.
- Maintaining the quality of the University, through maintenance of the quality of the teaching and research faculty means that in the future there will still be a high quality and prestigious university to which California students may have affordable access should the State of California once again recognize support for higher education as a budget priority.
- Failure to maintain the quality of the University will mean that if the people of the State of California once again recognize support for higher education as a budget priority, there will no longer be a high quality prestigious university to which students could be provided affordable access.

Fiscal Implications:

- This recommendation requires that in making budget decisions, adequate funds be directed to maintaining competitive remuneration for faculty.

Challenges:

- Advocacy for the maintenance of faculty quality with competitive remuneration forces the faculty to place itself in competition with other deserving elements within the University. The Academic Council has historically taken positions consistent with the maintenance of a single university that provides competitive compensation for all of its employees. Nonetheless, in making choices through a period of budgetary turmoil, protection of the quality of the UC faculty must remain a paramount priority.
- Downsizing faculty numbers in order to maintain competitive remuneration means downsizing and/or eliminating academic programs that are important and productive parts of the academic environment. The elimination of programs has never been easy for the University and mechanisms for making those choices must be developed.
- The State needs are defined by the requirement for an adequate workforce poised for employment with minimal further training and instruction. The State needs are also driven by demographic growth and the historic framework of the Master Plan.

Next Steps for Implementation:

- Recommendations from the Commission should maintain a focus on their impact on the quality of the University teaching and research programs through their impact on retention and recruitment of the University's research faculty.
- Budgetary decisions on both the expenditure and revenue sides must include overall competitive faculty remuneration as a first priority.
- In order to assure academic cohesion in a difficult fiscal environment, budgetary decisions should be jointly made by administration and the Academic Senate.

9. Recommendation offered by the Los Angeles Division (action)



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
LOS ANGELES DIVISION
3125 MURPHY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1408

PHONE: (310) 825-3851
FAX: (310) 206-5273

4 June 2010

Henry Powell
Chair, Academic Council
University of California

In Re: Statement of Academic Senate Values and Recommendations 2010

Dear Harry,

During this particularly difficult year in the history of the University of California, the Academic Senate has been called upon to reflect on the University of California's mission and future. We have written, critiqued, and endorsed numerous position papers and have opined on the first-round recommendations of the Commission on the Future. Most recently, the Academic Council supported a resolution to the Commission that emphasized the importance of total remuneration for maintaining the quality of our faculty and recommended four measures that should be taken to address the current financial shortfalls.

The UCLA Division has approved a statement that we now ask the Academic Assembly to endorse and forward to President Yudof. This statement expresses the fundamental values shared by all UC campuses, including excellence, diversity, access, affordability, breadth and sustainability. The statement also synthesizes many consensus recommendations that have emerged through discussions at the campus and system-wide levels. It incorporates key points that were affirmed in the May Council resolution, as well as views expressed in the Council discussion that were not reflected in that resolution.

The Senate has its greatest impact when it speaks with one voice, clear and strong. We recommend that the statement attached herewith be endorsed as our framework for formulating policies and plans in this era of scarce resources.

Thank you for your consideration.

With best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robin L. Garrell".

Robin L. Garrell
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate

UC Academic Senate Statement of Academic Senate values and recommendations, 2010

The University of California has entered an era of scarce and diminishing fiscal support. The available resources are insufficient to maintain the current size of our faculty, provide educational opportunities for an increasing number of eligible students, or grow campuses and programs in ways envisioned even five years ago.

These changed circumstances compel the UC to focus on its highest priorities. We must examine the basic assumptions that underlie our resource allocation decisions. We must have the courage to make difficult choices, recognizing that change is essential and must be led and planned.

People are the #1 asset of the University of California. Their talents and diversity are central to fulfilling the UC's tripartite mission of teaching, research and service.

- 1. To attract and retain extraordinary and diverse faculty, total remuneration (salary, post-employment benefits, access to affordable housing, family-friendly policies) must be a top priority.**
2. To attract and retain the best staff, UC must offer competitive salaries and benefits.
3. To fulfill our commitment to the State of California, we must sustain and improve access for qualified resident students at all levels (freshman, transfer, graduate and professional) to education and research opportunities in the UC. At the same time, we recognize the value of providing greater opportunities for nonresident students.
4. To ensure student access and student diversity, we should aim to sustain current enrollments. If the state cannot support high quality education of those students, however, consideration must be given to reducing enrollments.
5. Affordability is a core value. We must make all efforts to re-build the state support that will ensure access to the UC as a public institution and economic engine. We must provide adequate financial aid to UC students through Pell grants, competitive CalGrants, return-to-aid, and financial aid to undocumented students.

The size of the University must be commensurate with its resources. In the short term, this means that the faculty and staff must shrink and academic programs must be reshaped. Even so, sustaining academic excellence and creating opportunities for innovation must remain top priorities. The long-term plan for capital projects needs to be critically reassessed, taking into account the current economic climate and a realistic multi-year budget outlook.

Implications for faculty and staff:

6. Each campus should develop a realistic plan for reducing the size of its faculty and staff by attrition and hiring at a slower pace, while sustaining efforts to increase diversity.
7. Special scrutiny should be given to management and administrative positions, both academic and non-academic, to avoid proliferation and redundancies, and to ensure that all core-funded positions are essential to providing support for the academic enterprise.

8. Implications for capital programs:

- a. There should be a 1-year moratorium on approving major new buildings that rely on university and state funds and borrowing capacity. For renovations, the highest priority must be placed on those that are essential for safety, leveraged by external resources, and address the needs of core academic (teaching and research) programs.
- b. There should be a commensurate moratorium on new funding commitments for the design and construction of major buildings that were conceived to accommodate new programs and enrollment growth, but which realistically cannot be actualized within the next 5 to 10 years.
- c. In undertaking any capital project, whether funded by the state or other sources, the campuses must be required to ensure that operational funding is available for the support and maintenance of that space, and for activities within expanded space.
- d. In the special case of the Merced campus, it may be appropriate to consider exceptions to (a) and (b), but not (c).

9. Implications for academic programs: The Senate and Administration must work aggressively, in the spirit of shared governance, to:

- a. Modify or disestablish academic programs that are moribund;
- b. Identify courses that are critical to students' degree progress and direct instructional resources accordingly; where possible and appropriate, modify degree requirements to increase flexibility and reduce demand on limited-capacity courses.
- c. Develop innovative curricular approaches, which might include distance and online instruction and multi-campus collaborations, in support the UC's goals of ensuring access, affordability and excellence in education;
- d. Sustain our capacity for curricular innovation as a key element of academic excellence. Because resources are highly constrained, however, growth in some areas needs to be offset by pruning in others. Decisions about academic programs should continue to be made through shared governance at the divisional level, keeping in mind potential systemwide consequences.
- e. Suspend commitments to creating new schools and institutes, especially if their long-term viability depends on identifying substantial, stable resource streams.

An adequate, stable funding base is essential for the UC to fulfill its mandate and mission. Available funds should be directed toward the core missions of teaching, research and service to the maximum extent possible.

10. The University should take all possible steps to increase revenues from the State, federal programs, contracts and grants and private philanthropy.

5 June 2010

11. Fees are a necessary component the funding base. Increases should be gradual and predictable, but this is predicated on the stability of other revenue streams.
12. Administrative redundancies on individual campuses and at UCOP divert resources from the UC's core research and teaching missions. Efforts to eliminate duplication, streamline processes and achieve efficiencies should be accelerated.

ACTION REQUESTED: Adopt recommendation as the position of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and transmit to President Yudof

10. Discussion of Senate response to the recommendations of the Working Groups of the UC Commission of the Future (discussion)

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS