

Minutes of Meeting
March 3, 2015

I. Chair's Announcements

Gary Leal, UCPB Chair

Update: Chair Leal updated the committee on the work of the total remuneration task force. The work group has 4 Senate members and 4 administrators. The recommendations generated by the work group will be vetted by normal stakeholders, but the final decision is President Napolitano's. The group divided discussions into two parts: for 15-16, how to allocate 3%, and going forward, how to close the gap identified in the total remuneration study. The current recommendations only address the first question. Across-the-board increases of 3% are administratively the easiest. However, such increases do not address the internal salary inequities due to the "loyalty penalty" and related issues, and so the majority recommendation was to apply the salary increases only to the on-scale part of the salary. The group then spent significant time discussing the fate of salary increases for Above scale faculty: since Above scale salaries are not tied to the scales, the base upon which increases should be benchmarked is unclear. Eventually a formula was suggested that bases this on the current level 9 salary plus an addition based upon the number of years that a faculty member has been in the Above scale rank.

Discussion: Members noted that discussion seem to assume positive budget outcomes, otherwise recommendations will be unfunded mandates. Members wondered how committed work group members were to the scales, both in practice and in philosophy. Members also wondered how faculty remuneration would fare versus other categories in the "reinvestment in quality" bucket.

II. Consent Calendar

1. DRAFT Minutes of Meeting, February 3, 2015

Action: The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Consultation with UCOP – Budget

Debbie Obley, Associate Vice President

Update: AVP Obley reported on recent legislative hearings held in Sacramento. The Joint Legislative Audit Committee and the Committee on Higher Education used a 4 year old audit as an entry point to UC's budget. There are two open items: rebenching and the development of a budget manual, and both are in-progress. Legislative concerns include the correlation of the relatively poorer campuses and under-represented minority enrollment and that the fact that the richer campuses benefit disproportionately from non-resident tuition. The Higher Education committee is using a modified zero-based budgeting approach, and is focused solely on cost drivers, not revenue. In addition to efficiencies, the legislature is interested in learning more about faculty workload and exploring pension caps for UC (consonant with PEPRA). UC's distinctiveness from CSU seems to be increasingly blurred as more conversations are held; even the governor's staff has questioned why excellence is a desirable quality for UC.

The Committee of Two held its second meeting, which focused on transfers, enrollment, and program delivery. External experts included Dave Coleman from the College Board, who spoke about summer sessions and preparatory classes; Bill Massey from Stanford, who spoke about the cost of educational delivery models; and Robert Powell from UC Davis, who spoke about the changes to curricula, graduate student support, and educational quality that would be needed to create 3-year degrees in his field of chemical engineering.

Discussion: Members asked how the PEPRA-related pension cap idea might play out. AVP Obley indicated that such a cap would lower the plan's normal cost by reducing maximum payouts upon retirement; the exact amount of possible savings has not yet been calculated. During the PEB process, many collective bargaining groups, such as firefighters and nurses, lent considerable support and voice to protecting UC's pension plan. Members noted that faculty recruitment and retention would be negatively impacted by any caps.

IV. Consultation with UCOP – Academic Affairs

Aimée Dorr, Provost

1. Future of Office of Research and Graduate Studies

Update: The Strategic Operational Review of the Office of the President (SOROP) has concluded, but the findings are still being reviewed by UCOP stakeholders. Recommendations could be tweaked depending on budget outcomes. The role of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies is not anticipated to change much. Some changes will be made to the public face of the office, and some new diversity responsibilities will be assigned. The workload is expected to increase, and the FTE will remain flat or be cut. Research and graduate studies will stay together, and the definition of research will be the traditional one, not one focusing on entrepreneurship or commercial innovation. A revised posting should be available soon. Issues still to be resolved include the location of the Industry Alliance Service group (formerly Technology Transfer).

Discussion: Members asked about the desired balance between research and graduate studies administration, and Provost Dorr indicated that such details are still to be determined and UCPB's opinion is welcome. Members noted that multi-campus research is in many ways a unique feature of the UC system, but added that competed programs have been the most vulnerable to cuts recently. Some wondered if the new VP would (or should) have some amount of revenue generation added to the job duties. Members asked if research auxiliaries, like the supercomputer or the Observatories, would be in the Vice President's portfolio. Provost Dorr indicated that the full scope of duties had yet to be finalized. A new UCO director is being recruited, and changes to both leaders' duties have not been ruled out; the TMT process is ongoing, and incumbent personnel will continue to steward that project.

2. Doctoral Student Support

Update: A report to the Regents is being prepared for later this spring, following on the work began at last spring's summit. The recommendation to identify greater professional development opportunities for PhD students still has the most work remaining. While a resource portal could be useful, it is unclear as yet whether a central resource or local portals are desired.

Discussion: Members asked if the recommendation to leave non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) at the campus which generated it was being implemented, and Provost Dorr indicated yes, but the specific distribution rules were still being determined. Overall, \$32M in graduate student support needs have been identified, but the list does not include costs for faculty mentoring, etc.

3. Central Research Support

Update: Provost Dorr reminded members of the fine being assessed against UC's LANL management fee. Significant recent cuts to the MPRI program were only partially restored on a one-time basis, despite a request for full restoration on a permanent basis. Last year, direct lobbying by the EVCs and VCRs helped secure the one-time augmentation, and continued pressure for flexible, discretionary research funds for multi-campus projects and large federal grants is warranted.

4. Budget Engagement and Advocacy

Update: Provost Dorr asked if the committee had any specific feedback on the recent communications that had gone out.

Discussion: Members asked if student advocacy groups had been included in a similar effort. Provost Dorr indicated that various efforts to engage with students on this front were under way, but short term and long term interests do not always align neatly.

5. Self-supporting Programs

Update: Provost Dorr observed that SSPs were to be limited to graduate, professional degrees, and that the campus makes the determination if the degree is academic or professional.

Discussion: Members speculated that many SSPs were envisioned only as revenue sources. Provost Dorr noted that most potential SSPs never move beyond the concept phase.

V. Consultation with UCOP – Academic Personnel

Susan Carlson, Vice Provost

1. Negotiated Salary Trial Program Update

Update: The report is a compilation, not an analysis; the program is only one year old, and more data are needed before analysis can begin. Nonetheless, the preliminary data match expectations. For example, teaching loads are unchanged.

Discussion: Members asked if the funds identified in the report came from more than contracts and grants, such as gifts or donations. Others noted that gifts occupy a sort of grey area as they imply a contract and are often targeted to a particular project or program. Members also asked if the funds in the report were redirected from another project or if they were new funds to the system. Vice Provost Carlson said the data cannot answer that question.

Members asked how graduate students were being impacted by the program. Vice Provost Carlson noted that the funds were used not just for faculty salary, and that year 2 data should be more useful. Local data is tricky to analyze over time as funding sources tend to shift frequently at the local level. Members encouraged VP Carlson to include post-docs in subsequent reports as an additional longitudinal comparator.

VP Carlson noted that all costs are allowable under OMB regulations, and added that revised regulations are even more friendly to this type of program. Members wondered whether the final data would be able to indicate causality or only correlations. Members also sought additional specifics regarding what level of program performance would be considered a pass, and how it would be ended should it not succeed.

2. Total Remuneration

Update: VP Carlson reported that the University of Virginia had a multi-year salary plan approved by their state legislature. This may provide good leverage for UC.

VI. Consultation with Senate Leadership

Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair

Update: Chair Gilly updated the committee on several items of interest:

From the Academic Council meeting of February 25:

- Draft revisions to APM 210.1.d were approved again by Council. The draft will go for full systemwide review.
- Draft revisions to the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) were approved for full systemwide review.
- The Senate has a large carbon footprint, but at present, there is no viable alternative to face-to-face meetings for much of the Senate's business.

- UC Path replanning continues. A new go-live date for UCOP is still to be determined. The allocation is almost spent; additional resources will have to be sought soon.
- Nominations for the 15-16 Council Vice Chair are due March 16.

Other news:

- The Committee of Two held its second meeting, and presented an update at the March Regents meeting. So far, no proposals have emerged. Members of the governor's staff are continuing their campus visits, and will go to Merced in the next few days. At Berkeley, the governor's staff asked why excellence was necessary at UC, and they asked about the inclusion of private universities in the Comparison 8. It was noted that about half of the faculty that UC loses go to private institutions of such caliber, so the comparison is apt.
- The Community College Bachelors degree pilot has raised many concerns. Demand for non-duplicative degrees has not been clearly evidenced, and many upper division requirements are needed and may further complicate transfers.
- BOARS endorsed again the transfer initiative. However, the practice of having different requirements for the same department at different UC campuses is difficult to explain and seems ripe for simplification. The goal is to align 10 majors this year, and 10 next.

Discussion: Members asked if rebenching was being viewed as a success in the current budget environment. Chair Gilly indicated that it has mixed receptions; some in the administration continue to favor maximum local flexibility. Since the funds are largely zero-sum, someone will always feel disadvantaged. It was noted that the number of non-resident students has increased substantially since the rebenching process began, so some tweaks in that area might be useful.

VII. Consultation with Institutional Research

Todd Greenspan, Director, Institutional Research

1. Enrollment Planning

Update: Revised long-range enrollment plans (LREPs) have been submitted by all but one campus. Many locations lowered expectations regarding graduate student enrollment.

Discussion: Members asked if UC was still meeting its Master Plan obligation, and Director Greenspan noted that UC is matching the policy approved by the Regents in September. Some locations submitted figures showing cuts to enrollment that would be needed to match the level of state funding being received; such projections would not meet the Master Plan. Members also asked if the unfunded students were likely to be bought out by the state, and Director Greenspan indicated that the legislature is interested in funding new students only.

The in-state enrollment targets for this fall are being held flat since the budget is still unknown. Berkeley and UCLA have been instructed to hold their non-resident enrollment flat; San Diego may go up to 20% from 18; the other campuses were not given a specific cap, but it is felt unlikely that any would reach 20% at this time. However, until the state returns as a full partner in funding the university, campuses only have incentives to enroll non-residents and to create SSPs to make ends meet.

2. Rebenching

Update: Rebenching has been underway for 3 years, and there are 3 more years to go. Possible changes to year 4-6 will be informed by the updated LREPs, but budget immediacy has trumped long-range goals lately. Possible changes could include altering the medical resident weighting and reevaluating summer enrollment. Rebenching is hampered by addressing budgeted enrollment, not targeted enrollment, which sometimes leads to confusion and mixed messages being sent.

Discussion: Members asked where the funds that were being rebenched originated. Director Greenspan indicated that there is an 80/20 formula, where 20% of new funds are subject to

rebenching. Members asked if formulae used in rebenching match those used in the Cost of Instruction report. Finally members added that any further discussion of rebenching must include meaningful enrollment planning.

VIII. Systemwide Review Items

1. Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 128.D.2 (Vice Chairs)

Action: UCPB will support this amendment, with the caveat that limited financial impacts are confirmed.

2. Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence

Action: UCPB elected not to opine on this item.

3. Draft Equity for Access Guidelines

Discussion: Members wondered if the language was too technical for a broad audience. Members also wondered if performing the amount of due diligence needed was a realistic expectation of the OCIO and local finance offices. Record-keeping was noted as a potential problem if not created correctly at the outset. The time limit for successful returns is unclear, as is the threshold for lost investments.

Action: Discussion will continue at the April meeting.

IX. Self-supporting Program Proposals

A. Reviewing SSP Proposals

i. Response Template

Update: Based on the Academic Planning Council's proposal checklist, a review template was created. Members agreed to keep the APC categories on the checklist, but suggested adding a student job market analysis category in addition to the enrollment expectations.

Action: Analyst Feer will revise the template for use in subsequent SSP reviews.

ii. "Compelling" Reason

Update: UCI has proposed revised language to better specify what a compelling reason for self-support versus state support in an SSP proposal should address.

Discussion: Members felt the revision asked proposers to prove a negative, rather than state an affirmative reason or illustrate a comparative advantage to the alternate structure.

Action: Chair Leal will draft alternate language for consideration by APC.

B. Proposals

1. UCSD IRPS MPP

Shane White, Vice Chair and Lead Reviewer

Review: This proposal is for increased professional supplemental tuition, not a new self-supporting program. The proposal addresses each area in the APC checklist. Improvements could be made if the size of the reserves were specified and if the timing of the initial review were specified. Overall, the proposal supports a unique academic focus in a new geographic area.

Action: UCPB will convey its support for the PDST increase at the UCSD IRPS MPP to CCGA.

2. UCB MS Public Affairs

Action: UCSD Representative Betts will serve as lead reviewer for April.

3. UCLA MS Applied Statistics

Action: UCI Representative Klein will serve as lead reviewer for May.

4. UCSD MS Business

Action: UCSC Representative Friedman will serve as lead reviewer for April.

5. UCI MS Forensic Psychology

Action: UCLA Representative Luck will serve as lead reviewer for May.

6. UCB MS Earthquake Engineering

Action: UCR Representative Barish will serve as lead reviewer for June.

X. New Business

It was proposed to move the start time of the meetings to 9:30 to better accommodate airline flight schedules.

Meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: L. Gary Leal, UCPB Chair