

categories of faculty.

Academic Freedom: Union-represented librarians in collective bargaining negotiations are requesting that “academic freedom” protections be offered as part of their terms of employment. Academic Council released a [statement](#) that supports the formation of a working group to develop policy language that provides non-Senate academic appointees with protections for scholarship, research, and teaching, akin to those that apply to Senate faculty as defined in [APM 010](#) (Academic Freedom) and [APM 015](#) (Faculty Code of Conduct). Chair May noted that academic freedom is not a bargainable right, but a core part of shared governance reflected in Senate faculty responsibilities for teaching and research outlined in APM 010 and APM 015.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

- *Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer*
- *David Alcocer, Associate Vice President and Director, Operating Budget*

Budget Plan for 2019-20: Later this week, UCOP will ask the Regents to approve a UC budget plan for 2019-20. The plan outlines the University’s revenue and spending priorities and communicates the University’s State funding needs. It asks the State to make permanent the \$105 million in one-time funding provided in the 2018-19 budget, and requests \$278 million in permanent new funding to support enrollment growth, improve faculty and staff compensation, address mandatory cost increases, and improve degree attainment and student success. It also asks the State for \$100 million in one-time funding to support deferred maintenance. In addition to State funding, the plan anticipates revenues from expanded undergraduate and graduate enrollment, additional nonresident fees, philanthropy, and cost savings. Full funding of the plan will allow UC to avoid a tuition increase.

Multi-Year Framework: The 2019-20 budget plan is intended to be the first in a four-year framework for full funding of the University. When complete, the framework will articulate a vision for UC’s commitment to the State and its goals for its students, faculty, and staff. The framework has three key elements: 1) produce 200,000 more UC degrees by 2030; 2) accelerate social mobility by improving graduation rates and time to degree, especially for low-income and URM students; and 3) reinvest in UC faculty and faculty research to benefit the state. The framework also will emphasize UC’s need for consistent and predictable State budget increases, renewed capital investment, and moderate and predictable tuition increases.

The University calculates that it can produce 200,000 new degrees by 2030 using a variety of initiatives that target improved learning outcomes. The University found that about 10% of students in each UC undergraduate cohort do not complete a degree, and those students are disproportionately first generation and Pell recipients. Low persistence in the early years is one of the main reasons for the fall-off. UC also found correlations between living on campus and persistence and graduation rates. The President’s Student Housing Initiative aims to add 16,000 new beds by 2020 and another 15,000 by 2025.

Financial Statements: The Regents will receive financial statements in November showing a slight improvement in the University’s overall net financial position in 2018, largely due to decreasing pension and retiree health benefit liabilities, strong investment returns, and higher interest rates. As of July 1, UCRP had a funded ratio of 87% on both an actuarial and market

basis, the result of continued employee/employer contributions and strong market returns. In addition, the program to increase contributions to UCRP through internal borrowing from STIP now totals \$4.3 billion and has added more than 7% to the UCRP funded ratio. However, a UCRP “experience study” scheduled for next year may recommend revisions to the actuarial assumptions based on changes to factors affecting the unfunded liability calculation such as rising longevity rates. The Regents’ actuary will also be evaluating a potential change to the expected rate of return, currently 7.25%. A 0.25% drop would add \$2 billion of liability.

V. Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program (SSGPDPs)

- **Onyebuchi Arah, CCGA Chair**
- **Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, Institutional Research & Academic Planning**
- **Chris Procello, Academic Planning & Research Analyst, IRAP**
- **Cain Diaz, Director, Operating Budget**

Request from Chair May: CCGA Chair Arah noted that the CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP chairs will meet next week to discuss a plan for responding to Chair May’s request for an SSGPDP program review. Chair Arah expects CCGA to focus on graduate education issues, UCPB on budget and planning issues, and UCAP on faculty advancement issues. He has asked CCGA members to submit questions and data requests; some of which will be answerable by CCGA and UCOP IRAP, and some by campuses only.

Data on SSGPDPs: IRAP Analyst Procello noted that 98 SSGPDPs have been established across the UC system since 1972 (about 90 are active). Only 11 existed until 1998, and growth was slow until 2010, when the Great Recession and continued declines in State support inspired campuses to seek out more alternative revenue strategies. SSGPDPs are now the fastest growing segment of graduate education at UC. Applications to SSGPDPs more than quadrupled between 2007 and 2016, and the 8,000 systemwide SSGPDP enrollments are a growing share of the overall graduate population of 56,000. Campuses proposed 18 new SSGPDPs in the 2011-16 planning perspective period, and 59 in the 2016-21 period. UCSD has the largest number of SSGPDPs, followed by UCLA, UCI, and UCB, although the latter campuses have larger total enrollments.

Historically, SSGPDP enrollments have been predominantly White (33% in 2016), Asian (23%), and male, reflecting overall UC graduate education enrollment. SSGPDPs have been concentrated in business administration and management, although more recently they have expanded to a broader range of disciplines, including Health, Engineering, Computer Science, Law, and the Arts. In 2016, 57% of SSGPDP enrollments were CA residents, while 43% were international or domestic nonresidents. About 25% of domestic SSGPDP students were Pell grant recipients as undergraduates.

SSGPDP Policy: In 2016, the University approved a revised [SSGPDP policy](#) requiring SSGPDP proposers to make a “compelling academic and budgetary case for the program.” The policy also requires admissions standards for SSGPDPs to be comparable to state-supported programs, and establishes model criteria for SSGPDPs that include serving non-traditional populations and employing an alternative mode of delivery, schedule, or location. The policy requires a financial

accessibility and support plan and calls for three-year follow-up reviews of new programs. CCGA's own [Guidelines](#) recommend an analysis of market demand, but these analyses differ widely; some are conducted by the campus itself, and others by a third party.

Budget Analysis: Director Diaz noted that UCOP asks campuses to include in their initial SSGPDP proposals a budget schedule (cost analysis template) detailing projected revenues and costs, including direct costs subject to an indirect cost (IDC) rate. The 2018-19 schedule uses an IDC rate that varies by campus and is based on data from the 2018 UC Expenditure for Instruction report and calculated using a [methodology](#) developed by NACUBO. The campus-specific IDC rate is calculated with a stepdown allocation method similar to the one used to calculate federally-sponsored research IDC. The template was recently revised to ensure more accurate and consistent reporting of IDC across campuses. UCOP uses this calculation to determine whether a program is truly self-supporting. Policy requires SSGPDPs to be self-sufficient within three years, and the template must show a path out of any projected initial deficit. UCOP does not maintain data on the financial status of SSGPDPs after they have been established.

- UCPB members noted that the UCPB review would benefit from improved data about the financial performance of approved SSGPDPs; how campuses use or plan to use excess revenues; how the SSGPSP will use state-funded resources and compensate the campus for its use of services and facilities; and how the SSGPDP will help UC carry out its state-supported teaching, research, and service missions.
- Members noted concern that while there are more women and students of color enrolled in SSGPDPs now compared to 2001, their high cost makes them less accessible to underprivileged populations. It was noted that CCGA has proposed that SSGPDPs submit annual data addressing access to the programs for different socioeconomic, gender, and racial groups.
- While some UCPB members characterized the growth of SSGPDPs as a quasi-privatization process, some members urged caution about using the term “privatization” in the context of SSGPSPs, noting that all are UC programs run by UC faculty. Moreover, the popularity and financial success of the programs shows that they are filling an unmet need, and as State funding lags, revenue-generating programs like SSGPSPs strengthen the university, benefit the core academic enterprise, and help campuses fight off emerging deficits.
- Chair Steintrager suggested that UCPB clarify its expectations to campuses about the information it expects to receive about SSGPSPs, including:
 - a) The effect of the SSGPDP on state-supported programs and the undergraduate experience (e.g., faculty buy-outs)
 - b) The effect of SSGPDP overload teaching on research productivity and service
 - c) The relationship of tuition levels to access, affordability, inclusion, and diversity
 - d) More detail about and justification for the campus' IDC calculation if it differs from the IDC rate used on the template
 - e) The use of excess revenues

VI. SSGPDP Reviews

Proposed SSGPDPs with assigned reviewers:

1. UCI Master of Presentation Design
2. UCR Master of Supply Chain & Logistics Management
3. UCI Master of Engineering

ACTION: UCPB deferred discussion of the completed reviews to the December meeting.

New proposed SSGPDPs:

1. Flexible Masters of Social Welfare UC Berkeley

ACTION: UCPB member Professor Trounstein (UCM) volunteered to lead the review and report to UCPB.

VII. Five-Year Reviews of Multi-Campus Research Units

Per the Compendium, UCORP will lead the five-year reviews of the [UC Humanities Research Institute](#) (UCHRI) and the Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (INPAC), and CCGA and UCPB will each appoint one member to act as consultants to UCORP for the reviews. The UCPB consultant will be invited to attend relevant portions of UCORP meetings. UCPB will be invited to submit comments and recommendations to UCORP for inclusion in the final reports to UCOP.

1. UCHRI (UC Humanities Research Institute)

ACTION: UCPB member Professor Ahmed (UCB) will be UCPB's consultant to UCORP.

2. INPAC (Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology)

ACTION: UCPB member Professor Constable (UCSD) will be UCPB's consultant to UCORP.

VIII. UCPB Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources

- o **Eleanor Kaufman, UCPB Vice Chair**

Task Force Roster: Professor Kaufman will chair the UCPB Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR-TF) this year. She noted that there is an immediate need to constitute and convene the Task Force to respond to a just-released draft report of the President's Advisory Committee on ANR. Professor Kaufman is working with UCOC to finalize the ANR-TF roster, which includes representation from the three Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) campuses Berkeley, Davis and Riverside, as well as UCORP and CCGA. UCOC is also working to identify a Merced representative, and a UCEP representative.

ACTION: UCPB approved the UCPB ANR Task Force roster.

Draft Advisory Committee Report: Professor Kaufman noted that UCOP has released a draft report from the Advisory Committee charged by the President to consider options for the structure, governance, and funding of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). She noted that the recommendations include creating a 15-member UC ANR Governing Council that is appointed by the President and includes three Senate faculty representatives nominated by the Academic Council, and creating a new ANR funding model that combines the “set-aside” and “corridor” models. UCOP provided a short window to review the report (November 30).

Consultation with Senate Representative: Professor Mary Gauvain joined UCPB to discuss her role as faculty representative on the ANR Advisory Committee, which was asked to make recommendations concerning the oversight of ANR and its location, administrative and governance structures, funding model, and budgetary review process. The Task Force discussed concerns about a lack of ANR budget transparency, accountability, and governance oversight, as well as tensions with the Academic Senate, which has struggled to get basic information about how ANR spends money. The Advisory Committee is proposing a new governance and oversight mechanism – the ANR Governing Council – envisioned to have substantial oversight and decision-making authority. Professor Gauvain believes that the Governing Council, in contrast to existing bodies, will ensure significant Senate engagement in ANR decision-making. The Advisory Committee report also recommends a new funding model for ANR to ensure more stable ANR budgets. The new model would move State UC Cooperative Extension funding to a State set-aside calculated using the budget “corridor” model, to help protect UC ANR from year-to-year fluctuations in the larger UC budget. (She noted that not all Advisory Committee members agreed that ANR should be shielded from bad UC budget years.) The Advisory Committee also found that campuses and ANR could benefit from broader intercampus and interdisciplinary engagement and collaboration.

- UCPB members noted that there is a lot to like in the report. It enhances the Senate’s role in governing ANR and increases UCOP oversight of the ANR budget. Members also expressed strong concern about the short review timeline. It was agreed that Professor Kaufman would convene the UCPB ANR TF to discuss the report prior to the November 30 deadline. She also invited UCPB members to forward comments about the report.

IX. Systemwide Senate Review Items

1. Proposed Presidential Policy on Principles of Accountability with Respect to Financial Transactions
2. Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information
3. Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

ACTION: UCPB opted not to opine on the systemwide review items.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: James Steintrager, UCPB Chair