

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Minutes of Meeting
February 4, 2020

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of UCPB February 4, 2020 agenda
- Approval of UCPB January 7, 2020 minutes

ACTION: UCPB approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *Sean Malloy, UCPB Chair*
- *Bruce Schumm, UCPB Vice Chair*

ACSCOLI Meeting: Vice Chair Schumm attended the January 27 ACSCOLI meeting. ACSCOLI is charged with providing Senate oversight of UC's relationship with the UC-managed National Laboratories (Los Alamos, Lawrence Berkeley, and Lawrence Livermore). It discusses the status of the labs, their activities, and priorities for the Laboratory Fees Research Program (LFRP), UCOP's program for funding campus-lab research collaborations using the income UC receives for management of LANL and LLNL. ACSCOLI wants to increase its involvement in setting the criteria for the RFP that supports the LFRP. It also is seeking more information about how the UCOP Research Grants Program Office is gauging the success of the LFRP. Conversations continue with UC Irvine about developing a southern UC campus hub for LLNL, to extend the benefits of the labs to faculty and students based in Southern California.

Degree Completion RFP: UC has released an RFP in response to a \$15 million state budget appropriation for UC to develop or expand degree and certificate completion programs at UC Extension centers. The UCOP RFP review panel will include four Senate members and make recommendations to the Provost and the President in April. Chair Bhavnani has sent a memo to divisional chairs clarifying that the Senate develops and approves degrees, even if degree completion programs are run through a campus' Extension Center.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Mary Gauvain, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

COI Task Force: The UC Health Executive Vice President is forming a Conflict of Interest Task Force to consider UC policy and practice in the context of new federal reporting requirements related to outside income earned by faculty on the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

DACA: UCOP is working with campuses to assess how a potential Supreme Court decision to rescind the DACA program would impact students and UC workers. The University is planning for a variety of outcomes, and will continue to stand by its undocumented students in any case.

WGCA: The Working Group on Comprehensive Access Chair's Report has been released for systemwide review. The Working Group included three Senate representatives: Chair Bhavnani, Past Senate Chair May, and UCSF Professor Vanessa Jacoby.

Presidential Search. Chair Bhavnani has forwarded [letters from UCPB and Academic Council](#) to the Regents Special Committee for the Presidential Search. The letters encourage the Committee to include more opportunities for unscripted engagement with campus communities.

January Regents Meeting: The Academic Affairs Committee hosted presentations about UC graduate education as it relates to state workforce needs and the California economy. Merced and Riverside made presentations about their strategic long-term academic plans and goals in the context of infrastructure and financial needs. The Regents approved revised Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) fees for six business and law programs, and multi-year PDST plans for four graduate professional degree programs. The Regents also discussed the pros and cons of an across-the-board tuition model that ties increases to inflation, and a cohort-based model that assesses increases on incoming cohorts who would be guaranteed a rate for six years. The Regents may call a special meeting in February to consider tuition.

Admissions Audit: In response to the national admissions scandal, the UC Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services (ECAS) initiated a two-phase internal systemwide audit of undergraduate admissions, to review local processes and controls—particularly around Admission by Exception, Athletics, and Special Admissions. In addition, the California State Auditor will be conducting an independent audit of UC admissions,

Area D: Council has sent the Academic Assembly a recommendation to reverse its February 2018 [recommendation](#) ([amended in April 2019](#)) to increase the minimum Area D (Science) subject requirement for UC undergraduate admissions to 3 years. Council’s recommendation to maintain the current Area D requirement at 2 years of Science required and 3 years recommended follows a new [Public Policy Institute of California \(PPIC\) report](#) UC commissioned to analyze the effect of the change on underrepresented students.

Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF): The report and recommendations of the STTF were released for systemwide Senate review on February 3. The deadline for comment will be March 23 to enable discussion at the April Council and Assembly meetings. Based on feedback, the Assembly will issue a final set of policy recommendations to President Napolitano for transmittal to the Regents in April 2020.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

- *Kathleen Fullerton, Associate Director of Strategy, Planning, and Operations, State Governmental Relations*
- *Paul Jenny, Interim Chief Financial Officer*
- *David Alcocer, Associate Vice President, Budget Analysis and Planning*

The Governor has released his 2020-21 State budget proposal. It includes \$217.7 million of permanent new funding for UC, but does not cover all of UC’s core operating cost increases or address UC’s request for deferred maintenance funding. To fill the gap, the University will consider only its second tuition increase in eight years, as it engages its student and alumni networks, Regents, and campus leaders to advocate for full funding of UC’s budget plan. In addition to the operating budget, the University’s main legislative foci include student health care, housing and food insecurity; Cal Grant reform; funding for innovation and entrepreneurship programs; and support for AB 540-eligible students.

A UCPB member noted that the state has a \$22 billion budget surplus, while several UC campuses are projecting deficits after ten years of budget austerity. The University should seek a

“big ask” for its general fund appropriation rather than temporary one-time carve-outs of support for individual programs. One time funding is best directed to UCRP. UC has a strong case for directing additional Proposition 2 funding to UCRP, given the state’s support for CalPers and CalSTRs. Members also recommended that UCOP make extended presentations to the Regents about campus operating deficits and deferred maintenance that feature outcome measures illustrating the pain of austerity.

UCOP officials responded that the University is focused on maintaining its positive relationship with the new Governor. It wants to work with the Governor to meet his goals as it advocates for its original budget proposal. The University is emphasizing that a 5% increase to state general funds does not translate to a 5% increase in overall UC funds, because UC has moved to a blended funding model that combines state general funds, tuition, and UC general funds. The continued sustainability of that model requires moderate increases to each source – or exceptional increases to one. Investing in UC’s budget plan and sustaining those investments over time will require additional core funds of \$2.1 billion annually by 2024-25. Without additional resources, the annual shortfall will grow from \$259M in 2020-21 to \$734M by 2024-25. Regular inflation-based adjustments to student charges would significantly reduce (but not eliminate) the projected shortfall.

UCOP has been sharing data with the Regents that connect budget austerity to a decline in the quality of the student experience. It is also emphasizing that campus efforts to preserve instructional budgets have come at the expense of priorities like student services, development, and staffing. The Regents understand that all campuses are underfunding basic building maintenance.

UCOP and state officials recently met to discuss a possible restart of regular State contributions to UCRP or one-time Proposition 2 funding for UCRP. State officials noted that CalPers and CalSTRs are the current priority for Proposition 2 funds, and that funding for UCRP would not be available for at least a year.

After reviewing data indicating that campuses have \$24 billion in deferred maintenance and other capital needs for which funding has not been identified, the Regents charged a Working Group on Long-Term Liabilities to explore revenue strategies and options for addressing campus budget and infrastructure challenges.

UCFW-TFIR Chair David Brownstone joined the meeting and encouraged UC officials to form a working group to model options for borrowing – including a pension obligation bond – that would reduce the UCRP liability and avoid increasing employee contributions. CFO Jenny responded that a pension obligation bond would produce low yields and also hurt the university’s rating and its capacity to borrow for seismic upgrading and other capital needs. Chair Brownstone noted that UC’s employee contribution already exceeds that of many UC peers.

- UCPB members noted that UC competes with both public and private institutions for faculty. The University and the state should both strive to give UC students access to the highest quality education, not simply an education that compares to other public universities. To justify its requests for state funding, the University should articulate its quality and role in a way that differentiates it from other public systems. The Regents have to be part of a responsible budget strategy by supporting tuition increases when needed.

V. Executive Session

VI. Faculty Salaries

- **Susan Carlson, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel**
- **Pamela Peterson, Executive Director and Deputy to the Vice Provost**
- **Gregory Sykes, Academic Policy and Compensation Data Analyst**

Faculty Salary Plan: The proposed UC budget includes funding for a faculty salary program. UCOP is evaluating options for a 4% adjustment to the salary scales for 2020-21; however, uncertainty about the final state budget may delay action until after the Governor's May Budget Revision. A joint Faculty Salary Scales Task Force has been charged with reviewing the role and meaning of the UC faculty salary scales and off-scales. UCOP has estimated that it would cost \$112 million to bring all general campus faculty salary scales up to market parity with the Comparison 8 (without subsuming off-scales), based on data from 2018 showing a 7.5% differential between UC faculty salaries and the Comparison 8.

- A UCPB member noted that the salary scales are no longer effective in preventing salary compression and inversion, and faculty use outside offers routinely to secure off-scale raises. Given the situation, it might be more efficient for administrators to maintain a discretionary salary pool to use in recruitment and retention actions. Other members noted that it is important to fix the scales and to maintain Senate oversight over salary actions. UC's merit-based, peer-reviewed system has, at least on some campuses, helped ensure an appropriate distribution of compensation relative to the scales and merit-based off-scales. Members also emphasized that campuses calculate and use off-scales differently and that the Senate controls off-scale award decisions only on some campuses.

VII. New Proposed Self Supporting Degree Programs

- UCLA Self-supporting Master of Financial Engineering – Asia Pacific (M.F.E. - Asia Pacific) degree program.

ACTION: UCPB member Professor Stanton volunteered to lead the review and report back to UCPB in March.

VIII. Campus Reports

UCSF is concerned about proposed revisions to APM 120 currently out for systemwide review. The original impetus was to clarify provisions for the conferral of emeritus status on non-academic employees, but the current revisions would limit automatic conferral of those titles to tenured ladder-rank Senate faculty with the titles professor and associate professor. In the past, all Senate members automatically received emerita/emeritus status but now Health Sciences titles such as "in Residence" and "Clinical X," as well as LSOE and Teaching Professor titles, would not enjoy this automatic recognition. Given that faculty in these titles make important contributions to research, teaching, and service, they deserve to have access to automatic emerita/emeritus status. While the policy permits campuses to develop local criteria and procedures for conferring emerita/emeritus status, this work-around adds an unnecessary administrative burden.

ACTION: UCPB will draft a statement about APM 120.

IX. UCPB/CCGA SSPGDP Study Subcommittee

- **Ramesh Balasubramaniam, CCGA Chair (Zoom)**
- **Bruce Schumm, UCPB Vice Chair**
- **Kathleen McGarry, UCPB Member**

Last year, CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP were tasked with reviewing the self-supporting graduate professional degree ([SSGPDP](#)) program. The committees piloted a survey at UCI with the help of staff there and sent an interim report to Academic Council in 2019. A CCGA and UCPB subcommittee has been meeting to discuss next steps and develop recommendations for improving the review of new SSGPDPs and for increasing the accountability of existing SSGPDPs.

The subcommittee agrees that it is important for the Senate to monitor the impact of SSGPDPs on campus budgets and educational goals, direct and indirect costs, faculty effort, and state-supported programs, and to ensure that SSGPDPs maintain academic quality on par with state-supported programs. It agrees the Senate should also monitor the ratio of ladder-rank faculty teaching in SSGPDPs done on-load or overload; diversity outcomes; and student learning outcomes. Other big picture considerations include the extent to which SSGPDPs are appropriate within a public university and how systemwide Senate review improves proposed SSGPDPs.

The UCI report and committees' report both noted the difficulty of tracking how campuses use SSGPDP revenue or conduct three-year program reviews. Moreover, it is not clear whether approved SSGPDPs are being assessed against the projections and expectations included in initial proposals.

The subcommittee has drafted an initial set of guidelines for the Senate review of SSGPDPs, both at the proposal stage and during periodic post-approval evaluations. The guidelines encourage a clear connection between the CCGA/UCPB review of new proposals and post-approval evaluations. They ask programs to submit an evaluation plan with their proposals that fully addresses the key Senate areas of interest, including how the programs will measure quality and success. It asks approved programs to review outcomes against those benchmarks regularly, and to share evaluation results with the Senate.

Vice Chair Schumm noted that in 2008, during his tenure as CCGA chair, the Council approved a CCGA report that requested annual reporting of data on the socioeconomic, gender, and racial composition of applicants and enrollees in SSGPDPs.

- UCPB members noted that the Senate should monitor the extent to which SSGPDPs may be sapping resources, particularly faculty time and effort, away from UC's core educational mission at the department, college, or campus. It should monitor the SSGPDP's financial and educational benefit to the campus, and also assess the potential opportunity cost of offering an SSGPDP instead of a state-supported equivalent, given the loss of state tuition dollars that benefit the general campus. It should ask programs to detail net revenues; the program's use of ladder faculty, lecturers, and adjuncts; its effect on campus budgets and state-funded programs, UC's public mission, access and diversity, and resource sharing across departments. The Senate should ensure that considerations about the revenue generating potential of an SSGPDP do not cloud judgements about academic quality and other concerns.

X. Systemwide Review of the Working Group on Comprehensive Access Chair's Report

- **Robert May, Past Senate Chair**

The Working Group on Comprehensive Access (WGCA) Chair's Report has been released for public comment. The WGCA itself did not reach a consensus on the central question of whether UC should affiliate with external health care organizations that have internal policies limiting services at their facilities. The report outlines two options: 1) allow affiliations with non-UC entities that prohibit certain services for women and LGBT people, and 2) prohibit such affiliations. Option 1 would also require that affiliation agreements accord with principles tied to UC's commitment to evidence-based care, nondiscrimination, expanding access to and improving the quality of care, academic freedom, and UC's public mission and values.

The WGCA was formed after the University halted a planned affiliation between UCSF and Dignity Healthcare, over concerns about its consistency with the UC mission. Many opposed the affiliation because Dignity follows the Ethical and Religious Directives for Catholic Healthcare Services (ERDs), which include prohibitions on services like tubal ligation, abortion, and gender affirming care. These concerns also informed the July 2019 report of the UCFW Non-Discrimination in Healthcare Task Force (NDHCTF), which recommended that UC avoid affiliations with entities whose values conflict with UC's public mission and values.

The WGCA included three Senate representatives, including past Senate Chair May and current Chair Bhavnani. The Senate representatives issued a separate statement that was attached to the Chair's Report, urging UC to reject any affiliation agreements that do not expressly state that UC personnel or trainees will not be forced to abide by religious directives. (A PRA request confirmed that UC's current contracts with Dignity require UC staff working in Dignity facilities to follow the ERDs.)

Past Chair May noted that affiliations can be valuable to UC, but should not compromise UC non-discrimination principles or force UC physicians and trainees to compromise their values. He noted that proponents of the Dignity affiliation have not provided a cost-benefit analysis or demonstrated how the affiliation would help underserved populations. The affiliation is primarily a business decision that discounts important principles of access and non-discrimination. At the same time, pressure is growing for affiliations, particularly in rural communities, and including the Merced and Santa Cruz campus communities, where the only full service hospitals are religiously affiliated.

- UCPB members expressed support for the principles expressed in the NDHCTF report that call on the University to align affiliation decisions with core UC values. Some members also expressed concern that an absolute prohibition on affiliations would adversely affect access to care, including through the Veterans Affairs hospitals, which by law cannot provide abortion services, and in some UC campus communities where no feasible alternative exists. Reducing access to care might also be seen as contrary to UC values and public service mission. There were also concerns that the UC medical centers' depictions of the contracts with Dignity seriously misrepresented key elements of the contracts.

ACTION: Chair Malloy will draft a letter expressing support for option 2 and articulating concerns about the VA. The draft will be circulated for comment.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: Sean Malloy, UCPB Chair