

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

Minutes of Meeting
March 5, 2019

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of UCPB March 5, 2019 agenda
- Approval of UCPB February 5, 2019 minutes

ACTION: UCPB approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *Jim Steintrager, UCPB Chair*
- *Eleanor Kaufman, UCPB Vice Chair*

Academic Council Meeting: Council met with the Office of Academic Personnel to discuss processes for ensuring that student employees are paid correctly during the transition to UC Path. A group of campus academic personnel directors is developing options for a permanent solution to payroll errors, which have been concentrated among graduate students with complicated pay statuses. Council also discussed ongoing concerns about diversity emanating from the Regents and Legislature, and the UCSF Senate Division's proposed Memorial to the Regents to divest the University's endowment portfolio of investments in fossil fuel companies. The memorial is moving to an initial vote of Senate divisions per [Senate Bylaw 90](#).

UCEAP Advisory Board: Chair Steintrager attended meetings of the UC Education Abroad Program Advisory Board and its Finance Subcommittee. The Subcommittee vets the proposed UCEAP budget and approves program-specific fees. UCEAP is addressing a structural budget deficit, and has a budget reserve to cover fluctuations in the currency exchange market. The Subcommittee is monitoring the budgetary effect of the trend toward more summer participation in UCEAP, and how high program-specific fees may affect diversity.

TF-ANR: The UCPB Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources (TF-ANR) met by videoconference on February 22. TF-ANR invited the three Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) deans to provide individual perspectives on the AES funding model; the use of AES funds; and the potential for greater integration of non-AES campuses with the AES mission. TF-ANR is now developing recommendations for improving interactions between AES and non-AES faculty as well as for both marginal changes and broader structural reforms within ANR. Also, given that TF-ANR seems more interested in research issues than in budget issues, Chair Kaufman has proposed that TF-ANR might be better placed under UCORP.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Robert May, Academic Senate Chair*

Publisher Negotiations: On February 28, the University walked away from negotiations with Elsevier for subscription renewal contracts that expired December 31. There is broad support for the decision both within and outside the University. The systemwide Senate released a [statement](#) signed by members of the Academic Council and other systemwide committee chairs expressing

support for UC's negotiating position. The move is a watershed event and an opportunity to develop new sustainable models for the distribution of scholarly work.

Task Forces: The Academic Council Standardized Testing Task Force met in Oakland in early February. A second joint task force on scholarly obligations and protections for non-Senate academic appointees will be circulating a proposed APM policy for systemwide review.

State Budget: The Governor's proposed 2019-20 budget provides UC with a large increase in permanent funding over 2018-19, but it does not make permanent all of the one-time funding provided last year to fund enrollment growth and a tuition increase buy-out.

ICAS Legislative Day: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates held its annual Legislative Day meeting in Sacramento on February 20. Faculty leaders from the three segments of CA public higher education met with legislators and their staff to convey faculty perspectives on issues of common interest, including student financial aid, diversity, and graduate education.

IV. Update on the Multi-year Planning Initiative

- *Pamela Brown, Vice President, Institutional Research and Academic Planning*

Multi-Year Planning: The multi-year planning framework includes three overarching goals: 1) produce 200,000 more degrees by 2030 in addition to the one million already planned; 2) ensure the California Dream is available to everyone by improving undergraduate access and time-to-degree; and 3) invest in the next generation of faculty and research. In January, the Regents did a deep dive on campus plans for meeting the first two goals by eliminating achievement gaps for Pell recipients, URM, and first-generation students, and addressing time-to-degree and degree completion issues for these and other students in general. In March plans for growing the professoriate, increasing graduate degree attainment, and improving the academic infrastructure will be presented to the Board, along with a proposed funding plan for the framework.

The presentation will highlight data on UC's important role as a research university and emphasize that new ladder-rank and clinical faculty will support California's research, education, and health care needs, and benefit the economy. The presentation will address overcrowding by featuring data on class size growth over time, the growing number of students who report being unable to access their major of choice, and declining first year retention rates. It will emphasize that reducing the student-to-faculty ratio to 2005 levels will require adding 275 ladder-rank faculty and 200 clinical faculty FTE each year over the next four years. The Regents will hear that the 40,000 new graduate degrees planned as part of the framework provide an additional opportunity to increase the faculty diversity pipeline.

V. Consultation with UCOP

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

2019-20 Budget: The Governor's budget proposes a \$3.8 billion general fund appropriation for the University, including a \$240 million (6.9%) increase to UC's base budget, and \$153 million in additional one-time funding (\$148 million for deferred maintenance and \$15 million to support a degree completion pilot program). On the downside, the budget does not fully address

UC's request to make permanent the \$145 million in one-time funding from the 2018-19 budget; it includes three separate line items for UCOP (\$215 million); ANR (\$72 million); and UC Path (\$52 million); and it does not include UC's request for \$15 million in funding for AB 94 debt service. (AB 94 is legislation that shifted to UC's base budget State-funded debt service for capital improvement projects and that allows UC to use a portion of its general fund appropriation for debt service and other expenditures for certain State-approved projects.) Between now and the release of the May budget revision, UC will be working with the State to convert the remaining \$95 million to permanent funds, and to direct an additional amount to past enrollment funding shortfalls and new enrollment growth.

The University has not received General Obligation Bond financing since 2006. However, Senator Glazer and Assemblymember Medina are sponsoring a bill to place an \$8 billion measure on the 2020 ballot. The proceeds would be split equally between UC and CSU to fund deferred maintenance and seismic safety needs. The University's most recent [Capital Financial Plan](#) identified \$37 billion worth of total capital needs on the campuses through 2023-24, including almost \$9 billion in needs alone for state-eligible facilities, of which nearly \$5 billion relate to deferred maintenance. UC has established a new Seismic Advisory Board to advise UC on safety deficiencies based on updated code requirements and risk assessments. UC will prioritize funding using an allocation formula based on building age, size, occupancy, utilization, and other factors.

- UCPB members observed the unprecedented gap between the health of the State economy and the size of the UC budget, noting that UC will need to fundamentally reframe its position with the state to stop treading water. This will require UC to speak more honestly about how budget cuts are affecting quality and to show evidence of the decline. UC should not suggest that it can get by with less State funding.
- CFO Brostrom agreed that a fundamental disconnect exists, and noted that the State is more interested in funding CA undergraduate enrollment than graduate education and research. UC also faces opposition to non-resident enrollment, as well as to resident and even nonresident tuition increases. Because UC is so large, the State assumes it can solve its own problems. UC has taken steps to reduce its reliance on State funds – for example, through asset optimization strategies, and it needs to continue to diversify its revenue streams.
- UC has released data showing evidence of a decline in the student experience over the past ten years. These include declines in the percentage of students who are able to get into their first choice major; who report knowing a professor well enough to ask for a letter of recommendation; and who say they would still enroll at UC.

A new [analysis](#) of the Governor's proposed budget from the Legislative Analyst's Office recognizes UC's healthcare and benefits cost drivers, endorses the Governor's proposal to fund collective bargaining agreements, and acknowledges that UC has fewer represented employees than other state agencies. However, it does not offer guidance about how the state should think about UC's non-represented employees, except to encourage data-based assessments of UC's ability to attract and retain high quality faculty and staff. The LAO asserts that UC is competitive in recruiting and retaining faculty and suggests that the comparison group for faculty salaries should not be the Comparison 8, but a broader set of public universities. The LAO also acknowledges that UC has overachieved in terms of CA resident undergraduate growth, and takes a positive view of UC's plans to increase degree attainment and close achievement gaps. It

questions two specific campus proposals for the construction of new lecture halls, noting that the demand could instead be met through online education.

VI. Reviews of Multi-Campus Research Units (MRUs)

- *Andrew Baird, UCORP Chair (Zoom)*
- *Nasrin Rahimieh, UCORP Vice Chair (Zoom)*

UC-HRI: A UCORP-led Review Committee has produced a draft report on the five-year review of the UC Humanities Research Institute (UCHRI) MRU. UCPB's representative to the Review Committee contributed to the budget section of the report prior to his departure from UCPB. UCORP's chair and vice chair joined UCPB to discuss the status of the review. Housed at UC Irvine, UCHRI provides about \$1 million in annual competitive grant funding to faculty and graduate students on all ten UC campuses in support of collaborative multi-campus humanities research projects. UCHRI received multi-year funding awards from UCOP MRPI competitions in 2009, 2014, and 2018. In 2017, it received a \$10 million challenge gift from the Mellon Foundation to support a total \$30 million endowment raised over the next 4 years.

UCORP Vice Chair Rahimieh noted that the Review Committee posed several questions to UCHRI, including those about the budget submitted by UCPB's representative, and about the systemwide character of UCHRI's grant awards and decision-making. The Committee was satisfied that no campus is being excluded from collaborative projects or funding opportunities; in fact, it found evidence of an impressive level of systemwide involvement. In addition, UCHRI has maximized its MRU status, which has carried significant resonance with Mellon and other foundations. The draft report recommends 1) renewing UCHRI as an MRU for another five years; 2) extending the duration of the competitive funding it receives to longer than two years; and 3) involving development support from UCOP in the \$20 million fundraising effort. She invited UCPB to comment on the review. UCORP Chair Baird added that UCORP is considering the extent to which MRUs are able to leverage funding from UCOP into a self-sustaining model. UCORP also believes that UC should take a comprehensive look at the organizational structure and funding mechanisms for its MRUs and the four UC Institutes.

- A UCPB member noted that the University should consider moving UCHRI off of the MRU cycle and converting it into a permanent part of UCOP research infrastructure. Doing so would be a strong signal of the University's commitment to its 1,700 arts and humanities faculty, given that they receive less than 1% of total federal funding and depend very heavily on institutional funds. In addition, it was noted that UCHRI has been forced to focus energies on securing funding from external sources, which could distract it from its mandate to support humanities research on the campuses and limit funding to humanities research as framed by these external sources.

INPAC: Professor Constable is UCPB's representative to the UCORP Review Committee for the five-year review of the Institute for Nuclear & Particle Astrophysics & Cosmology. He noted that INPAC was founded in 1995 and fosters collaboration among faculty, researchers, and graduate students on nine UC campuses and the three national labs. Over the years, it has supported the production of many successful multi-campus research projects and collaborations. However, there has been no UCOP or campus funding of INPAC since 2015. The MRU has not met since 2016, and it lacks a clear strategic plan for moving forward independent of UCOP financial support. The Review Committee will recommend that INPAC sponsor an all-hands

meeting to consider whether and how to continue the MRU in the current financial circumstances. Although the research it touches is important, INPAC needs to make a stronger case for its continued MRU status.

TF-ANR: UCORP Chair Baird invited UCPB's leadership to participate in UCORP's meeting with the ANR Vice President on March 11. It was agreed that UCPB and UCORP would continue to discuss a proposed joint task force on ANR.

VII. Self-Supporting Programs Survey

CCGA has revised UCPB's proposed list of questions concerning SSGPDPs that will be sent to campuses as part of a CCGA-UCPB-UCAP survey. The questions cover issues such as the status of the programs; their impact on educational goals, budgets, and faculty evaluation; local practices for reviewing the programs; and their performance and success. CCGA will lead the effort to distribute and collect the data. UCPB members also reviewed a survey concerning UC Irvine SSGPDPs developed by a task force on that campus. Members were asked to cross-check the questions on that survey against the CCGA-UCPB-UCAP survey.

VIII. Campus Reports

Chair Steintrager asked UCPB members to complete a survey detailing their campus CPB's structure, operation, resources, leadership compensation, and involvement in shared governance. The information will be available as a resource to local committees to help them make a case for more vigorous engagement based on systemwide best practices.

UCPB members recommended that UCPB consider best practices and strategies for increasing the involvement of local Senates, particularly CPBs, in the University's multi-year planning process. It was noted that some campuses are asking chairs and/or members to make multi-year service commitments to help maintain continuity and institutional knowledge.

It was noted that campuses are struggling with overcrowding after years of unfunded enrollment growth. Undergraduates unable to get into their major of choice are increasingly demoralized. Meanwhile, graduate enrollment growth has remained flat, putting additional pressure on TAs and ladder-rank faculty. The severity of the problem is growing. It was noted that the UCSC CPB is leading a study of impaction and hopes to consult with other campuses about best practices.

IX. Publisher Negotiations and Open Access (With the UC Publisher Negotiating Team)

- *Richard Schneider, UCOLASC Chair*
- *Ivy Anderson, Director, Collections, California Digital Library*
- *Günter Waibel, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, CDL*
- *Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, University Librarian, UC Berkeley*
- *Mathew Willmott, Scholarly Publishing Data Analyst, CDL*

Open Access Transition: In its negotiations with scholarly journal publishers, the University's overarching goals are to reduce costs and transition UC from a subscription-based model to an open access (OA) model. Costs related to the subscription-based model are escalating and

unsustainable. UC spends about \$40 million on journal subscription licenses systemwide. Commercial publishers also promote “hybrid” journals in which authors pay an article publishing charge (APC) to publish OA articles on top of the subscription fees already paid. In 2017 UC’s APC payments for both hybrid and full OA publishing totaled about \$10 million (compared to \$7 million in 2016). UC seeks to eliminate this double-dipping and create a more rational, cost-controlled economic environment.

Pay It Forward: In negotiations with Elsevier, UC was seeking as a transitional move to a fully OA environment an integrated agreement that combines subscription charges and APC payments. This position was based in part on UC’s 2016 *Pay It Forward* study that investigated the impact of converting scholarly communications to an entirely APC business model. The study examined the APC level various research universities could afford based on their current subscription spend. It found that APCs are affordable for large research institutions if grant funds are applied, based on the current average APC charge of \$1,892 for publication in full OA journals. Following that study, CDL examined the impact on federal funding agencies of using grant funding for publication charges, and concluded that APCs would amount to about 1% of total federal research grant funding, based on an average APC of \$2,215. The Pay It Forward findings also suggested that under ideal conditions, competition in an OA environment will lower cost of scholarly communications over time if authors are the ones who make decisions about how their grant funds are used.

Proposed OA Model: The research led UC to settle on a preferred medium-term sustainability strategy – a multi-payer “publish and read” model agreement that moves all UC-authored articles to an OA model, with fees divided between authors and UC libraries. The model is structured around a Reading Fee that support subscription access, and a capped OA publication fee based on negotiated APCs and estimated publication volume. Under the model, the library will negotiate a single contract for all subscription and publishing activities, and use subscription savings to pay for the first \$1,000 of author APCs. For authors without grant funding or other resources, the libraries will cover 100% of APCs. UC’s negotiated discount for APCs will lower the cost to publish OA, and APCs will also be lower or free for UC authors because of library contributions. The total annual OA fee would be subject to a minimum and maximum. UC will not tell authors where to publish and authors may opt out of OA for any given article.

Next Steps: UC has paused its negotiations with Elsevier, but the door is still open to additional negotiations if Elsevier is willing to meet UC’s goals. UC is using different approaches with large commercial publishers, medium non-profit publishers, and small society publishers. The CDL continues to collect and analyze data as it models potential agreements, weighs risks, and considers new models that meet the University’s goals and also continue to support innovation.

- UCPB members thanked the negotiating team for their efforts on behalf of the University. It was noted that the transition to the Publish and Read model could entail challenges for some faculty, particularly questions of access for those in the social sciences and humanities.

X. Systemwide Senate Review Items for Optional Comment

- *Proposed UC Transfer Admission Guarantee*

Action: UCPB will not opine.

XI. Compendium Reviews

1. Reports on Proposed SSGPDPs from Lead UCPB Reviewers

a) UCSF Master of Science Degree in Genetic Counseling

Lead reviewer Professor Stanton noted that the two-year, full-time program in genetic counseling anticipates enrolling 11 students annually beginning in 2020, with initial tuition set at \$44,000; and net revenues of \$73,000 beginning in year two, with a break even by year four. Issues identified included 1) the lack of a clear accounting of indirect costs (IDC) to the campus for facilities usage; and 2) the lack a scholarship or financial aid plan, which are especially concerning given the small anticipated profits. In addition, the Program will rely heavily on non-Senate instructional faculty and alludes to a plan to help these instructors attain faculty status at UCSF, but provides no information about how this conversion would be accomplished.

Action: UCPB will send comments to CCGA.

2. New Proposed SSGPDPs

b) UC Irvine Master of Data Science

Action: Professor Trounstine will lead the review.

c) UCSF Supplemental Studies in Advance Practice in Nursing Certificate

Action: Professor Schumm will lead the review.

3. UCSD School of Public Health Full Proposal

Action: Professor Gross and Professor Bhargava will review.

4. UCSD Seventh College Full Proposal

Action: All UCPB members were invited to review the proposal prior to the April meeting.

5. Fully Online Degree in Business Administration at UC Irvine

Action: All UCPB members were invited to review the proposal prior to the April meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: James Steintrager, UCPB Chair