

**Minutes of Videoconference Meeting**

March 7, 2023

Donald Senear (Chair), Marc Steurer (Vice Chair), Eva Nogales (Alternate, Berkeley), Heather Rose (Davis), Alyssa Brewer (Irvine), Andrew Leuchter (Los Angeles), Carolyn Dicey Jennings (Alternate, Merced), Peter Atkinson (Riverside), Michael Provence (San Diego), Jill Hollenbach (San Francisco), James Rawlings (Santa Barbara), Dard Neuman (Santa Cruz), Susan Cochran (Chair, Academic Council), James Steintrager (Vice Chair, Academic Council), Seija Virtanen (Associate Director, State Budget Relations), David Alcocer (Budget Director), Nathan Brostrom (CFO), Amy Lee (Associate Vice Provost Academic Personnel and Programs), Aviva Roller (Academic Labor and Employee Relations Director)

**I. Consent Calendar**

UCPB approved the February 7, 2023 minutes and March 7, 2023 agenda

**II. Chair's Announcements**

- UCPB discussed possible in-person meeting dates and will conduct a decision poll.
- Vice Chair Steurer recapped the goals of the UC Health working group: focusing on UC Health decision-making and governance and identifying best options for faculty participation. The group hopes to have a preliminary report by April, with a final version ready in May for VP Byington's visit to UCPB.
- Council discussed and approved the self-supporting Master's degree programs reviewed by UCPB.
- President Drake and Provost Newman spent time at Council discussing the slow process of negotiating the details of the recent labor settlements. The most complex portion of the agreement concerns GSRs. Appointment percentages and top-ups are complicating factors. Funding gaps are unlikely to be covered through systemwide financing.
- CFO Brostrom discussed housing construction options at Council. The University has constructed 34,000 beds in the last twelve years, with additional beds becoming available this year. OP understands now is time to look at graduate and faculty housing. State zero-interest loan program for housing has been put on hold because of the anticipated budget deficit.
- APC met and heard a preliminary report from a subcommittee charged by the Provost to consider undergraduate education in the post-pandemic university. One key recommendation was to create opportunities for all undergraduates to have "experiential learning opportunities." A second subcommittee will be charged to consider the future of graduate education.
- UCPB should ask AVP Alcocer about his plan to include campuses' student enrollment growth plans in distributing rebenching funds.

### III. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- Leadership met with legislators and discussed transfer. The UC has created a transfer guarantee for California residents – if a resident completes the Cal-GETC at a community college and a UC transfer pathway while meeting a grade point average target that can vary by major and campus, they will be admitted to a UC campus. Lawmakers remain unhappy about referral in which students are directed to a less crowded campus. The CSU also admits students to the system rather than specific campuses. The UC argues that since the legislature allows this for the CSUs, it should do so for the UC.
- There is growing pressure within the UC for campuses to offer remote instruction for summer session. Some chancellors want to expand remote instruction as well as create a fourth quarter. A new workgroup, planned to focus on post-pandemic faculty priorities, has expanded to include the consequences of the graduate student strike. It will be chaired by the Davis divisional chair and VP Haynes. The Senate will hear from the group in the spring.
- A post-strike workgroup at UCOP will discuss the University's handling of the strike. Senate leadership's request to be included in any workgroup has not been accommodated. Discussions between the administration and senate regarding educational choices now includes the UAW, often with union input before faculty input. The consequences are procedural as well as financial. Guidance for grant reporting for faculty has been issued; the legislature does not want the UC to reduce the number of graduate student employees yet has no plans to allocate more funding to pay for increased labor costs.
  - A committee member wondered if transfer students had a higher level of financial need. This has not been found in UC transfers. Transferring is often a logical method to lower college costs as well as increase admission odds. Most transfer students go to California State Universities, and optimizing transfers for UC doesn't serve the bulk of the students. Legislators are looking for guarantees that we don't offer.
  - The new provost also seems to be supporting the idea of viewing summer as a fourth quarter; committee members wondered if the faculty would then be expanded to meet the growing need. Leadership is confident that faculty will not accept increasing uncompensated work.

### IV. Campus Bridge Fund Efforts for Grant-funded Faculty

Berkeley has \$5M from central funds, given to those who have no other resources to cover their lab costs. Details of distribution aren't clear; it will not be sufficient to cover shortfalls.

Davis faces a \$12-14M shortfall for GSR/Postdocs from Spring 2023 through Spring 2024. The campus plans to use a shared responsibility model in which the PI pays \$2500, the school provides \$2500, and the campus provides the balance. The campus will cover the cost of TAs through spring and will keep the ratio the same from the spring of 2023 to spring 2024 (costing the campus about \$10M). The administration has stressed that this funding is not available after this year.

Irvine is still developing a plan to help mitigate shortfalls in research-related graduate student work. A small amount of money from central funds may be available, but it is not yet clear how these funds will be disbursed. Faculty likely will also need to use discretionary funds to cover the remaining differences in funding.

At San Diego, faculty are experiencing anxiety about the process and equity in fund distribution. There has been no specific information for the mechanism of funds distribution or administration. Current understanding is that a PI will go first to their chair, then dean, then higher in administration to request funds. A pool of funds is expected to exist at each step. The campus is holding \$10M in reserves to backstop these requests. The EVC may participate if there are disagreements about funding.

At Los Angeles, funding is only available to help faculty for the current year; no decision has been made about any future funding help. Discussion has turned to unused reserves at various levels.

Merced has offered a guarantee for bridge funding to untenured faculty.

Riverside has a \$1M central fund to help after departments exhaust their unrestricted funds. This plan has caused an uproar on campus. Chairs have considered refusing to move those funds and find the direction to exhaust all carry-forward funds implausible.

At UCSF, faculty will get a one-time payment of \$12000 per postdoc for up to three post docs and \$2400 per graduate student. This will likely be a one-time payment. The campus has a longstanding bridge funding program in SOM, need based and is being presented as another way to make faculty whole. Future years' plans are yet undetermined.

Santa Cruz administration is waiting for more information from central Office of the President administration.

## **V. Budget Consultation with UCOP**

Associate Director Virtanen noted that delayed tax receipts are negatively affecting state budgeting. A \$23B previously projected budget shortfall has been revised upward by the LAO to \$28B. The UC is one of very few agencies slated to receive an increase. The 5% increase in base funding per-compact is now threatened if state revenues decline further. If the governor declares a fiscal emergency, reserves can be used to provide the 5%, if not, the University is likely to face cuts.

Associate Vice President Alcocer noted that if the University is unable to meet target goals agreed to in the compact such as enrollment numbers, other aspects of the agreement may be in danger. There was general acknowledgement that previous state budget crises resulted in the early termination of past funding agreements between the State and the University. Recent enrollment planning has been done on a rolling basis reflecting campus aspirations to reach their stated 2030 goals. The Budget Office has asked campuses to provide enrollment plans, broken out by the student categories most useful for rebenching planning. Hopefully the planned enrollment growth will be matched by the planned increase in state funding. If this is repeated frequently, rates of student growth should match a stable and predictable funding plan for the University.

- A committee member asked how to assure educational quality in a time of increasing enrollment pressure and decreasing funding. AVP Alcocer noted that legislators focus on admission rates rather than graduation gaps, persistence gaps, or other indicators that quality may be dropping. Administration hopes to convey that concern for students cannot end once

they are admitted but must continue through their educational experience. The 2030 Plan focuses on more than student numbers. This is one reason the LCFF+ school students would have a greater weight in rebenching.

- In response to a question, Associate Director Virtanen confirmed that every funding compact between the University and the legislature has ended prior to the agreed-on time.
- AVP Alcocer confirmed that set-asides comprise roughly 35 percent of the state allocation to the UC, with some of that set aside for debt service for systemwide projects.
- AVP Alcocer outlined a plan under consideration to empanel a set-aside review commission that would evaluate and categorize each set aside for either sustaining, with or without cost adjustment, phasing out, or including in a presidential block allocation. Principles for evaluation would include value to the instructional and research missions of the university, systemwide significance, and access to other sources of revenue. The plan envisions charging a commission this spring to generate a package of recommendations to be accepted or rejected as a whole. The Senate would be represented on this commission.

## **VI. Consultation with OP Costing of Graduate Contracts**

Associate Vice Provost Lee and Director Roller provided an updated estimate of the new contracts for ASEs and GSRs and discussed the top-up issue. Since then, the guidance they provided have been captured in a set of FAQs that are posted here: [https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/\\_files/faq-implementation-ase-gsr-collective-bargaining-agreements.pdf](https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/faq-implementation-ase-gsr-collective-bargaining-agreements.pdf).

## **VII. Proposed Self-Supporting Degrees for Review:**

1. UC Berkeley Master of Climate Solutions self-supporting Master's degree. UCPB reviewed this program last year and had a list of concerns. The program intends to attract mid-career professionals with an interest in the business side of climate change mitigation. Because a variety of backgrounds are targeted, a two-week boot camp will assure parity of preparation. A capstone project has been extended to now require both semesters to complete. There are three tracks or areas of study. An emphasis on management and policy, rather than engineering or other sciences, indicates the program's focus for career objectives. Return to aid has been increased from the original proposal. The program plans to rent space adjacent to campus as their proposed building will be undergoing seismic retrofitting. Eight ladder-rank faculty would each teach one MCS course in place of one state-supported course, with program-supported lecturers substituting in the state-supported courses. One additional faculty member will serve as the FEA for the program, focusing on DEI issues and topics. Return to aid is planned to be between 10-15 percent.

- Discussion included concerns that market analysis of career options and salary increases may not justify the \$69k cost of the degree. UCPB agrees that climate change is a growing area of interest for employers but retained some skepticism about the return on investment. Certificate programs in the same field cost approximately \$20k and may serve a similar purpose for career progression.
- The program budget does not explicitly account for repayment of the loan from the Rausser College Dean's discretionary fund, although the proposal indicates that repayment from revenue is intended.

- UCPB is concerned that the capstone project will be taught by lecturers, rather than ladder-rank faculty.

2. UC Davis Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development is a one-year program focused on recently graduated STEM students. The program is expected to substitute for roughly five years of industry experience, and provides a different pathway to the private sector than currently existing Master's programs. The Department of Bioengineering will oversee the program. Initial enrollment is planned to be 15 students growing to a steady state capped at 40, based on the department's capacity for the teaching-heavy capstone project. The reviewer noted that the rationale for numbers such as tuition and expected increase in compensation for graduates are presented without clear justification or explanation of how obtained. The proposal does not indicate the proportion of resident to non-resident enrollment. Only five percent of revenue is set aside for financial aid. In lieu of more generous aid the program suggests that students avail themselves of federal student loans. A loan from the College of Engineering is mentioned without an indication of how or when it will be repaid. The indirect costs match off-campus costs because the program is housed at Aggie Square in Sacramento, as well as new maker spaces. While courses new to the program are open to state-supported students, the off-campus location may limit uptake. The Davis library recommended against the program and the CPB said yes with reservations. UCPB agreed that this seems like a desirable program and interesting to students but the lack of detail challenges evaluation of the probable level of success of the program and claims for financial returns for students. Financial claims for the program's budget and return appear to be based on hopes for its success, rather than detailed analysis. UCPB would like to see the proposal with a greater level of budgetary detail.

**Action:** UCPB will recommend to CCGA that the UC Berkeley Master of Climate Solutions self-supporting program receive approval and that the UC Davis Master of Engineering in Medical Device Development proposal be revised and resubmitted to UCPB for analysis.

## **VIII. Divisional Planning Committees and Campus Budgeting**

UCPB members shared their divisions' methods for CPB involvement in budgeting and planning.

## **IX. Strategies for UCPB Representation to Set-Aside Commission**

Chair Senear suggested that UCPB find ways to influence the group planned to address the future of set-asides. Members encouraged the committee to indicate to the OP Budget staff that they would like to participate. Should the committee be able to create a report for the commission to use, it would be a method for influencing the direction systemwide budget decisions take. UCPB agreed to explore ways to influence this effort.

## **X. New/Unfinished Business**

UCPB wants to investigate the roles of campus CPBs, based on the information provided by members. UC Davis appears to have the most integration of the CPB in planning and budgeting for the campus, with Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz the next most involved campuses. The rest of the divisions have partial engagement with the CPBs and administration.

UCPB would like to investigate how to have more campuses experience the same high level of CPB integration as Davis. Professor Brewer offered to begin a document presenting best practices for campuses based on the information provided previously by other committee members. The committee noted that best practices come from good preparation and good questions. Consultation can be challenging on campuses, so committees need to work to lay groundwork before decisions are made.

Prepared by Stefani Leto, Analyst  
Attest, Donald Senear, Chair  
The meeting ended at 4:00 p.m.