

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday March 7, 2006

I. Chair's Announcements *Stan Glantz UCPB Chair**Academic Council and Assembly Activities.*

- There will be a special meeting of the Assembly on March 13 to consider a vote of No Confidence in and removal of the current Senate Chair, along with possible bylaw changes that may be necessary to enact removal of the Chair.
- Main actions of the February 8 Assembly included the initiation of a faculty vote on the Proposed Memorial to the Regents on Non-Resident Tuition; approval of the Compensation Principles (a version of which was endorsed that closely aligned with UCPB's position); and the election of Michael T. Brown (UCSB) as the 2006-07 Academic Senate Vice Chair.
- The Council approved UCPB's letter on private funding of leadership salaries and is sending it out for general Senate review.

Graduate Support Advisory Committee (GSAC). The group has not met since January, and, although a number of funding options have been considered, appears to be deadlocked on what to recommend.

UCPB's letter to the President on the LANL management contract. No response has been received yet. UCORP has reviewed the letter and will be formulating supplementary questions related to research programs / collaborations with LANL.

Consultation with UCOP and Regents on compensation. Chair Glantz participated in a conference call with Senate Vice Chair Oakley, Regent Hopkinson, SVP Darling and UCFW Chair Russell. Chair Glantz urged not adopting a policy without developing consensus on a slotting structure. Opposition was expressed to the idea of broadening the compensation comparison group

Action: UCPB will send a letter to GSAC Chair Attiyeh calling attention to the urgency of the matter and requesting that GSAC resume deliberations and make recommendations that can be implemented beginning in the 2006-07 academic year.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes of the January 10, 2006 meeting were approved with minor changes. The minutes of the February 7, 2006 meeting will be approved at the next UCPB meeting.

III. Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) Draft White Papers- Responding to the Challenges Facing Scholarly Communication - 5 Papers and 1 Proposed Policy

Issue: The white papers address copyright issues, best practices for book and journal publishing, new technology for publishing and presenting scholarly work, and the role of scholarly societies. They are accompanied by a SCSC proposed policy of a default

copyright agreement. The papers and proposal are out for general systemwide review by committees and divisions.

Discussion: A member who also sits on SCSC noted that while recently contracts with journal publishers have been a major concern, the white papers cover a larger scope of scholarly communication issues and that the next effort will address strategy. Members expressed appreciation for the special committee's efforts to educate faculty at large on these issues but focused their discussion on the "Proposal for UC Faculty – Scholarly Work Copyright Rights Policy," which is being proposed as a default position for individual faculty in negotiations with publishers. One member saw the policy as premature; another opposed it altogether. The majority felt the policy would help make a statement of collective strength and agreed on these changes to recommend:

- The term "scholarly work" is too broad; the proposed policy should be restricted to journal articles and conference proceedings.
- The paragraph immediately following the proposed policy should be incorporated into the policy statement itself.
- A policy should be proposed for use at the systemwide level to obviate the need for individual faculty members to negotiate these terms.

Action: Analyst Foust will draft a letter to the Council Chair reflecting the committee's position.

IV. UCPB "Futures Report" (was "Privatization") *Chris Newfield, Henning Bohn, Calvin Moore*

Issue: Draft 1.5 of the report, which is now titled "Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California", and a draft executive summary, were distributed. (See Distribution 1.) The draft executive summary outlines three of the trends discussed in the report and their respective effects:

- 1) Privatization, which would be accompanied by major tuition increases and other shifts in funding structures and expenditures and damage to quality across the system, and would fundamentally alter the nature of the university.
- 2) Maintaining the terms of the Compact, which is not seen as road to recovery, and which relies on replacing public money with private funds in the form of tuition increases and may be harmful to access, diversity, instructional quality and graduate education.
- 3) Restarting from the recent past (2001), which is a better picture than the projected future and would represent an increase in UC's general fund from what it now is.

Subcommittee members presented the report in detail and noted a number of specific suggestions from UCPB members that will be reflected in the next iteration.

Action: Comments from today's discussion will be incorporated in the next draft. Members may send additional comments to the subcommittee members. The next version (2.0) will be sent to Acting Provost Hume and SVP Darling for their comment and to be forwarded to the Long Range Guidance Team. Additional input will be sought from members of the Academic Council.

V. UC Education Abroad Program (EAP) – Budget and Planning Issues, Pat Conrad, Steve Cullenberg, Stan Mendoza

Issue: In its letter of 2/17/06 to Acting Provost Hume, UCPB posed a set of questions regarding EAP for consideration by the Academic Planning Council and Vice President Hershman. The questions were formulated in consultation with the Council of EAP Campus Directors (CoCD) and address funding issues and the integration of EAP with UC's other international activities.

Update:

Acting Provost Hume reported that actions have been taken on UOEAP budgetary issues, but there are still challenges to be addressed. The budget situation of UOEAP was unexpected; and a flexible funding plan has been agreed to that can accommodate short term program needs while a longer term plan is developed. A full review of EAP has been instituted.

UCPB subcommittee members made these points:

- The FTE model for funding EAP offices has to change in view of the administrative costs of short (less than year-long) programs.
- What is done on the campuses is to some degree replicated at the systemwide office.
- The priority for the CoCD is to get answers to questions 1 -3 in UCPB's letter (focusing on the funding formula and how allocations to the systemwide office and the campuses are made).
- UCPB recommendations could include: altering the charge of the EAP review committee to include specific budgetary and planning issues; adding a UCPB member to the review group; and requesting that UCPB vet the report of the review before it is finalized.

Action: Acting Provost Hume will facilitate getting answers to the questions as soon as possible.

Action: Analyst Foust will make another request for responses from the Budget Office and forward materials to the subgroup.

VI. UC Endowment Cost Recovery and Payout, Bradley Barber, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Advancement

Issue: In response to requests from three Chancellors to increase the administration cost recovery rate by 15 basis points, OP has considered the effects of such a change. A recommendation will be made to the Regents at their March meeting to increase the cost recovery rate by 10 basis points and look at the feasibility of recovering more costs while not adversely affecting fund holders or the growth of the fund.

Discussion: AVP Barber explained the reasons for the recommendations and what the various considerations are in meeting the goal of increased cost recovery.

Q and A:

Q: Will donors be displeased about the actual amount needed to cover costs?

A: - It is not unusual for funds to allocate 50 basis points or more for recovered costs.

Q: What are the costs?

A: The costs are not fund-raisers' salaries, but are used for fund-raising administrative costs.

Q: Why do campuses have foundations?

A: Most institutions have a foundation. Within a university system such as UC, however, it's difficult for campuses to do fund-raising. At UC the foundations are vehicles for attracting donors to specific campuses.

Q: What areas are the most endowed?

A: The biggest portion of private funding is for financial aid, then department support and endowed chairs, then research.

Members noted that an increase in cost recovery is a good investment, but also will in the end result in an increase in the payout rate. A concern was raised of having expanded development offices in an economic downturn.

Action: UCPB voted in support of the proposed recommendations to: 1) increase the cost recovery rate by 10 basis points; and 2) conduct a study on the feasibility of recovering more costs while not adversely affecting fund holders or the growth of the fund.

VII. UC Riverside Proposal to Reconstitute the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management (AGSM)

Issue: UCR has submitted a proposal for Senate review that would transfer authority to confer a B.S. in Administration from the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences to the AGSM and re-name AGSM the School of Management.

Discussion: Misgivings were expressed about the reconstitution because of the apparent lack of stability currently at the AGSM. It was noted that the current Dean is an interim appointment and is being filled by someone whose expertise lies elsewhere other than in business administration and management. There was also concern regarding the number of faculty positions being recruited because: 1) this appears to be another indication that the school is in a state of flux; and 2) the associated demand on resources to cover that number of hiring packages. Members agreed that the proposal not be approved, and that the planned reconstitution be carried out in the future only with adequate assurance that the school is in a stable state and has strong leadership, and that the planned faculty hires can be clearly justified.

Action: Analyst Foust will draft a letter outlining the committee's position on the proposed reconstitution of the AGSM.

VIII. 15-Year Review of the UC Committee on Latino Research (UCCLR)

Action: Members Norman Oppenheimer and Malcolm Gordon will take the lead in drafting UCPB comments on the 15-Year Review of the UCCLR, which will be prepared for the committee's consideration at the April 4, 2006 meeting.

Attest:

Stanton Glantz, UCPB Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst

Distributions:

1. Revised Draft UCPB report: “Current Budgetary Trends and the Future of the University of California” and draft executive summary.
2. UCR Proposal for the Reconstitution of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management.
3. Endowment Payout and Cost Recovery, 2006