

University of California Academic Senate
University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB)
Minutes of Teleconference Meeting
April 6, 2010

I. Announcements and Updates

- o *Peter Krapp, UCPB chair*

CITRIS Academic Review Protocol

UCPB reviewed the draft protocol for the pending five-year academic review of the Center for Information Technology in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), one of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal-ISI). The materials include a suggested external review panel roster, a draft charge for the panel's quantitative and qualitative assessment of CITRIS' progress, and draft Guidance for the CITRIS directors conducting the internal review. Chair Krapp asked for volunteers to lead UCPB's review of both the protocol and the final academic review in the fall.

Action: Jean-Bernard Minster and John Ellwood volunteered to be lead reviewers.

Joint Subcommittee on the Faculty Salary Scales

The UCPB/UCAP/UCFW salary scales subcommittee received updated "Comparison 8" salary data that point to an increasing gap in UC faculty salary competitiveness, projections about how different market adjustments to the salary scales would impact the percentage of faculty on-scale, and the costs associated with those adjustments.

Institutional Research Follow-Up Request

The Office of Institutional Research responded to UCPB's follow-up request for data and analyses on academic and non-academic FTE and salary growth. IR agreed to provide, in June, disaggregated academic employee data; a breakout of total salaries and FTE for ladder-rank faculty and lecturers; and salary and FTE data to distinguish SMG, MSP and PSS administrators working in academic departments. IR also noted that they would be unable to support UCPB's request for campus-level data or data comparing the growth of non-academics and academics over time proportional to a per-student and per-faculty member ratio.

Discussion: The appropriate role of IR is to coordinate the collection and collation of campus level data. Each campus has an office of institutional research, where these data should be held. It was suggested that UCPB take on the project itself, although it will be difficult if the data arrives in different forms from different campuses. It was also suggested that a group of campus faculty and graduate students undertake an independent research project to examine the issue. It is important for the data to be meaningful at a campus level.

Action: UCPB will write a letter requesting increased cooperation between campus IR offices and UCOP IR, asking campuses to share a defined set of data about staffing levels since 1998 .

Other Announcements:

David Lopez reported that a number of retirees concerned about their health benefits attended the Post Employment Benefits briefing meeting at UCLA. The presentation was consistent with the one UCPB and Council saw at the budget retreat. He also noted that the Education Abroad Program director search has begun, but there has been no involvement of the governing

committee, which has no plans to meet in the near future. UCPB will request clarification about the relation between the EAP governing committee and the search committee.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the March 2, 2010 UCPB Minutes

Action: UCPB approved the March minutes.

III. Budget Retreat Follow-up

On March 31, members of UCPB, the Academic Council, and the administration met in Oakland for a budget retreat hosted by the Provost. The intent was to arrive at a consensus about the budget options on the table and how to manage the crisis. There were presentations from the Budget Office about funding streams, from External Finance about UC's debt programs, and from Human Resources about future Post Employment Benefits scenarios. Chair Krapp introduced UCPB's Choices Report, and the UCFW chair presented UCFW's views on PEB alternatives. The Provost wants to continue the discussion in a series of regular follow-up teleconference meetings. He also noted that differential campus fees are off the table, at least for the near future.

Discussion: The lack of new ideas presented at the retreat is disappointing, but it is clear that UCOP is looking to UCPB and the Senate for creative ideas that can make a difference. Differential campus fees could have unintended consequences. It could be a slippery slope that will encourage administrators to base other decisions on revenue potential—an approach that could trickle down to the classroom level and set unit against unit.

The budget retreat served as another reminder that not all UC leaders fully understand and recognize how the least expensive disciplines with the highest enrollments (i.e. Social Sciences and Humanities) contribute very significantly to each campus budget from student fees and general fund revenues; these funds become available for central priorities, and for cross-subsidy of any areas that do not cover their expenditures either through enrollment-based revenues or through contracts and grants. Inversely, UCOP should have more courage to suspend the pursuit of expanding yet more unfunded mandates from the State, particularly in areas with low student-faculty ratios and high expenditures, for example Nursing.

As long as budgeted enrollments are shrinking, UC should mothball any new building plans, at least until revenues have demonstrably recovered. Even if capital construction funds are from a different source, filling new buildings with activity draws considerably on General Funds, whether by way of utilities and laboratory set-up costs, or by way of salaries and benefits,

The Senate should push back on proposals to change the future accrual of pension benefits for current employees, as such a move could spur an exodus of faculty and staff. The Senate should encourage decision-makers to focus on the fundamental goal of preserving UC excellence rather than focusing only on cost savings. The Senate should be concerned about the compressed review timeline for the PEB review, and the possibility that major decisions will be made while the faculty are away for the summer.

Senate Vice Chair Simmons invited UCPB to compile a list of specific budget priorities. Chair Krapp noted that the Senate has a duty to argue against bad cuts and for good cuts. He asked campus representatives to identify specific areas on their own campuses that are either losing money or that lack adequate support from the state or other funding sources and thus strain campus resources. It was noted that many long-term ideas will not help immediate budgets, but both are worth considering.

Action: Members will circulate a list of suggested stop loss candidates within two weeks.

IV. Initial Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future

The first set of Commission on the Future recommendations has been released for Senate review.

Members noted that not all of the Commission's recommendations are likely have significant potential budgetary impact; it will be difficult to use them to construct a new business model for UC. Some working groups have announced that they plan to release some of their more substantial and/or controversial recommendations in June. That review timeline is bad for the Senate. The Senate should push to have some resolution of the recommendations by summer.

The Funding Strategies work group will not present a second set of recommendations in June; however, there are other working groups impaneled by the Provost, outside the Gould Commission structure, and they are expected to make recommendations on post-employment benefits, and on alternate compensation, to the Gould Commission in June.

The Choices Report addresses some of the recommendations that have come forward by now. UCPB should focus on issues that are related to the committee's mandate; in some cases, it will suffice for the review to point to arguments made in the report. The committee discussed each recommendation briefly. Several members volunteered to contribute draft paragraphs about specific recommendations.

Action: Analyst LaBriola will compile and circulate feedback.

V. DANR Review Metrics

The Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) was the subject of an academic review in 2008, its first in many years, which the Senate found to be lacking in several areas. The Academic Council asked UCORP and UCPB to develop a series of guidelines and queries that would help DANR think critically about its new strategic vision and generate more pointed and concrete analyses in the future. That UCPB-UCORP work group has produced a draft memo recommending topics and metrics to address topics such as organizational structure and program changes. The letter is not intended to be critical of DANR itself, only to make the review process more effective.

Action: UCPB approved the memo.

VI. UC Accountability Report

Vice Chair Evan Heit is UCPB's representative on the joint Senate-Administration Advisory Group discussing which indicators to include in the 2010 UC Accountability Report. He said overall, the effort to develop meaningful indicators has been positive, but there are still a few concerns. Two major issues were discussed in detail:

First, the report mischaracterizes the decline in ladder-rank faculty numbers as a proportion of student numbers by lumping lecturers, instructors, and ladder rank faculty together in total faculty numbers, and by characterizing the proportional decline as slight, when in fact, it is a profound change to the nature of UC.

Second, the report uses the number of publications by discipline as a metric of productivity, which makes it appear that the humanities and social sciences are unproductive relative to the sciences. (The report also incorrectly suggests that this difference is due to the sciences getting more grant funding.) In fact, some disciplines favor shorter, multi-authored publications, and others longer, sole-authored publications. In addition, grant money for some scientific research may well be higher, but that is simply because it pays for much more costly research. UCPB agreed it is important to convey accurate information, and the misconceptions at UCOP are troubling. It was suggested that UCPB join with other Senate committees to address the misconceptions more systematically.

Action: Chair Krapp will draft a memo responding to these two foremost specific concerns, asking Senate Chair Harry Powell to communicate them to Dan Greenstein for immediate consideration in the Accountability Framework process. It was also agreed that UCPB will discuss further steps at the May meeting.

VI. Compendium Task Force Report

The final report of the Compendium Task Force has been released for systemwide review. Chair Krapp asked for volunteer lead reviewers to formulate a response for discussion at the next meeting. Comments are due by May 28.

Action: Jim Chalfant and John Ellwood will be lead reviewers.

VII. Professional School Fee Proposal

The Senate has been asked to review nine professional degree fee proposals for 2011-12 and beyond, two of which are for new academic programs that have not yet been reviewed or approved. The Senate has asked UCPB to address whether it is appropriate or possible to review a fee proposal for a program that has not been approved. Provost Pitts requests that the Senate address three broad policy questions in addition to reviewing the fee proposals:

- (1) What defines a “professional” degree program that distinguishes it from an academic degree program?
- (2) What criteria determine when it is appropriate to charge a professional degree fee?
- (3) What criteria determine whether a program should be self-supporting or state supported?

It was noted that these are pre-proposals and UCPB is not in a position to make a decision about specific fees at this point. Discussion of the broad policy questions should happen first.

Action: David Lopez and Don Senear will draft a response to the three policy questions. Committee Analyst LaBriola will provide any past memos regarding professional fee policy that may be helpful in guiding this discussion at the May meeting of UCPB.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Peter Krapp