

**An Academic Senate Perspective on the University of California**

**Prepared for President-Designate Janet Napolitano**

**Robert Powell, Chair  
William Jacob, Vice Chair and Chair-Elect  
Mary Gilly, Vice Chair-Elect  
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director**

**August 14, 2013**

## Contents

<b>SHARED GOVERNANCE</b>	<b>3</b>
Authority	3
Structure	4
Processes	4
Regents	5
<b>1. ONE UNIVERSITY – TEN CAMPUSES</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. Budget Reforms	7
1.2. University of California Retirement Program	10
1.3. Post-Tenure Review and Faculty Salary Scales	12
<b>2. EDUCATIONAL QUALITY</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1. Top Notch Faculty Drive Quality	14
2.2. Course and Program Quality	14
2.3. Metrics for Monitoring Quality	15
2.4. Online Education	16
<b>3. GRADUATE EDUCATION</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1. Importance of Research and Graduate Education	18
3.2. Graduate Student Support	18
3.3. Self-Supporting Programs and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition	20
<b>4. UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1. Evolution of UC Freshman Admission Model	22
4.2. Non-Resident Admission	23
4.3. The Referral Pool and Enrollment Management	23
4.4. Transfer Admission	23
4.5. Financial Aid	24
<b>5. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE WORK</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1. Faculty	25
5.2. Infrastructure and Extramural Support	26
5.3. Open Access Publishing of Scholarly Works	27
<b>6. SERVICE</b>	<b>28</b>
6.1. Health Care	28
6.2. K-14	29
6.3. National Laboratories	29
6.4. Agriculture and Natural Resources	30
<b>7. SUSTAINING FACULTY EXCELLENCE</b>	<b>30</b>
7.1. Total Remuneration	30
7.2. Post Tenure Review and Compensation	31
7.3. Faculty Diversity	32

## SHARED GOVERNANCE<sup>1</sup>

This document provides an introduction to the Academic Senate<sup>2</sup> of the University of California and summarizes selected issues that are the focus of current concerns. These issues include some where there is consensus and collaboration across the University and others that require ongoing engagement to find a consensus and resolution. Some issues are internal to UC, while others involve the way UC interacts with-and is seen by-the public and our elected representatives. In developing these topics, we have attempted to assess the landscape of the past five years and provide a balanced and fair view. We also provide links to background documents that describe official Senate positions and explain the reasoning underlying those positions. The ordering of these sections reflects a rough prioritization of the overall themes, but each section addresses issues of very high priority regardless its placement in the sequence.

### Authority

The Academic Senate occupies a unique position in shared governance, derived from the Organic Act of 1868 that founded the University and codified in 1920 in the Standing Orders of the Regents. Standing Order 105.2 spells out the "duties, powers and privileges" of the Academic Senate, which is comprised of over 8000 ladder-rank faculty of the University of California.<sup>3,4</sup> The President of the University is the President of the Academic Senate, but the Senate addresses the President through the Chair of the Assembly who is also the Chair of the Academic Council.

The Senate has plenary authority over courses and curricula, along with delegated authority, *"subject to the approval of the Regents, to determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees, other than honorary degrees."* It is also charged with evaluating the academic progress of each student in order to recommend candidates for degrees. On budget issues, the Senate's an expressly delegated advisory role. Standing order 105.2(d) authorizes the Senate *"to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget and to select a committee or committees to advise the President concerning the University budget."* The Senate is empowered to determine its own membership and organize its own governmental bodies and processes. The Senate is expressly authorized to advise the Regents through the President, using the formal instrument of a Memorial, which must be submitted to the entire Senate membership for a vote and which the President is obligated to transmit.<sup>5</sup>

The Senate's enumerated powers are the means by which it exercises its overarching

---

<sup>1</sup> See Simmons' [Shared Governance in the University of California: An Overview](#).

<sup>2</sup> The Senate is responsible for defining its membership, which is conferred according to employment title. See Regents [Standing Order 105.1](#).

<sup>3</sup> All ladder-rank faculty in the University of California are members of the Academic Senate, as are academic appointees in additional titles specified in Standing Order 105.1. Other academic titles do not confer Senate membership, and the number of individuals in these titles has increased, particularly as the University's medical centers have grown.

<sup>4</sup> The Academic Senate is cited in Article IX of the California State Constitution.

<sup>5</sup> The Senate last passed a Memorial (See [Senate Bylaw 90](#)) in 2012 asking the Regents to take a formal position [in support of ballot measures and legislation to increase state revenues](#) and prioritize funding for public higher education. This vote occurred in early 2012 and preceded efforts by all other segments of UC to show support for ballot measures that focused on higher education. In 2006, the Senate passed a Memorial regarding [nonresident tuition for graduate students](#).

responsibility to ensure that the academic mission of the University is realized according to the highest academic standards. The Senate carries out this responsibility through direct oversight of academic programs, including approval of new programs, periodic review of existing programs, advising the Chancellors on the selection and promotion of Senate faculty, establishing the standards for admission to the University and evaluating individual students to determine if they have met the requirements for a degree. The Senate exercises other powers indirectly via its advisory role on the budget, which reflects the priorities of the University and is integrally tied to the academic matters for which the Senate is responsible.

### **Structure**

The Senate is a representative body organized in ten Divisions, one on each UC campus. Each Division speaks through a representative assembly or a committee of the whole with a chair elected by the members of the Division. At the systemwide level, the Divisions are represented by a 60-member Assembly, whose members include the chairs of each Division, additional elected representatives of the Divisions, and the chairs of specified committees. Seventeen standing committees of the Assembly are charged with developing Senate positions on specific topics; the chairs of eight of these committees are also members of the Assembly. The Academic Council, comprised of the ten Division chairs and the chairs of same eight standing committees, serves as the executive committee of the Assembly and is the primary body through which the Academic Senate advises the President on systemwide issues. The Academic Council meets monthly; the Assembly meets one to three times a year. The chair and vice chair of the Assembly, who are also the chair and vice chair of the Academic Council, serve at large and may not be from the same Division. Each year the Assembly elects a vice chair for the following year who is expected to become chair in the second year of his or her service. The Academic Council nominates a candidate to stand for election.

Senate structures and procedures are governed by the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Academic programs, including admission of students, the structure of the curriculum, degree and scholarship requirements and course credit are governed by Regulations. Only the Assembly has the power to enact legislation that amends the Bylaws or Regulations.

The committee structure of the systemwide Senate is largely replicated in the Divisions. Divisional committees deal with their respective jurisdictional issues at the local level and are represented in the corresponding systemwide committee. Some committees work primarily at the Division level. For example, Division committees on Academic Personnel review individual faculty for appointments and committees on Privilege and Tenure adjudicate individual grievance and discipline cases. The corresponding systemwide committees participate in developing broad policies but do not review individual cases. For other committees, the primary work is at the systemwide level, where local perspectives are synthesized to shape positions on systemwide issues. For example, our University Committee on Faculty Welfare addresses retirement, salary and health care policies developed and implemented at the systemwide level.

### **Processes**

In order to ensure that it reflects the views of its constituencies, the Senate usually issues opinions on significant issues only after a systemwide review, in which every committee and every Division has had an opportunity to deliberate and render an opinion. The Academic Council synthesizes the views expressed by the standing committees and the Divisions in letters that it delivers to the President or other relevant administrators. Systemwide review typically requires

90 days to complete. Taking the time for a thoughtful, deliberative process usually results in improved policies and broader support<sup>6</sup>. Some matters require formal action by the Assembly.

**Administrators often cite Academic Senate processes as unreasonably slow. In working with the administration and the campuses we are sometimes able to streamline review processes. However, we find that on most questions taking the time for a full review may uncover potential problems before they impede a project, obtains broader understanding and buy-in, and ultimately facilitates progress. This is an area that requires continuous attention from both the Senate and the administration.**

Senior systemwide and campus administrators serve as consultants respectively to systemwide and Divisional Senate committees and regularly attend committee meetings. The President, Provost and Executive Vice President for Business Operations usually attend the monthly meetings of the Academic Council. Close collaboration between systemwide and Divisional Senate leaders and the relevant senior administrators is a hallmark of shared governance that often provides a mechanism by which University leaders draw on the insights of internationally renowned experts on such policy issues as pension design and funding, long-term investment strategies and interpretation of pertinent legal doctrines. For example, expert Senate committees and individuals contributed substantially to development of the University's program to restore its pension system to financial health.

**The Academic Senate and the administrations both at UCOP and the campuses have greatly benefited from the relationships that result from the consultation process. These often have led to a deeper understanding of the issues faced across UC. The Senate sees these as an underpinning of the effectiveness of shared governance.**

### **Regents**

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly are Faculty Representatives to the Regents. They attend all sessions of Board and committee meetings. They comment on matters before the Board but do not vote. When the Senate wishes to take a matter to the Board for consideration, it must do so through the President. As noted above, the Senate addresses the Regents most formally through a Memorial.

Over the last few years, the Academic Council has directly engaged with the Regents by inviting individual Regents to its meetings. The President or his/her designee is always invited to be present when such meetings occur. We have found that these discussions, with participation by administrative leaders, often assist the Regents to understand the practical implications of issues before them and to revise or refine their views of what should be done.

**The Senate seeks continued collaboration with the Office of the President on matters before the Regents, such as graduate education, faculty competitiveness and diversity and student diversity and access. We recognize that the Regents are often more focused on external matters, such as our relationships with state government and the media, but we also wish to engage them in discussions with our committees and on our campuses.**

---

<sup>6</sup> A recent success of the highly deliberative and consultative processes is the passage of a new open access policy governing the publication of scholarly works (Section 5.3).

## 1. ONE UNIVERSITY – TEN CAMPUSES

In this section, we highlight current issues that exemplify the tension between UC as a system and its ten individual campuses. With six of its nine general campuses members of the Association of American Universities (AAU), UC demonstrates the power of a system to nurture its component parts. At the same time, much more of the activity that makes the system great takes place at the campus level than systemwide. The Academic Senate is deeply engaged in the effort to balance competing centrifugal and centripetal forces in a way that ensures the academic excellence of all campuses.

UC's growth from a single campus to a system has mirrored that of the state. Los Angeles, Davis, San Francisco, Riverside and Santa Barbara matured throughout the mid- 20<sup>th</sup> century. The campuses at Irvine, San Diego and Santa Cruz developed during the last half of the century. Opening Merced as the 21<sup>st</sup> century dawned positioned UC to meet the challenge of a growing and diverse community in the Central Valley and support economic growth associated with proximity to a top research university.

No other state has more than two public universities in the AAU, and none derive multiple memberships from the one university model<sup>7</sup>. The clear emergence of UC as the premier public research university system resulted from the adoption of the Master Plan that clearly delineates its status as the public research university in California. Support from the state from the 1960s – through the 1980s enabled our campuses to attain AAU membership: UCLA (1974), UCSD (1982), UCSB (1995), UCD (1996), UCI (1996). The aspirations of Riverside and Santa Cruz have been undercut by the budget constraints of the past decade, but remain strong.

There are many reasons for the success of the University of California, but from an academic perspective, the critical elements include: the *a priori* assumptions that **no campus is the flagship**, a **common set of standards for faculty promotion and tenure** that are described in the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual (APM)<sup>8</sup>, **salary scales** that reward faculty progress throughout their careers, **common admission** standards that establish a floor for each campus, and the system of **shared governance** that is described above. In sum, the University of California is comprised of ten campuses with exactly the same aspirations, at different stages of evolution.

### ***Critical Areas:***

- ***Budget reforms*** that shift incentives to campuses to maximize local resources at the expense of the system (Section 1.1);
- ***Pathway to restoring the financial health of the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP)*** (Section 1.2);
- ***Post-tenure review and meaningful salary scales*** across the system (Section 1.3);
- ***Enrollment management*** to ensure that each campus meets its share of the University's Master Plan obligation to serve California students (Section 1.1).

---

<sup>7</sup> Examples include Iowa State University and University of Iowa, Texas A&M and University of Texas Austin, Indiana University and Purdue University.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/academic-personnel-policy/index.html>.

### 1.1. Budget Reforms

Under President Yudof's leadership, the allocation of funds to campuses has changed in ways that increase transparency while simultaneously creating new tensions as campuses seek to optimize resources. Core funds<sup>9</sup> were once pooled in the Office of the President and allocated to the campuses according to various formulas and cross-subsidies. Central expenses, including the cost of UCOP, were covered by off-the-top allocations controlled by the President. Since 2011, all funds except state general funds remain on the campus where they are generated. They are subject to the "Funding streams" tax to finance much of the Office of the President and selected central initiatives. State funds are generally allocated directly to the campuses based on both historical models of allocation using student workload and under the "Rebenching" initiative. Rebenching and Funding Streams are described below.

The effects of centrifugal forces (Funding Streams, campus priorities) and centripetal forces (Rebenching, systemwide priorities) must be delicately balanced. Consultation at the systemwide level is critical to ensure that resource decisions support both local and systemwide needs. The Senate has called out the need for more coordination. Most recently this has taken the form of a call to reinstitute an earlier version of the Executive Budget Committee. This Executive Budget Committee formerly was comprised of three Senate leaders, two chancellors, one campus provost and four systemwide vice presidents and was convened by the president<sup>10,11</sup> This body assures a close working relationship among the systemwide administrative and Senate leaders and the campus leaders during on-going budget and policy discussions.<sup>12</sup>

**The Senate strongly urges the President to reconstitute the Executive Budget Committee as a body that she would use to consult with the Senate and campus leadership<sup>13</sup>. We believe that many of our other recommendations would be enabled in a collaborative way were such a body to be in place. We also believe that such a body can focus critical discussions regarding the future of UC. This body could become the fulcrum upon which systemwide and campus interests and priorities are balanced.**

As UC proceeds with implementation of the Yudof-era reforms, critical elements include:

- Ensuring that relevant constituencies are effectively represented in the consultation mechanisms that shape budget decisions;
- Establishing a balance between preserving campus resources and equalizing resources among campuses;
- Establishing systemwide priorities and programs in which all campuses have an interest and to which all campuses may be required to contribute;

---

<sup>9</sup> Core funds include state general funds, student fees and UC general funds (nonresident tuition, portions of indirect costs assigned against federal and state contracts and grants, a portion of UC patent royalties, application and other fees and interest earnings).

<sup>10</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/1997/jnt1097.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> Note that for a period of about two years, 2011-2013, another body was convened by the Provost and called the "Executive Budget Committee". This had no relationship whatsoever to the Executive Budget Committee described herein. The more recently constituted body dealt with tactical issues mainly related to the UCOP budgets and was not constituted as a representative body. It had no Senate representation.

<sup>12</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/1997/jnt1097.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RLP\\_AD\\_SenatoreponExecBudgCte\\_FINAL.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RLP_AD_SenatoreponExecBudgCte_FINAL.pdf)

- Establishing a sustainable method for allocating future increases and/or decreases in resources.

**Funding Streams** allows each campus to retain all money generated on that campus<sup>14</sup>. In order to support operations at UCOP, a flat tax is applied to all expenditures on each campus<sup>15</sup>. The Senate endorsed this reform upon its introduction in 2011, but requested a study of its effects after three years in order to identify unintended consequences. Premised on a low assessment rate against a broad base, the plan has a tax rate of approximately 1.5% of all expenditures. Since implementation, campuses have raised questions about which of their expenditures should be included in the tax base and which UCOP services benefit them.

**Rebenching** redresses historical discrepancies<sup>16</sup> in allocating state funds to campuses by using enrollment numbers as the primary basis and establishing the principle that all students within a given category (e.g., undergraduates, professional master’s degree candidates, academic graduate students and clinical health sciences students) should be supported with the same level of state funds, regardless of their campus. The Senate developed its own analysis, communicated its recommendations<sup>17,18</sup> and engaged with the administration in developing an implementation plan based on the principle that no campus would *lose* funds. The current plan distributes *new* state funds differentially with the aim of equalizing per-student allocations over six years<sup>19</sup>. For some campuses, Rebenching means that new funding coming from the state will be less than it would have been previously. For most of the past two decades, state fund increases were largely distributed according to the historical fraction of the state budget assigned to each campus plus whatever enrollment growth dollars could be allocated to expanding campuses. Under Rebenching, 20% of any new state monies will be used to ameliorate discrepancies. The remainder is allocated according to the historical formulas. Rebenching also provides additional funding for campuses with less than 12% academic graduate student enrollment to support aspirational growth toward this target level.

**Enrollment management** underlies Rebenching, by establishing targets against which per-student allocations are calibrated. The process assigns each campus an enrollment target that reflects its share of responsibility for meeting systemwide obligations related to the Master Plan, which requires UC to “select from” the top one-eighth of California high school graduates. Enrollment management also quantifies goals for the proportion of academic graduate students in the student body, both systemwide and at each campus. Enrollment management must account for nonresident undergraduate students who are increasingly being used as a revenue source. Without a mechanism to control this growth, the number of spaces for California residents on some campuses could decline below an acceptable level.

---

<sup>14</sup> Such funds include tuition and indirect cost recovery.

<sup>15</sup> Revisions to Funding Streams that increase the number of metrics used to assess the tax are likely to occur in future years.

<sup>16</sup> Although there are many reasons for the discrepancies, one of the most critical is the difference in the student-to-faculty ratio that was funded by the state at different times as well as the different methods of funding enrollment of various types of students (e.g., undergraduate and graduate).

<sup>17</sup> [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA\\_MGY\\_Rebenching.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA_MGY_Rebenching.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA2Yudof\\_Dorr\\_Brostrom\\_Rebenching080912FINALdocx.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA2Yudof_Dorr_Brostrom_Rebenching080912FINALdocx.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> The 2012-13 academic year is the second of six years of Rebenching.



Some campuses have chosen to enroll students beyond the UCOP target, at least in part because they can keep the “excess” tuition. UCOP is now developing a systemwide enrollment plan derived from multi-year plans developed at each campus. As Rebenching proceeds, a decision must be made as to whether to use a UCOP enrollment target or actual enrollment to determine funding levels for each campus. Because of the funding implications, the Rebenching model and UCOP targets will impact campus decisions relating to their own resident and nonresident targets. This, in turn, impacts diversity and access. Under Funding Streams, campuses have a financial incentive to enroll nonresidents and, potentially, to under-enroll residents, making it critical for UC to establish an enrollment management process that ensures it meets its Master Plan obligations to California residents.

Under Rebenching both Merced, as a new campus, which must grow and San Francisco, which has no undergraduates, are treated as anomalies in setting enrollment targets and trajectories.

**The Senate supports the systemwide budgeting model underpinned by Rebenching, Funding Streams and enrollment management. Its engagement in the development and implementation of the first two of these was important in ensuring acceptance by the faculty across the system. The Senate urges that all three of these essential elements now be combined within a single planning framework.**

**The Senate supports the unique position of Merced as well as the allocation of funds to Merced, Riverside and Santa Cruz to support growing their academic graduate programs.**

**The Senate supports enrollment targets that are enforced through the Rebenching process and that require reassignment of funds from the budgets of those campuses that fail to meet their quotas to those campuses that meet or exceed their targets<sup>18</sup>.**

**The Senate urges caution in considering any proposed changes in the Funding Streams model, particularly proposals to change the components of the tax base. It is clear that a campus can advocate for and exploit changes in either Rebenching or Funding Streams in order to reduce the effects these programs were designed to have. We encourage early and direct consultation with the Divisional Senates and the systemwide Senate committees as changes are contemplated.**

**The Senate urges a principled approach in accounting for students who matriculate in academic programs that were once state supported but have converted to self-supporting. Students no longer receiving state support need to be subtracted in the Rebenching calculations for that campus and should not be counted in the calculation by which state funds are distributed (Section 3.3).**

**The Senate welcomes an open consultation process that will lead to enrollment management plans for the campuses over the rest of the decade. Enrollment targets are critical to educational quality and Rebenching allocations (enrolled students up to the target will receive state support). As a result of budget cuts, the quality of the teaching environment as measured by student-to-faculty ratio or size of classes is diminishing. Enrollment management is crucial to reversing this trend.**

## 1.2 University of California Retirement Program

The University manages its own University of California Retirement System (UCRS), which is a key component of the total compensation it offers all classes of employees. The defined benefit portion of UCRS is the University of California Retirement Program (UCRP). In 1990, when the University faced a budget crisis, UCRP was significantly overfunded and UC halted both employer and employee contributions. During the period, the state stopped including a line item in UC's budget for the cost of its pension plan, although it continued to do so for California State University, whose employees participate in the state system. By 2005, the Academic Senate foresaw a shortfall and began offering urgent advice that contributions resume, advice that became more pressing after the financial collapse of 2008. Under the leadership of President Yudof, and with the active participation of the Academic Senate in a joint administration/faculty task force<sup>20</sup>, employee and employer contributions to UCRP were restarted in May 2010. At the time contributions were restarted, UCRP was about 73% funded. The unfunded liability counts only the obligations accrued from *past* service of employees and current retirees, which has the very highest degree of protection under the Federal and State Constitutions. In December 2010, the Regents approved both a new tier of pension benefits for employees hired after July 1, 2013. They also approved a multi-year ramp-up of contributions to cover the accumulated unfunded liability for pensions already earned and to meet ongoing normal costs for new obligations. By 2018 the contribution rates approved in 2010 will fund the annual required contribution (ARC)<sup>21</sup>.

As UC moves towards fully funding UCRP critical elements include:

- The State budget has not restored a line item for UC pension costs, despite UC Advocacy. Ongoing pressure will be needed on this issue at the same time that some members of the legislature are demanding that the UC pension plan reduce its benefits further.
- Employer contributions to UCRP are a new and substantial burden on operating costs. Some campuses now advocate for capping the employer contribution at a level below the ARC for amortizing the unfunded liability within 30 years. The Senate has consistently supported the full ramp-up to contributions that will meet ARC in order to minimize the period when the ARC will remain at the maximum levels and to ensure that UCRP is able to weather future market downturns.
- Every campus maintains reserve funds in a centrally managed Short Term Investment Pool (STIP). Recent analyses suggest there may be excess liquidity in these funds that could be used to reduce UCRP's unfunded liability at a lower cost to operating budgets than projected in 2010.

By July 1, 2014, the employee contribution rate to UCRP will be 8% and the employer contribution rate will be 14%. This is roughly 3.9% above normal cost<sup>22</sup> for employees covered

<sup>20</sup> <http://ucrfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/task-force-inf/>

<sup>21</sup> The ARC is the rate of contribution that pays the normal cost of the plan, the interest on the unfunded liability of the pension, and a portion of the principle of the unfunded liability. The schedule approved by the Regents amortizes the unfunded liability so as to reach 100% funding by 2039, or thirty years after the Regents approved restarting contributions.

<sup>22</sup> The normal cost for Plan Year 2012-2013 was 18.09% of covered payroll.  
<http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/nov12/f10.pdf>

under the old retirement tier but not enough to cover the normal cost and interest on the unfunded liability. As of July 1, 2013, the unfunded pension liability was roughly \$12 billion. Investments in UCRP are assumed to earn a return of 7.5%. Hence, if only normal cost is met, the unfunded liability will increase roughly \$800 million in 2013-2014.

There have been some statements that implied that the interest on the unfunded liability for 2012-13 would be “paid” by the difference between the assumed UCRP rate of return of 7.5% and the actual, roughly 12% return, for a single year. Since investment returns are smoothed over five years under the actuarial plan adopted by the Regents<sup>23</sup>, it is clear that using the UCRP one-year return is entirely inappropriate.

**The Academic Senate urges fulfilling the Regents’ goal of contributing modified ARC annually to UCRP. Until the combination of employee and employer contributions reaches this goal, following the lead set by the Regents when they adopted the contribution plan in 2010, the Senate urges the President, under existing authorities granted by the Regents<sup>24</sup>, to meet modified ARC by investing some combination of transfers from the Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP), proceeds garnered through the sale of debt as part of a general taxable borrowing, or restructuring existing debt to free up previously budgeted revenues.**

**The Senate specifically urges that these funds be used to retroactively meet modified ARC for 2012-13. This is supported by the analysis performed by the Senate’s Task Force on Investments and Retirement<sup>25</sup> and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare<sup>26</sup>.**

**The Senate strongly opposes the view that one-year returns on UCRP can compensate for a lack of funding of the interest on the unfunded liability.**

Besides the UCRP pension contributions, significant reforms have been made in the retiree health benefit. Eventually, the normal cost will decrease from 7.9% to 4.1% of payroll. New tier employees will be affected, as will roughly half of UC’s current employees who are not grandfathered in the current system. All retirees and employees will see a reduction of the maximum UC contribution to retiree health from about 90% of the premium to a floor of 70% of the premium. Retirees will pay the rest.

The Senate’s Health Care Task Force (HCTF) has been monitoring the development of UC Care, a proposed UC self-insurance health care program that could be provided to UC retirees and employees as soon as January 2014. HCTF has been concerned about the rapid development of this program especially in view of the \$57 million actuarial deficit accrued in the past two years when UC moved to self-insurance for students.

**The Senate supports the changes in retiree health benefits. The Senate has been actively engaged in the details of their implementation on July 1, 2013<sup>27</sup> and will continue its**

---

<sup>23</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/sept10/j5.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/mar11/f12.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucfw/TFIRLiquidityStatement050613.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucfw/reports.html>

<sup>27</sup> <http://ucrpfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/news-updates/hr-to-round-ages-in-determining-eligibility->

engagement.

### 1.3. Post-Tenure Review and Faculty Salary Scales

The greatness of the University of California results from outstanding faculty on every campus. Periodic and rigorous academic peer review directly coupled with merit-based salary increases based on a common set of UC-wide standards against which all UC faculty are measured is the foundation of UC excellence. A common standard of excellence and a standard salary structure directly tied to merit have fostered the rapid development of faculty quality that enabled six UC campuses to achieve AAU membership. Fiscal constraints and differences in local resources have weakened this system and threaten to continue to do so at an increasing pace.

Except for faculty in the health sciences<sup>28</sup>, salary is determined by rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) and step (e.g., for Professor, Step I through IX). Each individual's rank and step are set through a rigorous peer review system, while the actual salary scale is set systemwide. Each step is associated with a specific salary. Special scales apply to a limited number of disciplines that compete directly with the private sector for talent, such as business, engineering and law<sup>29</sup>.

UC developed its peer review system in the 1920s. This process by which faculty members of committees on academic personnel evaluate the scholarship, teaching and service of every Senate member at approximately three-year intervals remains a cornerstone of shared governance today. The criteria for these reviews are established in the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and are the same on every campus. The review determines an individual's rank and step and, with it, a minimum salary level set in the salary scales<sup>30</sup>. This system of regular reviews both before tenure and throughout the career of every faculty member continues to be unusual in higher education and is prized by the Senate.<sup>31</sup>

In considering the future of faculty salaries critical elements include:

- Two decades of declining University budgets have made salary scales uncompetitive, reducing the significance of salary increases received as the result of merit reviews. Discretionary funds from unfilled faculty positions have been used to increase salaries for faculty who receive outside offers or to offer competitive salaries when recruiting new faculty. Today, over 65% of our faculty are no longer "on scale." This creates disparities between academic units and campuses with varying resources and imposes a "loyalty

---

[to-remain-under-current-rules-for-retiree-health-benefits/](#)

<sup>28</sup> The health sciences compensation plan specifies other components to salaries based on the clinical income, type of practice and salaries from grants and contracts.

<sup>29</sup> The complexity of UC is reflected by the complexity of its salary structure for faculty: <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/academic-personnel-policy/salary-administration/index.html>.

<sup>30</sup> Typical salary scales may be found at <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/files/1112/table1.pdf> and <http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/files/1112/table3.pdf>.

<sup>31</sup> A 2001 study by the [Association of American Universities](#) noted that perceived benefits of post-tenure review include that the procedure: contributes to high faculty productivity, improves faculty development and heightens faculty morale, improves the connection between stated goals and individual performance, enhances faculty participation in the mission of the university, maximizes the allocation of faculty skills and resources to unit missions and provides improved accountability both within and outside the institution.

- penalty" on long serving faculty who do not actively pursue outside offers.
- Since 2007, two attempts to develop plans to reinvigorate our salary scales have failed, resulting in further decoupling of the salary scales from actual salaries.
- Salary equity issues appear to exist for women and underrepresented minorities in some academic units. After a systemwide Senate study completed in 2012 demonstrated the likelihood of such inequities, each campus is now conducting studies to identify any patterns of lower salaries for female and underrepresented minority faculty. Plans for addressing any inequities that are discovered will be developed.

**The Academic Senate has consistently advocated for finding a means of restoring the tight link between post-tenure peer review and competitive salaries. The Senate believes that breaking this link undermines the expectation that faculty members on any campus of the University of California at the same rank and step meet the same standards of excellence and are competitively compensated.**

**The Academic Senate will continue its partnership with the Office of the President to ensure that there are no biases in faculty compensation based upon gender and race.**

## **2. EDUCATIONAL QUALITY**

Sustaining UC's educational quality is the Academic Senate's highest priority and core responsibility. The Senate serves as the guardian of educational quality through its Regentally-assigned authority and oversight over curricula and programs, admissions and faculty appointment and promotion and through its related advice on priorities for resource allocation.

### **Critical Areas:**

- *Educational quality derives from an outstanding faculty engaged in cutting edge scholarship that directly manifests in the education of all of our students but is threatened by policy makers who demand that faculty "teach more" in order to cut costs (Section 2.1);*
- *If not carefully conceived, externally driven educational efficiency measures can dilute educational quality by diverting resources, reducing the resources to ensure course quality, substituting unproven technologies, increasing class size, reducing the number of teaching assistants per student and discouraging students from participating in outside activities and off-campus educational opportunities (Section 2.2 and 2.5);*
- *UC must maintain public accountability by measuring performance; however, UC faculty must be engaged in determining appropriate metrics. Emphasizing quantitative metrics over qualitative assessments that evaluate the content of the curriculum and the student learning experience threatens educational quality (Section 2.3);*
- *Educational quality depends on both curricular and financial considerations, and the separation of authority over these areas between faculty and administration must be tempered by an understanding of their interrelationships (Section 2.4).*

### **2.1 Top-Notch Faculty Drive Quality**

The University's educational quality derives from the expertise and quality of the faculty and an

environment that values and supports their research and teaching. The University's ability to attract and retain top faculty is the lynchpin to maintaining quality. Critical elements include:

- Quality students, especially top academic graduate students, and adequate resources to provide a quality educational experience (Section 3);
- Quality colleagues and the opportunity to build research programs with an appropriate support infrastructure (Section 5);
- Competitive compensation and total remuneration that includes anticipation of a secure future within the institution and a secure retirement (Section 7).

These elements are intertwined. Distinguished faculty attract top graduate students, who help those faculty build strong research programs, which reinforce the institution's reputation, and help, in turn, attract talented junior colleagues. Faculty research enhances the undergraduate experience not only through the transmission of the instructor's cutting-edge scholarship in the classroom, but also by offering undergraduates opportunities to participate in the faculty's creative or scholarly production in the field, laboratory, or studio, and by connecting them to the larger community through research-based service projects.

**The Senate believes the University must make a more compelling public case for the ways in which learning in a research university benefits students at all levels. We are concerned that the current focus on tuition levels hampers the University's ability to communicate the importance of recruiting and retaining top research faculty. The Senate is prepared to join the President and other administrative leaders in an effort to foster a broader conversation about educational values and UC's future.**

## **2.2 Course and Program Quality**

UC's educational quality rests on a comprehensive learning experience that includes individual courses, faculty-led and student-developed research projects, and participation in a community of learning. The vision for any UC degree or program comes from the faculty and reflects the synergy between teaching and research, including the unique opportunities offered to undergraduates through their exposure to research<sup>32</sup>.

All courses offered at UC are developed by UC faculty and approved through the Divisional Academic Senate's course and program review process. Courses must provide ample opportunity for closely-mentored relationships with faculty and other University-affiliated personnel. Instruction must foster students' ability to interpret, organize and present information critically, analytically and effectively. Instructors and students must adhere to high ethical standards of intellectual integrity. Research faculty regularly update their courses to reflect the latest developments in their fields.

All UC academic programs are reviewed approximately every seven years in a rigorous process that begins with a self-assessment and is followed by an evaluation of the "fitness for purpose" of course content and instructional methods by internal and external faculty experts and administrators. Faculty are expected to complete a course and program learning assessment in which they define learning goals, map those goals to the curriculum and assess the extent to which students master them in the major. Learning goals include attaining critical thinking,

---

<sup>32</sup> (See University Committee on Educational Policy's [White Paper on Undergraduate Research](#)).

analytical reasoning, written communication and other discipline-based skills. Separately, students evaluate each course they take, and their ratings are incorporated into the faculty advancement process. These reviews are in addition to the regular reviews of entire campuses by UC's accrediting agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), which also requires substantial Senate input.

**The Senate has consistently supported educational innovation as part of an ongoing commitment to UC quality, but insists that faculty must lead the design, implementation and evaluation of all new academic programs and approaches. Recent calls for top-down change threaten shared governance in higher education by attempting to substitute quick fixes for deliberate and measured change.**

### **2.3. Metrics for Monitoring Quality**

Consistent with much of the national discourse on accountability in higher education, the governor and the legislature have begun serious efforts to tie future budget increases for the University to achieving specified "performance" criteria. Before the catastrophic budget cuts of the last decade, state allocations to the University were grounded in enrollment numbers. The new thrust includes enrollment but also targets such metrics as graduation rates and time to degree. Choosing what to measure inevitably influences programmatic priorities. The Senate must play a major role in selecting metrics that are both responsive to external concerns and appropriate for a research university. The wrong metrics could distort educational priorities and potentially harm students rather than reflect UC's central research mission. The University needs to advocate for the right mix of input and output measures.

UC data<sup>33</sup> show that the University has maintained or improved important educational performance standards during the most challenging fiscal period in its history. Graduation rates continue to be among the highest in the nation among public institutions; the time to degree for undergraduates has not lengthened; the proportion of undergraduates reporting some research experience has grown; and research funding continued to rise until the onset of federal budget sequestration. At the same time, other data highlight potential degradation in the quality of the student experience. The student-to-faculty ratio has increased as a result of budget cuts and the number of degrees awarded per faculty member is rising. Class sizes have grown while support for teaching assistants has dropped, forcing faculty to reduce the number and quality of assignments. Increases in the instructional workload also reduce faculty ability to conduct research and, cumulatively, undermine the attractiveness of UC as an academic employer.

The urgency of advocacy for "right" metrics is illustrated by a short-lived proposal from the governor's staff earlier this year to make anticipated budget augmentations for UC and California State University (CSU) contingent on increasing four-year graduation rates by 10% over four years with required annual progress in specified increments. Not only did this proposal ignore the disparity in baselines between UC's four-year graduation rate (more than 61%) and CSU's (approximately 16%)<sup>34</sup>, but it also ignored accumulated budget cuts that will be only partially restored under the governor's plan. Similarly, several Regents and the governor have suggested that faculty should teach "more courses" – ignoring both the documented increase in student

---

<sup>33</sup> <http://accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/>

<sup>34</sup> Under this plan, CSU would increase its four-year graduation rate of 16% by 1.6% to 17.6%, while UC would increase its rate from 6.1% to 67.1%, in other words, the 10% increase was applied to both rates.

credit hours taught by each member of the faculty and the faculty's research mission<sup>35</sup>. In quality terms, a mandate to teach more courses also decreases faculty capacity for personal interaction, seminars and collaboration with undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students.

Proposed Legislation (SB 195) calls on the state to establish a new commission that would create metrics for outcomes, progress, efficiency and effectiveness to drive higher education funding priorities in California. Inconceivably, SB 195 does not call for the public higher education segments to be directly represented on the commission. Given the visibility of the "accountability in higher education" movement, some version of this bill is likely to emerge in statute in the near future. To ensure that UC quality is not lost through simplistic measures, the UC administration, particularly State Government Relations and the Senate will be challenged to collaborate and engage all stakeholders in substantive dialogue to craft accountability metrics that align with UC's mission.

**The Senate has consistently held that the student-to-faculty ratio is one of the most critical measures of educational quality. The ratio has increased to roughly 23.5 from roughly 21.5 through the 1990s and as recently as 2008-09 and from less than 20 thirty years ago<sup>36</sup>. It is likely to continue rising over the next few years as enrollments increase and UC faculty retire or separate from the University more quickly than new faculty are hired. It is essential that the student-to-faculty ratio be the cornerstone of any accountability measures used by UC or state government to define quality and assess the campuses' progress in maintaining or increasing quality. The Senate urges strong advocacy for restoration of the student-faculty ratio as the single most important guarantee of UC quality education.**

**The Senate and UCOP have consistently held that student credit hours (SCH) per faculty is a more meaningful measure of faculty teaching workload than a count of courses taught. The UC Annual Accountability Report includes a particularly useful disaggregation of SCH per faculty according to lower division, upper division and graduate courses, which indicates that SCH taught per ladder rank faculty member has increased by approximately 10% since 2005-06.**

#### **2.4 Online Education**

Online education is prominent in the national conversation about higher education and has become the focus of much attention at UC. The dominant theme internal to UC is how best to use online capabilities to enrich and improve learning. For more than two decades, UC faculty have developed, deployed and evaluated online materials to enrich and improve the curriculum, predominantly by adding these resources to in-person classes, while collaborating in major digitization projects that allow students and researchers to access vast collections of data in a wide variety of formats - from visualizations of the Roman forum to real-time tracking of astronomical phenomena. UC faculty have also been active in offering online courses to students beyond their own campuses, primarily (but not exclusively) through summer sessions and UC Extension. Currently, UC offers over one hundred online courses originating in on-campus academic departments to matriculated UC students. In the last two years, UC faculty have also developed over 15 Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), which provide a powerful public service. Most online courses have been developed on the campuses, but in 2010 President Yudof

---

<sup>35</sup> UC faculty bring \$5.4B of extramural funding for \$1B faculty salary supported by the state.

<sup>36</sup> (<http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may13/e1.pdf>). Note that during most of the time since 1990 the budgeted ratio was 18.7 to 1.



launched UC Online Education (UCOE), a UCOP unit that has guided development of over 25 fully online courses offered to UC students on their own campuses as well as to non-UC students. In the coming year these courses are expected to be available to students on any UC campus.

Most recently, in response to the governor's call for UC to use \$10 million of its 2013-14 budget allocation to develop online offerings that will increase access to high-demand courses for UC matriculated undergraduates, UC launched the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). The effort has been marked by fruitful collaborations among faculty, students, staff and administrators and among the campuses. It is coordinated jointly by the Office of the Provost at UCOP, the Academic Senate and UCOE.

The ILTI Request for Proposals was issued to Senate faculty in July. We anticipate a robust set of proposals that will be pedagogically innovative, serve priority current needs and be available across multiple campuses for several years. The Senate will play a key role in evaluating responses to the RFP, and local Senates will oversee quality of approved courses through existing mechanisms. Unresolved issues include development of a seamless cross-campus registration tool and development of a financial model that can accommodate the virtual movement of individual students across multiple campuses.

**The Senate supports the expansion of online education, including ILTI and campus-based efforts, but is determined to maintain UC quality by requiring that regular-term online courses be taught by Senate faculty and evaluated through local Senate processes. The Senate has strongly opposed proposed legislation that would require UC to contract with for-profit private providers due to concerns about quality and UC's proven ability to deliver high quality courses on its own.**

**The Senate and UCOP will be challenged to shift the public debate about online education away from a view that mass-scale courses can be a budget and access panacea to a focus on quality and how best to use technology to improve teaching and learning as well as access to quality courses across UC campuses.**

**The Senate supports models of online instruction, including hybrid classes that focus on improving quality through innovative techniques. Such instruction will likely require intensive interaction with faculty and/or teaching assistants and should not be viewed as a means of saving money. It may, in fact, be more expensive than traditional modes of instruction.**

### **3. GRADUATE EDUCATION**

Strong graduate programs - the heart of a great research university - are usually grounded in their campus departments, although UC's extraordinary success in growing a statewide system of research universities reflects systemwide as well as local effort. Since the earliest days when UC established a second campus in Los Angeles, the systemwide Senate's Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)<sup>37</sup> has set standards for graduate programs at UC. Graduate programs cannot be offered without a favorable CCGA recommendation to the Provost based on a review that includes comments from outside experts. As UC has grown, rigorous CCGA reviews provided

---

<sup>37</sup> Senate bylaw 180 establishes the role of CCGA (<http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/blpart2.html>).

the foundation for the Master Plan's designation of UC as the state's academic research institution with a commitment to build out graduate programs on its planned new campuses. CCGA also advises the president and all agencies of the Senate on broader research and learning issues related to graduate affairs, and recommends minimum standards of admission to any UC campus for graduate students. CCGA's program approval authority extends to self-supporting programs.<sup>38</sup>

Critical Concerns:

- *Emphasis on undergraduate education in the public arena undervalues graduate education and research (Section 3.1);*
- *Nonresident supplemental tuition limits support and recruitment of international Ph.D. students (Section 3.2);*
- *The funding model for a graduate academic program or professional degree program is closely linked to the nature and quality of that program (Section 3.3);*
- *CCGA review processes – which often include multiple iterations with program proposers - may require more time than entrepreneurial academic units and UCOP administrators want to accommodate.*

### **3.1 Importance of Research and Graduate Education**

The Senate has consistently reaffirmed the principle that a threshold level of graduate enrollment is critical to every UC campus and that graduate students are key contributors to the University's research and instructional missions<sup>39</sup>. Graduate students participate actively in faculty-led research teams, undertake independent research and provide a substantial portion of the small-group instruction that complements undergraduate experiences in lecture (and, increasingly, online) classes. The opportunity to recruit, train, educate and collaborate with outstanding graduate students is a major reason why faculty come to and remain at UC. Conversely, graduate students are attracted to academic programs led by world-class faculty. Together they account for our great scholarship.

**The Senate urges the president to prioritize activities that increase the visibility of UC graduate programs and research. The Senate will join in whatever partnerships are appropriate to realize this priority.**

**The Senate urges that every campus receive enough state support to realize aspirational institutional goals for graduate enrollment. This is realized through Rebenching, which targets a minimum of 12% enrollment of academic graduate students for every campus.**

### **3.2 Graduate Student Support**

Recruiting the best graduate students requires support packages that must include tuition/fees and a stipend or salary in order to be competitive. Most packages are developed in the departments and draw on faculty research grants and instructional funds to pay research and teaching assistant salaries. As UC graduate tuition has increased, departments have struggled to obtain adequate funds to pay graduate students' fees, particularly for international students who

---

<sup>38</sup> Policy and guidelines pertaining to the approval of new degree programs can be found in the Compendium ([http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/\\_files/documents/compendium\\_jan2011.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/compendium_jan2011.pdf)).

<sup>39</sup> <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/ds.yudofrepowellCommitteReport.pdf>

cannot obtain resident status. Although many of the University's graduate programs are currently rated among the best in the world, they are falling behind in the world market where they compete for the best graduate students.<sup>40</sup> Two task forces examined this issue last year. The Academic Council's Taskforce on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS) identified as top-priority concerns the lack of competitive stipends for graduate students, (especially for underrepresented minorities<sup>41</sup>) and the difficulty in departments of covering nonresident supplemental tuition (NRST)<sup>42</sup>. A parallel joint Administration-Senate task force did not focus as closely on NRST.

The issue of NRST has long troubled faculty. In 2006, over 3500 faculty, 83% of those voting, supported a Memorial stating that, "The Academic Senate of the University of California requests that the Regents of the University of California structure and advocate a budget for the University that eliminates non-resident tuition for academic graduate students." This Memorial sought to take one step further the Regents policy adopted in the November, 2005: "Effective Summer 2006, the Nonresident Tuition Fee be waived for not more than three years for graduate academic students who are advanced to candidacy"<sup>43</sup>. In most disciplines, academic graduate students advance to candidacy between their second and third years. The leaves the academic program in which those students are enrolled (or extramural funds) to pay the NRST for up to three years.

**The Senate generally agrees with the findings of CAGSS that competitiveness in graduate education requires not only excellence in research and education, but also financial support for students for the duration of their degree programs. UC's student stipends are unattractively low and NRST increases the cost of supporting international graduate students so much that departments may take fewer high-quality international students in favor of domestic students who are less expensive to support<sup>44</sup>. The Senate believes that UC should: (1) Restructure NRST to ensure our competitiveness for the best students regardless of their places of origin<sup>45</sup>; (2) Eliminate systemwide time limits on graduate student instructor (GSI) employment<sup>46</sup>; and (3) Allocate additional resources to increase academic doctoral student stipends.**

**The Senate supports all measures that increase the diversity of the graduate student body as intrinsically valuable and also as essential to increasing the pool of potential applicants for faculty positions. The Senate recognizes that diversity begins with a diverse pool of applicants. This requires that published data show that stipends and total support packages are competitive. Admissions decisions must then be blind to NRST to avoid bias that favors or disfavors students based on nationality.**

---

<sup>40</sup> ([http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/CAGSSGradCompetitivenessPaper\\_072012.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/CAGSSGradCompetitivenessPaper_072012.pdf))

<sup>41</sup> (<http://www.ucop.edu/graduate-studies/files/gsiwg-july2012.pdf>), page 7.

<sup>42</sup> "Among the 27 non-UC public research universities that are members of the AAU and were surveyed by UCOP regarding their tuition remission policies, 20 do not charge any NRST to research grants." CAGSS report, page 22.

<sup>43</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2005/fin1105.pdf>

<sup>44</sup> Nonresident domestic students are eligible to be California residents after one year, thereby qualifying to be charged in-state tuition.

<sup>45</sup> Within the AAU public universities, 5 of the 10 universities with the lowest fraction of international students are UC campuses; only one UC campus is above the 50th percentile. CAGSS Report, page 14.

<sup>46</sup> (<http://www.ucop.edu/graduate-studies/files/gsiwg-july2012.pdf>), page 26.

### **3.3 Self-Supporting Programs and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition**

Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs) and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) are important sources of revenue for UC graduate programs and allow the University to serve extended populations of students. Questions about tuition levels and final authority over some aspects of these programs are unresolved and will be active issues in the coming year.

Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs), which are not funded by the state, are required by Presidential policy to be fully supported by tuition and fees.<sup>47</sup> They are subject to the same academic standards as state-supported programs, and are subject to the same review and approval by Divisional Senate bodies and CCGA<sup>48</sup>. The Senate and the administration have disagreed over the need for the Senate to fully explore the academic implications of converting a state-supported program to SSP status. The Presidential policy governing such a conversion is currently under revision by the Academic Planning Council. Proposed revisions will be subject to review during 2013-14. The President has final authority to set tuition levels for SSPs.

Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) is charged to professional degree programs (Medicine, Law, Business, etc.) that are also supported with state funds. Programs with PDST's generally have an overall tuition burden that reflects market prices and the expectation that students who receive these degrees will benefit from higher incomes. The Regents must approve all PDST levels.

Unresolved controversies surround PDST increases, which are seen in some quarters as incompatible with the governor's and legislative calls to freeze tuition in the wake of the passage of Proposition 30. Most increases proposed for 2013-14 have been put on hold, causing a loss of projected revenue to the campuses<sup>49</sup>. Conversion of state funded programs to SSPs is controversial because many believe that programs created through state investment should not be turned into for-profit enterprises and that conversion will have unintended consequences for other academic programs.

**The Senate is engaged in current efforts to revise both PDST and SSP policies and will participate actively in their review and ultimate implementation in 2013-14.**

**The Senate affirms the guidance provided by CCGA for evaluating the conversion of state-supported programs to self-supporting programs<sup>48</sup>.**

## **4. UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

Much public support for-and conversation about-UC focuses on affordability and accessibility for undergraduates, including those from underrepresented California populations. Prodded by strong advocacy groups, the legislature revisits these themes often. Advocates propose what appear to be simple "fixes" to problems they define, and the University must take care to respond constructively. In the current year, for example, increases in the University's budget that only partly restore the cuts of the last five years were conditional on freezing tuition levels and

---

<sup>47</sup> [http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/\\_files/documents/self-supportpolicy-2011.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/_files/documents/self-supportpolicy-2011.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> ([http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/DS\\_LPreCCGASSPguidelines.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/DS_LPreCCGASSPguidelines.pdf))

<sup>49</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/jul13/f3.pdf>

maintaining enrollment of California resident undergraduates. A parallel focus on perceived obstacles to transfer from community colleges to UC drives legislative pressure to increase standardization of the lower division curriculum. Such external priorities interact with UC's own concerns about recruiting and supporting a diverse student body, ensuring that admitted students are academically prepared, managing capacity limits and serving nonresident students who can pay the full cost of their education.

The Academic Senate, through its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), is a close partner with the administration in confronting these challenges. Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(a)<sup>50</sup> charges the Academic Senate with “determin[ing] the conditions for admission” to undergraduate status, a mandate that includes advising the president on the full array of policies and practices regarding admissions requirements. The Senate delegates this role to BOARS, which is instrumental in designing admissions and financial aid proposals to implement the Regents policy that requires the University to “*seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California*”<sup>51</sup>. The parameters for this goal are set by the Master Plan for Higher Education, which directs UC to “select from” the top 12½% of California high school graduates. In 2012, over 13% of California public high school graduates received an offer of admission to a UC campus to which they applied. Within the systemwide framework, students apply to individual campuses, and each campus chooses which applicants to admit. To ensure that it meets its Master Plan obligation, the University maintains a referral pool of applicants who meet the minimum criteria for admission but are not accepted at any campus to which they apply. These applicants are offered a place on another campus where space is available.

The chair and vice chair of the Academic Council and the chairs of the Senate committees with jurisdiction over admissions, preparatory education and the undergraduate curriculum participate with their counterparts from California State University and the California Community Colleges in the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). This volunteer body provides a valuable venue in which representatives of the three senates exchange information and craft unified positions and recommendations on issues affecting all three segments. It is particularly valuable for addressing issues related to the transfer function.

**Critical Areas:**

1. *Admitting a pool of undergraduates who reflect the diversity of California within the constraints of Proposition 209, which bars racial preferences (Section 4.1);*
2. *Growing nonresident enrollment without displacing eligible California residents or disproportionately burdening campuses that enroll resident students not accepted at campuses with large nonresident populations (Section 4.2);*
3. *Meeting the guarantee obligation with limited resources and while the last referral campus (Merced) becomes more selective (Section 4.3);*
4. *Facilitating the transfer process and increasing transfer student enrollments while their applicant numbers go down (Section 4.4);*
5. *Maintaining UC's generous financial aid policy if tuition cannot increase to cover some of the costs of financial aid. (Section 4.5).*

---

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/bylaws/so1052.html>

<sup>51</sup> Regents Policy 4401, <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/4401.html>

#### 4.1 Evolution of the UC Freshman Admission Model

##### Eligibility in the Local Context and Comprehensive Review

In 2001, the Regents adopted BOARS' recommendation that UC establish an Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program to guarantee the top 4% of graduates from each California high school admission to at least one UC campus. In 2002, the Regents adopted BOARS' recommendation to base evaluation of applications for admission on a "Comprehensive Review" using a variety of measures of achievement.<sup>52</sup>

##### Entitled to Review - Admissions Policy Reform

In 2009, on the advice of the Senate, the Regents approved a major change to undergraduate admissions policy that took effect in 2012. Its intent was to diversify and slightly reduce the number of California residents *guaranteed* admission to UC and to create a supplementary pool of applicants who would be *entitled to review* without a guarantee. Up to that point, UC defined a student's eligibility for admission as a guarantee that they would be admitted to at least one UC campus if they completed the required coursework and either met an academic index score derived from grades and standardized test scores or ranked in the top 4% of their high school class. The new policy shifted the balance between index scores and high school class rank for identifying applicants guaranteed admission by expanding the ELC guarantee to the top 9% from each California high school and reducing the index guarantee to the top 9% of graduates statewide (the "9 by 9 guarantee"). The new policy also added an "Entitled to Review" (ETR) category of students who are guaranteed a review if they meet minimum requirements but who may not be admitted<sup>53</sup>. After determining that the current index reached more than 9% of California high school graduates in the 2012 admissions cycle, the Senate adopted BOARS' recommendation for changes in the index.

##### Holistic Review

In 2010, in consultation with BOARS, the Regents adopted a resolution<sup>54</sup> recommending a single score individualized ("holistic") review system as the preferred implementation of Comprehensive Review. They also allowed campuses flexibility to follow alternative approaches that are as effective in meeting campus and University goals. Six campuses have now transitioned to a holistic system while the other three use individualized reviews that lead to diverse freshman classes. BOARS and UCOP are in the early stages of analyzing the combined effects of the new mix of admissions guarantee and eligibility and the implementation of holistic review.

**The Senate is actively engaged with both systemwide and campus offices who are managing the changes in admissions policies and procedures. The Senate will recommend refinements in these policies as needed as their results are analyzed such as the recent proposal to revise the Statewide Admissions Index.**

#### 4.2 Non-Resident Admission

---

<sup>52</sup> The policy established guidelines and [14 specific Criteria](#) for reviewing and selecting applicants designed to capture a broad view of their talents, using multiple criteria to define merit, including academic and non-academic data such as an evaluation of the applicant's school context and/or the context of opportunity more broadly.

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/eligibilitychanges/>

<sup>54</sup> <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/minutes/2011/edpol1.pdf>

In 2013-14, nonresidents will exceed 10% of total undergraduate enrollment at UC, the upper bound suggested by the UC Commission on the Future in 2010. Although it is considerably lower than in many states, 10% represents a sharp increase in only a few years, with some campuses setting long-range nonresident targets of 20%. Nonresident students pay significantly higher fees than residents, and under the Funding Streams budget model, their fees remain at the campuses where they enroll, making expansion of nonresident enrollment attractive. Nonresidents are also disproportionately concentrated at a few campuses. In 2011, BOARS adopted a policy that nonresidents admitted to a campus must “*compare favorably*” to California residents admitted to that campus to ensure that California resident applicants are not turned away in favor of weaker nonresident applicants.

**The Senate expects campuses to meet individual targets to enroll California resident undergraduates that are consistent with UC’s Master Plan obligation. Non-resident applicants may only be admitted on top of those targets according to the availability of space under the “compare favorably” rule for eligibility.**

#### **4.3 The Referral Pool and Enrollment Management**

BOARS sets systemwide admissions policies and guidelines for comprehensive review, and campus senate admissions committees design selection criteria and processes to evaluate applicants to that campus. Campus administrations are currently engaged with UCOP in setting individual campus enrollment targets. Under Rebenching, UCOP-approved enrollment targets are expected to become the base for allocating state funding to each campus.

As described above, UC has relied on a referral pool to ensure that it could meet the Master Plan guarantee to a specified number of freshman applicants each year. As applications to all campuses have risen, allowing each to be more selective, Merced has become the only campus that still accepts students from the referral pool. Merced has now indicated that it will no longer be able to accommodate all referral applicants as soon as next year. Without some adjustment to policy or practice, UC may no longer be able to offer a guarantee of referral admission to every student defined as eligible through the “9x9” policy. In 2013 about 1.5% of referrals accepted the offer from Merced. In addition to state funding levels, enrollment management decisions made centrally will determine when (but not if) the referral guarantee at UC will end.

**The Academic Senate has promoted a collaborative approach to systemwide enrollment planning because of its direct impact on diversity and educational quality. The Senate views the referral guarantee as an important promise to California students and seeks careful review of the alternatives to-and potential consequences of-ending the referral promise.**

#### **4.4 Transfer Admission**

In 2012, the Senate [approved](#) new transfer admission pathways<sup>55</sup> that align UC policies with recent legislative mandates to the California Community Colleges (CCC) and California State University (CSU), clarify the transfer process for CCC students, and are expected to improve their preparation for UC-level work by guiding major preparation. Beginning in fall 2014, CCC transfer applicants will be entitled to a comprehensive admissions review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three pathways: a UC Transfer Curriculum in the relevant

---

<sup>55</sup> [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA\\_LP\\_SakakireSR476Camendments\\_FINAL.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/RMA_LP_SakakireSR476Camendments_FINAL.pdf)

major; an “SB 1440” Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree for Transfer from a CCC in the relevant major; or the existing general education pathway specified in [Senate Regulation 476C](#).

The Senate is aware that some members of the legislature believe that the transfer process is not working as well as it should and that UC admits too few transfer students, even though UC is close to meeting its Master Plan target of admitting one-third of undergraduates as junior transfers. The Senate anticipates that in the next academic year, UC will face new legislative requests or mandates to increase transfer rates. Senate representatives to ICAS will work with their colleagues from the other public segments to offer advice to the legislature and develop recommendations to UC on effective ways of responding to any new mandates.

**The Senate strongly supports the transfer path and is committed to policies that help clarify the transfer process and ensure that transfer students are prepared to succeed at UC.**

**The Senate urges close collaboration with the Senates of the CSU and CCC and all three segments’ State Government Relations representatives to transfer policies that encourages strong preparation.**

#### **4.5 Financial Aid**

##### The Educational Finance Model (EFM)

The University’s Education Finance Model (EFM)<sup>56</sup> ensures that UC is financially accessible to all admitted students, regardless of income, and that a student’s family income does not affect their choice of campus or educational experience. The EFM and the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan<sup>57</sup> offer a positive message about affordability by providing scholarships and grants to fully cover tuition and fees for all students with financial need who come from families with annual incomes less than \$80,000. The model relies on a mandatory return-to-aid of a set portion of tuition. Its fiscal underpinnings are calculated on the basis of tuition that will increase over time. However, the EFM is threatened by rising costs and the specter of tuition freezes mandated by the state, which will shrink the available revenue stream. UCOP has prepared a number of proposals to sustain the EFM into the future, but none is viable if tuition is frozen. The loss of a viable EFM could have a devastating impact on access and diversity by placing significant burdens on underrepresented minority groups and low-income families.

**The Senate supports the goals of the EFM and a policy-driven approach to financial aid that will allow UC to continue meeting its goal of ensuring that all admitted students can afford to attend, regardless of income, and meeting its commitment to educating a high percentage of low-income and first generation students.**

**If tuition increases are not permitted at a level needed to meet EFM requirements, the Senate supports vigorous advocacy for additional state funds for student financial aid.**

##### California Dream Act Students

---

<sup>56</sup> [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/future/AffordabilityWorkGroup\\_Final.pdf](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/future/AffordabilityWorkGroup_Final.pdf)

<sup>57</sup> <http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/paying-for-uc/financial-aid/grants/blue-gold/index.html>



California AB 540, signed in 2001, provides that undocumented public university students who attended 3 years of high school in California pay the same fees as California resident students. With the passage of AB 131 in 2013, AB 540 students are now eligible for Cal Grants, California's need-based state financial aid program. However, they remain ineligible for federal financial aid.

**The Senate supports ensuring California Dream Act students receive total aid at levels comparable to all other students.**

## **5. RESEARCH, SCHOLARLY & CREATIVE WORK**

The California Master Plan for higher education designates UC as the primary state-supported academic institution for research. Research, scholarly and creative work not only form the backbone of everything that UC does, they bring faculty and sustain them. UC has more than 800 research centers, institutes and programs across its ten campuses, five medical centers, and through its participation in the direction of three national laboratories. In 2010-11, funded research projects employed more than 28,000 full-time FTE students and accounted for expenditures of \$4.4 billion, with about \$1 billion in addition in recovered indirect costs. This represents over a fivefold return on the \$1 billion investment the state makes in ladder-rank faculty salaries. That year, contracts and grants represented nearly one-fourth of UC's total operating budget<sup>58</sup>. Top ranking research, creative and scholarly achievement in UC spans all academic disciplines; from the Arts, to the Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences, Business, Engineering and Law. The research enterprise influences UC's service and educational mission, laying a foundation for undergraduate, graduate and professional degree programs.

### **Critical Areas:**

- *There is a disconnect between the public view of the educational mission of UC as primary and faculty who are almost exclusively hired on the basis of their research, scholarly and creative achievements (Section 5.1);*
- *Infrastructure support for scholarly achievement in all disciplines is essential, yet today we face declining or no state support for capital projects and an increasing disparity of access to funding across disciplines (Section 5.2);*
- *The Senate adopted an open access policy for scholarly works at the July 24, 2013, meeting of the Academic Council. For successful implementation, this policy requires that a robust infrastructure be readily available to all UC researchers. (Section 5.3)*

### **5.1 Faculty**

As discussed in Section 1.3, faculty excellence is rewarded through UC's post-tenure peer-review system, which deeply involves the Academic Senates at each campus. APM Section 210 sets criteria for appointment and review in the professorial series: "*performance in (1) teaching, (2) research and other creative work, (3) professional activity, and (4) University and public service.*" As a research university, UC expects the research, scholarly and creative work of the faculty to drive their accomplishments in the other three arenas, and therefore is considered the most fundamental ingredient of review. Without accomplishments in research, faculty cannot fulfill

---

<sup>58</sup> <http://accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/accountabilityreport13.pdf> pp. 111-118.

their other responsibilities in a manner appropriate to UC. Research is also inseparable from graduate education, and, as a system, UC comprises the strongest and most impactful graduate student enterprise in the country. In addition, more than half of UC's undergraduates have some research experience while at UC.

**The Academic Senate urges the President to raise a strong voice in support of UC's research mission, both in the public arena and in negotiations with the legislature and the governor. Although the Senate recognizes that there have been many efforts over the last 20 years to articulate the importance of research to our external constituencies, it is now time to find new venues and new approaches. The Senate is prepared to work with the President on such initiatives and also to provide leadership, as appropriate. This message must include the essential role that UC plays in the education of our students and the importance of UC research to the California economy.**

### **5.2 Infrastructure and Extramural Support**

Declines in the research infrastructure (space and staff support) and competitive remuneration for faculty threaten research excellence at UC. A lack of a capital budget for buildings and maintenance limits access to new space for laboratories and libraries. Most recently, the federal sequester is having a serious impact as well.

**The Academic Senate encourages the President to take an active national role to ensure the competitiveness of California and the United States in supporting the most innovative research in the world. Research cannot flourish without up-to-date infrastructure, including both staffing and appropriate facilities, and UC relies heavily on indirect cost recovery to finance both general administrative support for the research enterprise and facilities construction and renovation. Recent decreases in direct research support as a consequence of the federal sequester have also reduced the funds collected as indirect cost recovery, with serious consequences for infrastructure. The Academic Senate urges that support and advocacy for research expressly address the need for infrastructure and that it include and recognize all forms of scholarship and creative work.**

**The Academic Senate recognizes that funding for academic buildings – both new buildings and renovations – will be highly constrained for the foreseeable future. Modern facilities are crucial for our research and education missions. At the same time, limited resources must be deployed strategically, and competing priorities, such as reducing the student-to-faculty ratio, must be thoroughly explored. The Senate urges a transparent decision making process that assures consultation at an early stage.**

While the vast majority of funded UC research is managed at the Divisions and at the national laboratories, the Office of the President provides research funds and support in three broad areas: multicampus research programs and initiatives (MRPI)<sup>59</sup>, individual grants programs, and the California Digital Library (CDL). As a result of budget cuts, grants programs have been severely constrained, with some programs being eliminated entirely. Perhaps the most visible still-existing program is a triennial research grants competition supported by fees that are paid by the Department of Energy for management of two National Nuclear Security Administration

---

<sup>59</sup> The MRPI awards are multiyear, span all disciplines and are meant to capitalize on cognate strengths of different campuses to address major research topics.

national laboratories. Central support for the CDL allows for significant economies of scale that enable access to critical research materials for faculty in all disciplines and at all locations.

Sustaining systemwide research and service in an era of declining research dollars is a top Senate priority, and three Senate committees work collaboratively with UCOP on policy and program issues. The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) works closely with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) and, over the past two years, has redesigned multicampus research unit (MRU) policies and evaluation protocols. The Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI) collaborates with the UCOP Office of Laboratory Management and with managers at the three national laboratories to encourage scientific collaboration between UC and the laboratory staff. The University Committee on Libraries and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) works in close partnership with the CDL to oversee and guide the University's deployment of library resources and publishing capabilities to support research.

**The Academic Senate strongly supports the role of UCOP in sponsoring centrally funded research and infrastructure. The Senate welcomes its continued oversight and consultation role in these programs through its committees and through judicious reliance on advice from faculty with specialized expertise.**

**The Academic Senate continues to support central funding for the CDL and will continue its role in overseeing library resources for UC through its related committees.**

### **5.3 Open Access Publishing of Scholarly Works**

After a protracted series of reviews, the Academic Council adopted an open access publishing policy at its July 24, 2013 meeting. The policy, which is similar to existing federal policies, grants a default license to the University to make research articles published by faculty available in an open access repository managed by the University. Individual faculty are not required to publish in open access journals and may opt out of the policy by declining to grant the license on an article-by-article basis, a provision that was necessary to win general support. Successful implementation of the policy will require adequate funding for the CDL to build out the repository so that it is both easily accessible to and trusted by all members of the faculty.

The Senate's open access policy applies only to Senate faculty. Given the significant numbers of non-Senate research professionals who belong to the University community, we urge that the President issue a policy that would apply to all employees. In addition to jurisdiction over all University employees, the President also controls resources and can ensure that the repository is adequately supported. As the publishing economy evolves in the coming years, the President may also want to dedicate resources to direct support of open access publishing, for example, by entering into contracts with commercial publishers or paying article charges for individual authors.

**The Senate urges the President to issue a systemwide Presidential policy on open access publishing that applies to all scholarly works published by all employees of the University of California.**

**The Senate supports the efforts of the Provost and the California Digital Library to make open access publishing a success in UC by providing infrastructure, expertise and adequate funding.**

## 6. SERVICE

As a land grant institution, UC's service role has been integral to its mission. The Academic Senate and its individual members are involved in service across a wide variety of arenas. The highest profiles are in health care, K-14 education, the National Laboratories, and Agriculture and Natural Resources programs, but this is by no means a complete list. Here we focus on activities that directly reflect institutional priorities and are highly visible both within the state and nationally.

### Critical Areas:

- *Improving shared governance for Senate and non-Senate research and teaching faculty is crucial to the UC service mission in health care. (Section 6.1);*
- *Evaluating faculty contributions to UC's service mission in K-14 can be problematic in a culture where the evaluation of research and teaching is better understood (Section 6.2);*
- *Sustaining and redefining as necessary the relationship between UC and the National Laboratories in a changing political and financial environment is critical (Section 6.3);*
- *Balancing resource allocations between extension programs and campus based research where their work overlaps in the service areas must ensure that primacy of the overall UC research (Section 6.4).*

### 6.1 Health Care

UC's five academic medical centers<sup>60</sup> (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco) are a vast resource for California, providing clinical training and conducting research while constituting California's fourth largest health-care delivery system. This enterprise is extremely complex and we will make no attempt to describe it here. The Academic Senate is engaged across UC's Health Care enterprise, but a large number non-Senate faculty and researchers (M.D.s and Ph.D.s) within the UC hospitals perform a substantial share of the service in the health sciences. Only small portions of the Senate's structures and processes are available to this group of non-Senate professionals, who also do not participate in Senate governance on general campuses. In order to protect UC quality, it is important to be vigilant about protecting faculty's academic freedoms in a context where they do not enjoy the privileges of tenure.

The Senate makes no specific recommendation but notes that a portion of non-Senate faculty and researchers engaged in the medical enterprise have been interested in becoming Senate members. As per the Regents' Standing Orders, the Senate determines its membership, and hence this issue continues to be dealt with through our Senate processes. Given the organizational and institutional differences between the general campuses and large hospital complexes, it is not clear that simply incorporating these employees into the Senate's shared governance role would ever be practical. Neither would many of these professionals wish to be evaluated by the criteria applied to Senate members. Medical Center administrators would not necessarily accept the extension of rights currently limited to Senate members, such as the right to a hearing by a Senate committee prior to imposition of discipline. Other privileges currently reserved primarily to Senate members, such as participation in the University's mortgage origination program, are controlled by the administration or the Regents and could be extended by policy without disrupting fundamental employment relationships.

---

<sup>60</sup> The new medical school at UC Riverside does not currently plan on developing a major medical center as exists on the other five campuses with medical schools.

**The Senate strongly supports the University's leadership in health services, research and teaching but urges ongoing attentiveness to the institutional tensions arising from the interaction between medical centers and general campuses.**

## **6.2 K-14**

All schools of education in UC have graduate and professional degree programs that interact directly with K-14, the most visible of which are in teacher education. Increasingly, however, other academic units are engaging K-14 with research that addresses current issues in education. Undergraduate, graduate and professional degree students work directly in K-14 schools as part of their academic programs, and UC faculty monitor their progress, develop liaisons with schools, and conduct research in school settings. These efforts are typically not highly visible to the public, nor are most academic units adept in evaluating faculty efforts in this arena. Given the continued calls for more K-12 and higher education collaboration, this will need attention over the next decade.

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) establishes criteria for certification of high school courses as acceptable for meeting UC's and CSU's requirements for admission. These are referred to as the 'a-g' requirements<sup>61</sup>, reflecting their designation in the Senate's Regulations. UC faculty participate in initiatives such as the California Subject Matter Projects (CSMP), which provide professional development to K-12 teachers, and the UC Curriculum Institutes, which develop rigorous Career Technical Education courses that meet a-g requirements. Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) at UCOP oversees numerous projects that reach out to and serve K-14 students, and faculty are involved in all aspects of these programs. The SAPEP activities, which are intended to increase the diversity of the pipeline to higher education, have strong support within the legislature.

**The Senate strongly supports of UC's and individual members' work in K-14 and is engaged in the diversity initiatives, both in the pipeline and in admission processes.**

**The Senate seeks to be proactive to ensure legislative actions assist UC in meeting its Master Plan obligations and enrolling a diverse student body.**

## **6.3. National Laboratories**

The University of California's management of the three national laboratories<sup>62</sup> has always been viewed as national service. LBNL remains under exclusive management by UC, while LANL and LLNL are now co-managed with corporate partners through Limited Liability Corporations. The Senate has taken a strong role in the oversight of these laboratories through its Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI). The Senate's partnership with the UCOP Office of Laboratory Management contributes to maintenance of scientific expectations at a level that enables their missions to be met. We have also championed collaborations between the

---

<sup>61</sup> Senate Regulation 424.2(a)-(g) (<http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/rpart2.html#r474>) lists the high school subjects required for eligibility to be admitted to the University: history/social science (2 years), English (4 years), mathematics (3 years), laboratory science (2 years), language other than English (2 years), visual and performing arts (1 year) and college preparatory elective (1 year).

<sup>62</sup> Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

laboratories and the campuses both in service of enhancing their respective research missions and to provide an academic outlet for the creative energies of the staff of the laboratories.

The challenges for the laboratories over the next decade will be contradictory and profound. Constraints on federal funding have the potential to reset expectations about future plans at the same time that new scientific challenges demand national engagement. For the national security labs, stockpile stewardship, the potential for new treaties on nuclear weapons, and the need to renew the workforce will require significant new investments, as will a potentially growing national consensus that understanding and preparing for climate change is a strategic national interest.

**The Senate believes that its continuing role in laboratory oversight will benefit all of the laboratory missions. We recently renewed the term of ACSCOLI to extend through the term of the current contract for LANL and LLNL. We welcome continuing engagement with the Office of Laboratory Management and increased engagement with the Office of the President on laboratory issues.**

#### **6.4 Agriculture and Natural Resources**

UC Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) has been highly visible to the legislature and the state since the inception of UC as a land grant university. Funded centrally (\$80M annually), ANR supports over 700 academic researchers in 40 departments at 3 colleges and 1 professional school and operates 57 local offices supporting over 300 Cooperative Extension advisors and specialists who interact with California industry and the public. Campus-based ANR research supports Senate faculty, encompasses a number of graduate degree programs, and has produced important innovations in California agriculture. Nonetheless, the combination of campus research and public outreach in the mission of ANR adds complexity to decisions about- and accountability for- resources. The Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) was formed on the model of ACSCOLI to develop detailed understanding of the mission and to bring a Senate perspective to bear in regular interactions with ANR leadership regarding the research and education issues that link the faculty to ANR.

**The Senate believes that continuing interactions with ANR leadership through ACSCANR is essential to ensuring an appropriate balance of the educational, research and service aspects of ANR's mission.**

### **7. SUSTAINING FACULTY EXCELLENCE**

The excellence of UC faculty is critically important to the quality of education and research conducted at the University. The quality of teaching and research depends on successfully recruiting and retaining faculty. In turn, recruitment and retention rely on a competitive market position for all of our faculty, especially for candidates in high demand. It is also clear that UC needs to continue and strengthen its efforts to increase faculty diversity. Recruiting, mentoring and retaining female and underrepresented minority faculty requires constant vigilance to ensure success.

#### **7.1 Total Remuneration**

The Senate has consistently advised using total remuneration as the appropriate tool for assessing the competitiveness of our overall compensation package. We distinguish total remuneration from total compensation, cash compensation and benefits prevalence for several

reasons. The benefits that UC offer differ from those at many other universities and makes apples-to-apples comparisons difficult<sup>63</sup>. This does not necessarily mean that they are better or worse, but the differences require careful analysis. For example, since UC is one of few academic institutions with a defined benefit pension plan, general market comparisons yield inaccurate results when they compare UC to institutions with defined contribution plans. Total remuneration, unlike other compensation analyses, includes longitudinal data and actuarial projections, and normalizes the cash value of disparate benefits to allow for head-to-head comparisons.

The most recent total remuneration study was completed in 2009<sup>64</sup>. Beginning in July 2012, the Senate has promoted the need for a new study that would measure the effects of restarting employee contributions to our retirement plan and the cumulative effects of budget reductions on the valuation of faculty compensation.

**The Academic Senate continues to promote the need for a comprehensive total remuneration study based on a methodology that is accepted by both the administration and faculty. On July 23, 2013, President Yudof agreed to undertake that study and put it into motion under the guidance of the Office of the Provost. The Senate urges that an advisory group be formed with Senate membership. The Senate also urges close collaboration with Human Resources, which has considerable expertise in doing such studies. The Senate will work closely with the administration to ensure that the study provides the necessary information for informed decision-making. It is essential that the Senate participate in determining what actions to take, if any, as a result of this study.**

## **7.2 Post Tenure Review and Compensation**

As discussed in Section 1.3, faculty salaries have been tied historically to our merit and promotion system, which includes rigorous peer review. This linkage has been the backbone of a personnel system within which, over generations, faculty have been assured that continuing excellence in all areas of scholarship would be rewarded regardless of whether they pursued outside offers or threatened to do so.

**The Senate strongly believes that competitive faculty salaries are vital to the excellence of the University. The total remuneration study should provide guidance as to how to move towards parity with our “Comparison Eight”<sup>65</sup> institutions and appropriate alignment of salaries with our merit and promotion system to reward excellence. The last time UC salaries aligned with comparison eight salaries was 2001. While it appears that UC salaries currently lag by at least 10%, the new total remuneration study recently approved by President Yudof will tell a more complete story.**

## **7.3 Faculty Diversity**

Beyond competitive remuneration and academic excellence, UC’s faculty is judged by its

---

<sup>63</sup> The most prominent of these is the defined benefit retirement plan, see Section 1.2.

<sup>64</sup> <http://compensation.universityofcalifornia.edu/comparisons.html>

<sup>65</sup> Selected in an agreement with the state, our comparison eight institutions have been used to establish benchmarks since the 1980’s. They are Harvard, Stanford, MIT, Yale, Michigan, SUNY-Buffalo, Virginia and Illinois.

diversity<sup>66</sup>. The current faculty demographic trend<sup>67</sup> shows the difficulty in recruiting and retaining young faculty, female faculty and faculty of color. UC competes with the best universities in the world to recruit from national and international pools of candidates. In order to secure the best and brightest new faculty – and keep them at UC for their most productive academic years – UC must offer a welcoming campus climate<sup>68</sup>. Fostering that climate through successful recruitments requires competitive remuneration packages at the start. Equally, if not more important over the long term, retention requires regular monitoring of campus compensation patterns to ensure that neither gender nor ethnicity suppress promotional increases that are competitive and equitable over the course of a career. Further, it is the consistent view of the Senate that our reward structure needs to be funded at a rate that mitigates any perceived need for our current faculty to seek outside offers of employment as leverage to raise their salaries.

**The Senate has joined with the Office of the President to promote salary equity for female faculty and faculty of color. Campuses are required to carefully analyze this issue and take steps to ensure that no inequities exist. The Senate is working with the Provost to monitor the progress of this effort. The Senate expects a rigorous approach to ensuring salary equity.**

**The Senate has promoted increased funding for the President’s Post-Doctoral Fellowship (PPDF) program as a means of identifying potential faculty with a strong interest in diversity who can eventually become UC faculty.**

**The Senate leadership has also promoted the participation of the national laboratories affiliated with UC in the PPDF program using funds from the laboratories. According to the most recent information, this will occur in the competition for these fellowships. The Senate hopes to remain involved with this initiative.**

---

<sup>66</sup> The Academic Senate’s commitment to diversity can be seen in the recent addition to the Academic Council of a new permanent member, the chair of UCAAD (as of 2006), and their continuing work on faculty salary equity.

<sup>67</sup> <http://accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/accountabilityreport13.pdf>

<sup>68</sup> President Yudof circulated The Final Report of the Faculty Diversity Working Group dated December 4, 2012, to campus, UCOP and Senate leaders on August 7, 2013.