Dear Janet:

At its June 27, 2018 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed the attached letter from the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) to express a request that shared governance be more effectively engaged in the process of evaluating potential changes to systemwide programs housed at UCOP, particularly in advising on foundational questions as to their location and governance.

This request follows from the Academic Council’s letter of March 9, Principles for Interpretation of the Huron Report. That letter noted the laudatory findings from Huron regarding the functionality of UCOP and stated that: “changes should only be made to enhance the function of the University of California.” Now under serious consideration, proposed changes to major units as well as to special programs that benefit the whole university – UC Health, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, UC Press, the Education Abroad Program, and ILTI, among others – could seriously compromise the critical systemwide nature of, and systemwide support for, these important efforts.

These endeavors are central to the University’s academic mission, and as such we believe it vital that the Academic Senate participate in a thorough review of each. We can provide our best counsel on the implications of any move or change in oversight on instruction, research, and service. Several units being considered for relocation fall directly under the advisory umbrellas of corresponding Senate committees which can offer analyses useful to the Administration in fully assessing the consequences. Academic considerations should be the primary driver in the current reorganization process.

Accordingly, Council requests that the Senate be fully engaged in the foundational review of proposals to relocate or reorganize systemwide programs or units housed at UCOP that wholly, or in part, relate to the academic mission. This would include an opportunity for systemwide reviews of the final UC ANR and UC Health Advisory Committee work products.
We look forward to productive engagement of the ongoing partnership between the Administration and the Academic Senate. We are very pleased to note that some of the proposals in Council’s letter of March 12, *UCOP Reorientation*, regarding consolidation have been advanced by you. In addition, we hope you will further consider the key recommendations to separate UCOP’s governance functions from its service and support functions, and to alter reporting relationships to better focus attention upon the University’s teaching, research, and public service mission.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Shane N. White, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Provost Brown
    Academic Council
    Senate Director Baxter
    Senate Executive Directors
SHANE WHITE, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: UCOP Reorganization

Dear Shane:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) is deeply concerned about the initiatives to move administration of systemwide University of California operations from UCOP to the campuses. These changes go beyond a simple reorganization of UCOP; they reflect a reorganization of the University itself. For this reason, the core principle of shared governance must apply; any such proposals deserve more—and more substantive—consultation with the Academic Senate.

Several units being considered for relocation manage academic programs that support mission-critical activities in teaching and scholarship at multiple campuses. Yet, despite the centrality of the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP), the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR), and UC Press to the UC academic mission, consideration of removing them from UCOP is being made on a case-by-case basis without appropriate Senate consultation. For example, neither the UCEAP Governing Board nor the Senate were given an opportunity to weigh in on EAP’s move to UCSB; faculty input was limited to the details of the MOU and new “Advisory Committee.” The President has now appointed “Tiger Teams” to develop recommendations for the future of UC Health and ANR in a compressed summer timeline for consideration by the Regents in November. Each team includes only one faculty member. We are also aware that the President is considering moving UC Press to UCLA and the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) to a new location. We are concerned with the speed at which these processes are moving forward and about the lack of Senate involvement—even Senate committees responsible for providing oversight of these units are being left out of the discussions.

The motivation for these actions appears to stem from political challenges that UCOP is facing in state government and the resulting desire to reduce UCOP’s visible budget and improve external impressions. Importantly, however, the Huron Report noted that “UCOP offers world class services that are the standard and best practices across higher education,” and that “UCOP is in the bottom half of the eleven system offices in terms of relative size.” In other words, the authors of the report find that UCOP does a good job and is not overly large. We are concerned that if further
restructuring is suggested, we will, as with UCEAP, be presented with a *fait accompli* and that the Senate will once again be able to do no more than request an additional member or two on an already-formed advisory group.

We agree that streamlining reporting lines within UCOP is the purview and responsibility of the President. Nonetheless, the President appears to be developing plans to fundamentally re-envision the University’s systemwide functions without a clear strategic vision that addresses broader questions about UCOP’s overall role, mission, and structure. Any plans to restructure programs such as ANR, UC Health, or UC Press must focus not only on the business implications—which themselves have not been clearly spelled out; rather they must consider, with due respect for Senate purview and processes, changes that might alter or diminish the connection of these units to the University’s academic mission.

In brief, we support a careful review of systemwide operations to ensure that their organization and management provide the greatest benefits to faculty and students throughout the University. However, we oppose a piecemeal process to restructure the intellectual logic that holds University of California systemwide functions together; *and we are adamant that any such review must involve appropriate Senate consultation.*

Sincerely,

Joshua Schimel, Chair
UCPB

Encl.

cc: UCPB
Executive Director Baxter