

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Henry C. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-9711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: henry.powell@ucop.edu

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

June 11, 2010

PRESIDENT MARK G. YUDOF

Dear Mark:

I am pleased to transmit the Academic Senate's full comment on the 29 recommendations developed by the Working Groups of the Commission on the Future in their first phase. During the review period after the recommendations were released, the Senate has collected commentary from 12 standing committees and all 10 divisions. As you know, the comment from the divisions consolidates the work of various committees within each division. Taken together, this body of work presents a complex analysis, grounded in experience and deep knowledge of the University. Although its sheer volume may be daunting, the Academic Council's Memorandum to the Commission on the Future serves as a valuable navigational guide. I am confident that the Commission's work will be enhanced by consideration of the perspectives offered here.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this report.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Henry C. Powell".

Henry C. Powell
Chair, Universitywide Academic Senate

Encl: (2)

Cc: Associate Vice President Kelman
Academic Council
Executive Director Winnacker

**MEMORANDUM TO THE
UC COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE**

**FROM THE UC ACADEMIC COUNCIL
June 11, 2010**

Re: Senate Response to the First Round of the Working Group Recommendations

The first round of recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future Working Groups was circulated to all committees of the Academic Senate on each campus and to the systemwide standing committees for evaluation and comment. Individual members of the Senate throughout the University devoted significant time providing thoughtful commentary regarding the recommendations. Extensive comments were received from Senate agencies. These comments were debated by the Academic Council at its May 26, 2010, meeting. In addition, the Academic Council independently drafted its own recommendation to the Commission, which has been circulated to the Commission. The Academic Council is the executive body of the UC Academic Senate. The Council includes the chairs of each of the ten campus divisions of the Academic Senate plus the chairs of eight of the seventeen systemwide standing committees of the Senate. This memorandum to the Commission summarizes the commentary received from agencies of the Academic Senate throughout the University and reports the position of the Academic Council.

Overview of the Working Group Recommendations

The University of California is a uniquely successful institution. No other institution in the world, public or private, provides a high quality education to such a diverse student body by a world-renowned research faculty on multiple campuses. The Commission should seek to sustain and build upon this remarkable success story. The work of the Commission is by its nature an undertaking to make the best better.

The University has evolved into the best public institution in the world over its 140 year history as a result of great leadership and supportive policies, and particularly due to the commitment of the public and state leaders to the Master Plan for Higher Education. The genius of the Master Plan facilitated the development of a single University system with ten integrated yet unique major research campuses, of which 6 have been designated members of the prestigious Association of American Universities. The extraordinary public support for the University, in conjunction with its unique system of merit reviews for promotion, has attracted promising faculty, and has enabled the University to retain them. The strength of the University stems from the quality of the faculty.

Generous state financing also has enabled the University to be truly accessible and affordable to the public it serves. The cornerstones of the University, quality, access, and affordability, must be fiercely defended; they define who we are.

The Academic Council acknowledges the tremendous effort and contribution of time provided by the members of the five Commission Working Groups. The Commission was created in response to a revenue crisis caused by a severe decline in the State's financial support to higher education, in conjunction with a long-term downward trend in funding. The combined recommendations provide a thorough self-study of the University of California in response to this budgetary morass.

The Commission also was born from a need to “develop a vision for the future of the University that will reaffirm our role in sustaining California’s economy and cultural life while recognizing that our limited state resources require us to be creative and strategic in meeting that mission.” To date, the Working Group recommendations have not fulfilled this second objective. The recommendations do not offer a comprehensive vision of UC’s future. Rather, they provide incremental, budget-driven solutions focused on efficiency. The Working Groups pay tribute to the mission of the University, but their discussion does not return to these values, with the result that their recommendations are driven by fiscal expediency, rather than justified by values. An exception to this is the Education and Curriculum Working Group’s attempt to define “UC quality.” The Academic Council hopes that these, and any forthcoming recommendations, are measured by the extent to which they preserve core principles.

The lack of pedagogical justification for the recommendations is particularly troubling. By focusing on “throughput,” the vision of undergraduate education expressed in the recommendations seems to undermine the purpose of a liberal arts education—to prepare students with the analytic tools to be successful and productive citizens in whatever fields they choose. UC’s educational mission is broader than job training, and this distinguishes it from other state institutions. The recommendations also disregard the singular contribution to the undergraduate experience of an education informed by a faculty engaged in research, which provides an opportunity for students to participate in the creation of knowledge. The oversight of the significance of UC’s mission as a research institution also is reflected in the dearth of recommendations regarding graduate education. Graduate students are central to the quality and reputation of the University; they should not be an afterthought. The University should affirm the importance of graduate students both to faculty projects and the University’s research mission, and to undergraduate education, by addressing the issues facing graduate students.

No one deliberative process, no single legislative session, no single set of administrators, can restructure the University to produce a better result. While the Working Groups’ self-study is rich with ideas that may improve the functioning of the University, the recommendations fail to provide an evaluation of their cumulative effect, nor do they provide a solution to the University’s growing and systemic budget deficit. That absence is instructive. We learn from the failure to easily solve the budget shortfall that there is no magic bullet that will maintain the quality of the research and teaching programs of the University of California in the absence of adequate resources. The magnitude of the fiscal deficit is simply too great to be solved by incremental fixes. The University must convince the public and the legislature to reinvest in public education as an investment in the future of California. The rise of California as a great economic power is due in large part to the success of its university systems.

In an attempt to grapple with the magnitude of the problem, the Commission should address the “big questions” of the appropriate and acceptable size of the faculty and student body, whether the University can afford to continue to grow programmatically and in terms of capital infrastructure, and how to maintain the quality of the University through competitive faculty remuneration. The recently released “[Choices](#)” report written by the Academic Senate’s University Committee on Planning and Budget assesses competing options and priorities and offers a choice

among them based on a set of principles. To this end, the Academic Council has drafted and submitted a recommendation of its own addressing these issues, which was sent to the Commission under a separate cover. We look forward to a full debate and review of this recommendation.

As the work of the Commission proceeds, the Academic Council hopes that many of the recommendations will be elaborated. While the recommendations on the whole state laudable goals, they lack implementation details, evaluation of their costs and benefits, and consideration in the context of competing and even contradictory recommendations. Formal Senate endorsement of any of the recommendations will be contingent on further review of well-specified proposals. Finally, we remind the Commission that full and adequate consultation requires time for deliberation. Consultation on forthcoming recommendations should take into consideration the academic calendar, and the Regents should not take action without faculty consultation. The Senate offers its considerable expertise and a strong grass-roots deliberative process. The future of the University deserves no less.

Senate Response to the First Round of Working Group Recommendations

The remainder of this document summarizes the Senate's collective assessment of the recommendations submitted by the five Commission Working Groups. The response is organized thematically by addressing related recommendations from different Working Groups together. Most of the recommendations were discussed by the Academic Council at its May 26 meeting. The responses to some recommendations were sufficiently uniform that the Council was able to endorse or reject those recommendations by consensus.

Fees and Financing

Access and Affordability Recommendation 1: Reaffirm UC's commitment to access for California students.

Academic Council strongly supports this recommendation. That said, it is important for the State to reaffirm its commitment to quality public higher education through reliable funding. It will become increasingly difficult for UC to maintain its commitment to access for California students without increased support from the State.

Access and Affordability Recommendation 2: Reaffirm the University's commitment to be financially accessible for all undergraduate students admitted to UC.

Council also agrees with this recommendation, but notes that in order to make the University truly financially accessible, the following issues must be addressed: 1) Financial aid should be made a systemwide priority, which acknowledges that some campuses enroll more financially needy students than others (UCM); and 2) the University may need to pay more attention to financial accessibility for middle income students, taking measures to ensure that students from all economic backgrounds have similar levels of access by re-evaluating the balance of grants, loans and work expectations (UCEP).

Access and Affordability Recommendation 4: Re-establish UC financial aid eligibility for undocumented California high school graduates.

Council supports this recommendation on the grounds of both diversity and fairness to undocumented students. On the first point, re-establishing financial aid eligibility will increase diversity at UC by allowing more of these students to enroll at a UC campus. On the second point, it is important to note that approximately one-third of student fees paid by undocumented students are used to support other financially needy students, yet undocumented students have not benefited from financial aid programs (UCEP).

Access and Affordability Recommendation 5: Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering cohort of new undergraduate students.

Although Council favors providing accurate information about current and future fee levels to students and their parents for planning purposes, there are significant financial and legal risks to the University of adopting this recommendation, given the instability of the State's support of public higher education. Therefore, Council does not support this recommendation. Enacting such a policy would straightjacket UC not only by limiting the University's ability to respond to extreme financial circumstances, but also by forcing it to dramatically increase student fees every fourth year (UCB, UCLA, UCR, UCSD, UCEP, UCPB). In short, this recommendation is impractical when the State is not a reliable partner (UCM). Moreover, it does not make sense that students from two different cohorts could conceivably take the same course, but pay different levels of fees for it (UCD, UCLA, UCR, BOARS, UCPB).

Access and Affordability Recommendation 6: Rename the Education Fee and the Professional Degree Fees (but not the Registration Fee) as “tuition.”

Council agrees with this recommendation, noting that all state universities underwrite a portion of the costs of their student bodies. They nevertheless charge “tuition,” which in California has been called “fees.” Technically, “fees” include other specialized costs for diverse programs that not all students are required to pay. To be consistent with other higher education institutions, UC should call these required payments by their proper name, “tuition” (UCSD, UCEP). Renaming “fees” as tuition will minimize confusion sometimes involved with securing federal funding for student aid.

Funding Strategies Recommendation 5: Adopt a multiyear strategy to replace student fees with tuition, generate new revenue to protect academic quality, and strengthen university planning.

Although Council agrees with relabeling “student fees” as “tuition,” it cannot support this recommendation as a whole for two reasons: 1) The State Legislature does not give UC a three-year budget and the state does not have a predictable revenue stream, so instituting such a policy is unwise (UCI, UCPB); and 2) it also could harm student morale by establishing four unequal cohorts, placing a larger burden on each entering freshman class (UCPB). Finally, such a policy could legally constrain UC’s ability to raise fees (UCPB). While Council applauds the Commission for forward-

thinking, it cannot support either this recommendation or Access and Affordability Recommendation 5, given the instability of the state budget.

Funding Strategies Recommendation 7: Advocate for a Pell Augmentation Grant to Institutions (“Pell PLUS”).

Council strongly endorses this recommendation. In so doing, we note that low-income students often come from high schools that lack adequate diversity of academic offerings and provide less counseling support, and they often need additional support services to make sure they do not fall behind students from better funded schools (UCEP). UCPB adds that in not advocating for Pell Augmentation grants, UC appears to be leaving money on the table.

Funding Strategies Recommendation 9: Allow for the possibility of charging differential tuition by campus, as a means of mitigating potential future enrollment impacts on some campuses.

Council strongly rejects this recommendation. Differential tuition by campus would inevitably undermine the UC system, and lead to the stratification of campuses. Such stratification would negatively affect the quality of academic programs, students and faculty, and public perceptions of campus goals (UCD, UCI, UCM, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCSD, UCSF, BOARS, UCEP, & UCPB). Public education is not a private good; this recommendation is embedded in an economic model applicable to the private sector, not the public sector, and undermines the rationale for public support of UC. It also ignores the benefits that all faculty and students derive from the system.

Systemwide Research Collaboration

Research Strategies Recommendation 2: The University of California must ensure continued excellence across a broad spectrum of cutting-edge research. To aid in this effort, the University should (1) prioritize internal funds to support world-class research in disciplines where extramural funding options are limited; (2) motivate the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects to capture new funding streams; and (3) augment and enhance opportunities for graduate student research and support wherever possible.

Council lends its conditional support to this recommendation, citing the following caveat: Prioritizing internal funds to support research “where extramural funding options are limited” would direct UC research funds away from those activities for which such funding exists. UC should maintain support for excellent research across a broad range of disciplines, including those for which external funds are scarce (UCSB, ACSCOLI, UCORP). Campus faculty should also be an integral part of the planning process for large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects (UCEP, UCPB), with graduate students playing key roles (CCGA, UCEP).

Research Strategies Recommendation 3: Create multicampus, interdisciplinary “UC Grand Challenge Research Initiatives” to realize the enormous potential of UC’s ten campuses and three national laboratories on behalf of the state and the nation.

The Senate is divided on this recommendation, with five divisions (UCD, UCI, UCM, UCR, UCSF) and three committees (ACSCOLI, UCAAD, and UCOPE) in favor, and four divisions (UCB, UCLA, UCSB, UCSD) and two committees (UCEP, UCPB) against the recommendation. One justification for such “Grand Challenge” initiatives lies in the type of research that currently is being funded. For example, NIH and NSF have instituted large-scale research funding programs (e.g., the NIH Roadmap) that are best addressed by harnessing the expertise of research laboratories in multiple institutions (UCSF). Senate divisions and committees expressed a number of reservations about this recommendation. First, the funding process associated with the traditional Multiple Research Units (MRUs) and the newly established Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPIs) lacked clarity, transparency, and faculty oversight. Along with the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (CAL ISIs), these programs are the most likely candidates to undertake such “Grand Challenge Research Initiatives” (UCD, UCI, UCSB, UCSD, ACSCOLI, UCEP). In addition, UC already is engaged in grand challenge research through existing entities (Cal ISIs, MRPIs, etc.), and new initiatives may draw money away from some existing endeavors. At the very least, the relationship between new initiatives and existing research units must be clarified (UCD, UCI, UCSB, UCSD, ACSCOLI, UCAAD, UCEP). Funding additional initiatives may be difficult given the current budgetary environment (UCR, UCSD). The development of new “Grand Challenge” initiatives must be balanced against assisting faculty with existing grants in meeting their obligations by providing access to indirect cost funds and other central resources that would facilitate completion of the work (UCSF). Finally, as with Research Strategies Recommendation 2, Council reiterates that any “Grand Challenge” initiatives should not be planned in a top-down fashion (UCSB, UCSD, UCEP, UCPB).

Non-Residents

Size and Shape Recommendation 1: Increase the number and proportion of non-resident students at the undergraduate level.

Funding Strategies Recommendation #6: Increase enrollment of nonresident undergraduates.

If California resident students who are funded by the State are not displaced, then the Senate could support these two recommendations. Council’s main concern is to ensure that non-resident students do not force out residents. Members also are wary of the political risk associated with this proposal (UCD, UCI, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCSD, BOARS, UCAAD, UCEP, UCOPE, & UCPB). BOARS emphasizes that any increase should be informed by its [August 2009 Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment](#). Finally, UCIE has reservations about how international student enrollments would be increased; international students may not increase quality or contribute to diversity.

Graduate Issues

Size and Shape Recommendation 4: Allied health practice doctorates. Examine the utility of practice doctorates for allied health professions in terms of national healthcare quality and costs, UC and CSU missions, and the future needs of California residents.

Council conditionally supports this recommendation with the following comments. First, UCSF endorses the recommendation that a nationwide study be conducted on the benefits of practice doctorates. A study would allow education and health professionals, rather than state regulatory authorities, to clarify the appropriate educational requirements needed to provide high quality care. It also is critical to assess whether and how such programs improve clinical outcomes. CCGA recommends that UC continues to encourage the development of joint doctoral programs (JDPs) in these professions, rather than being developed unilaterally by the CSUs. Above all, respondents emphasized that the research doctorate should remain the exclusive domain of UC (CCGA, UCEP, UCPB). Practice doctorates either could be offered as JDPs (CCGA) or UC could opt out of offering a few specified practice doctorates (UCEP). UC should retain control over those practice degrees in the allied health sciences that include a significant degree of research training (UCEP, UCPB).

Access and Affordability Recommendation 3: Reaffirm the University's commitment to fulfilling graduate education's role in serving UC's research enterprise, UC's teaching mission, and the diverse knowledge and workforce demands of the State and beyond.

Council strongly endorses this recommendation and laments the lack of specific recommendations that address the recruitment and funding of graduate students. Many UCs are located in areas with high cost of living, which makes it difficult to compete for graduate students with institutions which offer more support. The UC system should explore foundations and industry as sources of increased funding for graduate and professional education (UCSF). Also, while we recognize the needs of the state in certain professional fields, we recommend that graduate programs be developed based on faculty specialties and campus interest, and not be mandated by the State Legislature as was recently proposed by the Legislative Analyst's Office (CCGA). We note that identified state needs change frequently, while the development of strong graduate programs grounded in research occurs over the long term.

Self-Supporting Programs

Education & Curriculum Recommendation 3: Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities.

Although the enticement of additional revenue may be attractive, Council has significant concerns about this recommendation and does not endorse it. First, these programs are market-driven and are subject to sudden changes in student demand, which could result in hiring faculty for programs that may not endure (UCI, UCEP). There also is significant skepticism as to whether these programs are truly self-supporting, as they inevitably draw upon state-supported resources such as shared facilities, faculty instructional time, etc. (UCSB, UCSF, UCPB). At a minimum, Council recommends that the University engage in a system of full cost accounting before developing more self-supporting programs. There also are issues of quality, access, and competition between state-funded and self-supporting programs. To maintain quality, all self-supporting programs need Senate oversight, but even then, the overall quality of UC's undergraduate instruction may decline, given the limited number of faculty available to teach (UCLA, UCR, UCSD, CCGA). The Senate also has

concerns about the University Extension's role in the running of these programs (UCD, UCR). Competition between state-supported programs and self-supported programs remains an unresolved issue. CCGA notes that a number of "poor" academic departments or programs are trying to establish self-supporting programs. Self-supporting programs also may cannibalize existing state-supported academic programs by diverting students. Finally, both CCGA and UCAAD have serious doubts that self-supporting programs will be accessible to some groups of working professionals and underserved communities, given the high costs and fees associated with many of them.

Advocacy

Funding Strategies Recommendation 1: Develop a multiyear advocacy campaign aimed at grass roots opinion leaders throughout the State of California to foster public and political support for the University as a major priority for state funding.

Research Strategies Recommendation 5: Proactively demonstrate the significant and long-lasting benefits that UC research provides to California and the nation, including the development of new knowledge, new industries, and new opportunities for economic expansion and employment. In addition, UC should speak in a strong and clear voice in advocating at the national level for increased and sustained investment in research and knowledge development.

Council strongly endorses both of these recommendations. With respect to Funding Strategies Recommendation 1, UCEP remarks that such advocacy specifically should include faculty, students and alumni to help provide a grassroots perspective on the value of higher education to citizens and to the State of California. The University should also partner with business interests in California, and engage in local political advocacy at the campus level. Regarding Research Strategies Recommendation 5, CCGA comments that actively demonstrating the significant and long-lasting benefits that UC research provides to California's economy and the nation is essential, as is advocacy at the national level for increased and sustained investment in research.

Indirect Cost Recovery

Funding Strategies Recommendation 3: Revise practice and policy on charging indirect cost recovery for non-federally funded research

While in principle, Council supports recovering greater indirect costs from all sources of funding, it does not support revising the current policy on charging indirect cost recovery for non-federally funded research. Its main concerns stem from the threat to UC's competitiveness for grants if it unilaterally rejects grants that do not pay indirect costs (UCI recommends that UC work with other AAU institutions to modify the policies of non-federal funding agencies). Among Council's chief concerns are the potential harm to the ability of junior faculty to get grants and advance in their careers, and disproportionate effects on faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences (UCB, UCSB). Secondary effects of lost grants could include decreasing the diversity of the faculty and declining opportunities for graduate students. Finally, any decision to accept or reject research monies should be made at the campus level. Note that some funding agencies are prohibited from providing money for indirect costs.

Funding Strategies Recommendation 4: Improve indirect cost recovery rates with federal agencies.

Research Strategies Recommendation 1: The University of California must recover a greater share of the costs of research sponsored by outside agencies and make its management of those funds more transparent to ensure accountability to its sponsors and its researchers.

Council endorsed a statement applauding greater transparency in the management of indirect costs and efforts to recover a greater share of the costs of sponsored research from all sources, and particularly to increase indirect cost recovery rates with federal agencies. However it does not support the rejection of grants that do not provide indirect costs. Council cautions that flexibility is paramount to maintaining UC research competitiveness (UCI). For those agencies that cap grants, an increase in indirect costs will reduce funds available for research and graduate support (UCD, UCSD, UCEP, CCGA). More dynamic models for establishing appropriate overhead rates would be desirable; some research projects, particularly in the Humanities, do not require significant infrastructure (UCSD), and costs vary among campuses. However, the benefits to principal investigators of research sponsored by the University and their use of collective goods such as facilities and administration, necessitates a systemwide approach to indirect cost recovery.

Therefore, Council supports central negotiation with federal agencies (UCD, UCSB).

Transfer

Size and Shape Recommendation 2: Improve the student transfer function by developing more complete lower-division transfer pathways in high-demand majors.

The Senate overwhelmingly supports facilitating transfer by easing pathways for students into majors, with the caveat that faculty must retain local curricular authority over majors (UCB). The process of standardizing curricula across campuses will require resources to support the articulation of courses (UCSB, UCSC), particularly when the Community Colleges are under great strain (UCI). Also, campuses should be allowed to opt out of recommended changes and provide alternative transfer pathways. Concerns were raised about the lack of student readiness, and the need to assess transfer students to ensure adequate preparation and to develop support services for them (UCSB, UCEP, UCOPE). Finally, BOARS notes its endorsement of existing efforts to ease transfer, including its support of the Community College Academic Senate's Course Identification project (C-ID), which is an effort to develop a common course numbering system throughout CCC for lower division major courses. BOARS also supports (and UCEP supports the consideration of) full implementation of Senate Regulation 477¹, which provides for the acceptance of a set of lower

¹ When four or more UC Senate Divisions agree to accept a course from a given California Community College as transferable for preparation for a specific major, the course will be deemed as transferable for the same major at all UC Senate Divisions one year after notification of the divisions. Similarly, if four or more Senate Divisions agree to accept a set of courses as adequate for lower-division major-preparation for a UC upper-division major discipline, that set of courses will be deemed as accepted for lower-division preparation in the same major at all the UC Senate Divisions one year after notification of the Senate Divisions. During the year following initial notification, individual Senate Divisions may decline to participate in the agreement. Additionally, all Senate Divisions will be given an annual opportunity to opt out of any previous obligation resulting from this regulation. The Academic Council or the senate agency it so

division courses for major preparation if four or more divisional Senates accept them for the same major (it allows divisions to opt out within a year of notification and annually thereafter). UCEP recommends that any proposal to improve transfer be evaluated by the appropriate Senate agencies—UCEP, UCOPE, and BOARS.

Size and Shape Recommendation 3: To improve the student transfer function, enhance the ASSIST website for greater user-friendliness and improved capabilities.

The Senate strongly supports this recommendation, provided that the costs are equally shared by the three segments. Some suggest doing a cost-benefit analysis prior to further development, and/or assessing the cost-effectiveness of improvements (UCI, UCSB).

Administrative Efficiencies

Size and Shape Recommendation 5: Eliminate administrative redundancies across the UC system and promote efficiencies where possible.

Funding Strategies Recommendation 2: Design and implement a system to identify, promote, and adopt the best administrative practices within the UC system.

Senate agencies favored efforts to eliminate redundancies and promote best practices, depending on evaluation of the particular projects proposed. Proven best practices should be shared among campuses and start-up costs and savings estimates should be weighed (UCSB, UCPB). Faculty should be included on any committee reviewing best practices (UCEP). Several respondents caution that centralization and the development of large-scale systems can be costly and that in some circumstances, redundancies are appropriate (UCLA, UCEP, UCPB). UOEAP is an illustration of centralization that benefits all campuses (UCSC, UCIE). Respondents strongly endorsed examining the relative growth in senior management and administrative staff vis-à-vis student and faculty FTE (UCPB, UCFW).

Research Strategies Recommendation 4: Streamline risk management practices to increase the efficiency of the research enterprise, making optimal use of faculty researchers and administrative staff support.

Senate committees and divisions strongly endorse an effort to streamline risk management practices. They argue that UC is too risk-averse, and that the costs of compliance are higher than the benefits (UCB, UCI). Compliance requirements governed by multiple external and internal authorities have become increasingly burdensome on faculty time and are not coordinated systemwide or even within campuses. For example, UCSF notes that there are no mechanisms to adjudicate instances when regulations conflict (e.g., efforts to increase transparency can violate the privacy of research

designates shall advise the President on the implementation of this regulation so as to ensure that there is adequate notice for all Senate Divisions, that Senate Divisions have an annual opportunity to opt out of these obligations, and that community college students who intend to transfer to UC are minimally affected by a Senate Division's decision to no longer accept a course or set of courses.

subjects), and recommends an ombudsman to resolve conflicts between administrative arms of the University.

Improving Time to Degree

Education and Curriculum Recommendation 1. Manage educational resources more effectively and efficiently to:

(1) Increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years.

Council supports this recommendation, as long as some flexibility is maintained in recognition of different student circumstances, and as long as the focus is on eliminating systemic roadblocks to timely progress. There are legitimate reasons for students taking longer than four years, including a change of majors or the need to work (UCI, UCSD, BOARS). Respondents also note recent success at improving time to degree--graduation rates are climbing (UCSB, UCSC, UCPB). Alternate suggestions for improvements are focusing on the number of units rather than the number of years enrolled (UCI), limiting credits required for majors (UCLA), reviewing degree audit systems and bottlenecks to gateway courses (UCEP), and allowing faculty to teach in summer in lieu of a quarter or semester (BOARS).

(2) Create a pathway for undergraduate students to complete degrees in three years.

The Academic Council endorses this recommendation, provided that the University facilitates the opportunity for well-prepared students but does not broadly promote it or require students to remain in that track (UCB, UCI, UCLA, UCM, UCSB, UCPB). Currently, just under 3 percent of graduates complete their degree in three years. Many respondents expressed concern that a three-year degree undermines the aim of a liberal arts education (UCB). It would curtail intellectual exploration, minors, changes in major, overseas experience, and research opportunities (UCB, UCD, UCSC, UCEP, UCIE). Moreover, students who are able to complete degree requirements in three years are the ones who would benefit most from the opportunities of attending a research institution (UCSC). If UC quality is defined by learning informed by a research environment, then the recommendation's impact on educational quality is cause for concern (UCPB). Summer courses are less likely to be taught by ladder-rank research faculty, and AP classes are not of UC quality (UCB, UCEP). Respondents also feared that because UC currently does not have the resources to meet course demand, prioritizing access for 3-year students could displace other students, particularly those in impacted majors (UCD, UCEP). Finally, some financial aid packages do not cover summer sessions (UCEP).

(3) Make more effective use of faculty resources.

Academic Council notes that the University already is making effective use of faculty resources. With budget cuts and increases in faculty to student ratios, faculty are working more. In addition, the University has increasingly relied on lecturers in an unplanned, *de facto* manner, and even greater use of lecturers will negatively impact the character of the institution (UCB, UCM, UCPB). Some Council members favored a strategic and explicit policy of hiring lecturers with security of employment in order to retain ladder-rank faculty as a temporary response to the budget crisis. The

Senate, as a whole, opposed this recommendation, primarily because of the suggestion that research grant funding should be used to buy out ladder-rank faculty from instruction. Respondents argued that buy-outs will create inequities in teaching loads, will disproportionately burden younger faculty or faculty in disciplines with limited funding opportunities, and may increase student-faculty ratios (UCSB, UCEP, UCPB).

(4) Maintain or improve the undergraduate student experience. While many Senate divisions and committees either supported or offered no comment on this recommendation because of its vagueness, several objected to the idea that some courses are “unnecessary” as being antithetical to a liberal arts education (UCLA, UCM, UCEP, UCSB). Others disagreed with the emphasis in the recommendation on “throughput” rather than quality (UCM, UCSB).

Online Instruction

Education and Curriculum Recommendation 2: Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs.

Previously, the Academic Council sent a letter to the President expressly endorsing the exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum in the form of a proposed pilot project, contingent on the procurement of external funding. Council rejects consideration of online undergraduate degree programs until evaluation of the pilot project is completed. Responses from Senate divisions and committees were split. Many endorsed an incremental, cautious approach to online instruction with several caveats, including: courses must be faculty-driven and approved by a department; cost saving claims must be substantiated and faculty workload and IT support and infrastructure must be factored into any cost analysis; quality must be maintained and verified; and interaction with students is essential (UCEP). Most respondents doubted that online courses would save money unless ladder-rank faculty are replaced with less expensive instructors, which casts doubt on quality (UCM, UCSB, UCSC, UCPB). Some endorsed online instruction as a supplement to face-to-face instruction or for gateway classes or to prepare community college students for entrance to UC (UCB). Others felt that online instruction would not provide adequate support for at-risk students and that targeting gateway classes fails the population that needs the most support (UCM, UCPB). Many stated that quality requires face-to-face interaction between students and faculty and among students (UCAP, UCEP). On the whole, the Senate supports the use of online instruction in a hybrid form and in particular circumstances, such as self-supporting graduate programs (UCI, UCSC, CCGA).

Academic Planning

Education and Curriculum Recommendation 4: Develop a systemwide academic planning framework that incorporates campus goals within the context of priorities identified for the University as a whole.

The Academic Council agrees that systemwide academic planning can play a positive role in facilitating cross-campus collaboration, helping to identify areas of synergy and opportunities for

coordination (UCB, UCLA, UCSC). It supports inter-campus collaboration for program development over centralized direction; the central administration should not set campus curricular priorities and campus autonomy must be maintained (UCB, UCD, UCI, UCEP). Each campus is a major research university and must develop programs in pursuit of its own excellence (UCI, UCM). Academic planning is driven by campus-based needs and concerns, but is subject to systemwide review; current planning mechanisms are rigorous and do work (UCD, UCSB, UCPB). Systemwide academic planning can serve as a useful restraint on the development of large new programs that may not be justified by need. There also is a systemwide role for facilitating cross-campus programs in unusual or unique fields, e.g., in helping to create a financial model to allow students to take advantage of courses that are not offered on their home campuses (UCI).

Faculty Compensation

Funding Strategies Recommendation 8: Examine alternate faculty compensation plans.

A majority of Senate agencies opposed this recommendation (UCB, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, BOARS, UCAP, UCFW, UCOPE, UCPB, UCORP). None supported it without conditions. Respondents offering conditional support noted that further exploration of the idea may be warranted and that greater exposition of details is needed before they can support it (UCI, UCLA, UCSD, UCEP). Also, if adopted, any alternative plan should be voluntary and flexible, and FTE should not be relegated to soft money positions (UCEP). Those opposing the recommendation strongly rejected it on the grounds that it would create a two-tiered salary plan and would create divisions among the faculty and between disciplines (UCSB, UCAA, UCOPE). Many expressed support for reaffirming and funding competitive salary scales for all faculty. Faculty remuneration should be based on merit, not access to external funding or potential for income generation (UCM, UCAP, UCFW, UCPB). There was a significant amount of apprehension about reliance on external funding sources that are neither reliable nor predictable, and a feeling that taking such a step would undermine the case for state-supported FTE (UCB, UCSB, UCSC, BOARS). In addition, respondents argued that it would undermine the teaching mission of the University and could limit course availability (UCSB, UCEP).