



## Notes from the Academic Senate Chair

Henry Powell [henry.powell@ucop.edu](mailto:henry.powell@ucop.edu)

Dear Colleagues,

We are in the middle of another challenging budget year. Although there are some encouraging signs—the Governor's proposed budget restores \$370 million to UC—we are far from feeling secure. Although the governor's idea to formally tie education and prison funding was intriguing, it has not attracted widespread support. Nonetheless, the proposal helped bring attention to the problem and shifted the momentum of the discussion. We now have state leaders acknowledging publicly that UC

has been underfunded and that change is needed if California is to remain competitive and have an educated citizenry prepared to meet the state's long term needs. Many others are realizing that an investment in UC is a long-term investment in California's future. A new Public Policy Institute of California poll shows a majority of Californians are now willing to pay higher taxes for education.

### A Letter from Chair Powell about Recent Incidents of Intolerance on Campus

*Black History Month 2010 at the University of California San Diego was marred by several incidents that mocked its purpose. The Chancellor and her administration moved quickly to investigate each incident and to hear from those who were most traumatized. While it is too early to ascertain its motivation, the impact of such behavior falls most heavily on those whose communities historically suffered the effects of racial discrimination and its social consequences. [Read more](#)*

This is also a "year of advocacy" for the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which is holding all of its 2009-10 meetings in Sacramento. ICAS' main goals this year are assessing the California Master Plan for Higher Education on the occasion of its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary and strengthening advocacy at a time of broad disinvestment in public higher education.

The February 4 ICAS meeting featured a conversation with Assembly member Ira Ruskin, who co-chairs the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. This important discussion reinforced the need for close cooperation among UC, California State University, and the California Community Colleges (CCC). On February 2, I gave testimony at a hearing of the Joint Committee, speaking for the three segments as chair of ICAS. There is a broad recognition that the sharp cuts in funding are undermining the vision of the Master Plan and restricting access to public higher education.

Continued on page 4

## Q&A with Patrick Lenz, Vice President for Budget

The *Senate Source* recently sat down with Vice President Lenz to get his take on some of the most critical issues facing the University.



**As Vice President for Budget, you are UC's lead negotiator in Sacramento for state funds. Can you describe the process? When negotiating with legislators, what can you offer in exchange for better funding?**

In any normal year the process begins when the Regents approve the UC budget and we initiate discussions with the Department of Finance and the Governor's Office in an effort to get as much funding as possible in the governor's proposed budget in January. By mid-February, the Legislative Analyst's Office releases their analysis of the budget. Generally, budget subcommittee hearings begin in March and proceed through the May Revise, which is the Governor's revision to the budget based on updated projections of revenue (from April 15 tax receipts) and expenditures. When negotiating with legislators for better funding, UC can offer student access (enrollment growth); quality faculty and staff; improving student/faculty ratio; improving time to degree; ensuring that state funding is an investment in an educated and highly trained workforce; and stimulating and sustaining economic growth in California.

**The California budget process has been criticized in many circles. Term limits, Proposition 13, and the 2/3 budget rule are often cited as problems. Do you foresee any solutions? What are the keys to success in navigating the pitfalls in Sacramento?**

I believe term limits present a challenge to educating policymakers on who we are as a research university and the enormous benefit we provide to California. The budget suffers from an outdated revenue model that was based on the manufacturing economy of the 1960's, not the economic environment we face today. I believe there needs to be a change to the two-thirds vote on the budget that precludes the budget from being enacted in a timely fashion and holds the state budget hostage while legislators and the governor make deals on other policy issues in ways that are neither transparent nor often times in the best interest of the state.

**What do you consider UC's most critical state funding needs? How do you determine what UC's budget "ask" will be?**

The state is at crossroads; it needs to determine if California should continue to invest in its public universities. UC's state funding per student is half of what it was 20 years ago and we are struggling to maintain the fiscal resources to meet our campus funding needs and maintain a quality UC education, even with the dramatic increase in student fees. Determining the "budget ask" is a process that begins in July or August with extensive consultation, a September Regents' meeting that identifies what UC has achieved in the recent budget process (if the state budget is enacted by September) and additional consultation through the November Regents meeting. While we prepare a "needs budget" for the UC, it is prioritized given the fiscal condition of the state, but representative of the minimal investment that should be supported from the state General Fund.

Continued on page 2

**The proposed budget does not include funding for UCRP. How are you making the case that the state has a responsibility to contribute?**

We have the support of the Governor regarding the state's obligation to UCRP as represented by the \$20 million he put into the 2009-10 state budget. However, that funding was deleted by the legislature, and statutory language was adopted that says "It is the intent of the legislature that no new General Fund augmentation be made available for contributions to the University of California Retirement Plan." My mission is to reverse this language through a Budget Trailer Bill that will recognize the state's obligation to fund its portion of UCRP, now and in the future. We already have the support of the Governor's Office and the Department of Finance. Now, we just have to get this bill through the legislature.

**The Legislative Analyst's Office often takes positions opposite those and critical of UC. How are you working with the LAO to find more common ground?**

I've spent 28 years doing state budgets and have the highest regard for the LAO, which I see as a vital institutional resource and fiscal/policy advisory body to a term-limited legislature. However, I have disagreed on more than one occasion with their conclusions. We respond to their policy and budget recommendations and work very closely with the LAO staff to educate them about UC budget and policy issues. However, despite what I consider to be a close personal and working relationship, I believe some of their recommendations represent a "short-sighted" view of the University's funding needs and California's rate of return for investing in higher education, and particularly in UC.

**There have been calls for UC to sell properties and research stations to raise capital, and one state senator has proposed a "Student Protection Act," which would require UC and CSU to cap annual student fee increases at 10%, and provide a 180-day waiting period for any increases. How are you responding to these ideas?**

UC evaluates "surplus property" annually, and if the conditions are right we do sell property. Some property comes with specific conditions such as profits for any donated property that is sold will go to the donor's heirs or be placed in a special account to support scholarships. In these cases, none of the proceeds of sale would benefit the UC budget. Gump Station is a world renowned research facility that generates enormously significant oceanic discoveries and research findings to address global warming. No university funds go to support this research facility; it is all dependent on federal and private grants, along with fees charged for the use of the facility.

Any recommendation to cap fees must be accompanied by a guarantee of state General Fund support. This year, state General Fund support for the UC budget was reduced by 20% or \$637 million, yet the 32% increase in student fees will only generate \$330 million (net of financial aid). How can UC support any cap on fees when the state dramatically cuts our budget and we can only generate half of the funding cut by the state through an equally dramatic fee increase? Without a guarantee on the level of state support for the university, any "cap on fees" will leave UC with few options but to continue lay-offs, furloughs, and program reductions, and an inability to replace faculty.

**How do you make the case for UC when so many other state funded agencies and institutions have their hand out?**

California needs to ask itself where it wants to be in five years, not five months from now, and how it should invest the state's limited General Fund dollars. There is no rate of return on investing in corrections, but for every \$1 the state invests in UC, we provide a \$4 return to California's economy. If the state wants to make progress on improving its economy and fiscal stability in the future, we need to invest in UC now.

**How are you cooperating with the other California higher education segments to secure greater funding for everybody?**

Since President Yudof's arrival, there has been an ongoing and coordinated effort with Chancellor Reed at the CSU and Chancellor Scott at the California Community Colleges (CCC) to secure additional funding for higher education. This has included not only funding of our respective budgets, but a concerted advocacy effort for full funding of Cal Grant financial aid. On April 27<sup>th</sup>, UC, CSU, and CCC will conduct a joint lobbying day, in Sacramento.

**Many faculty express frustration at the lack of UCOP's budget "transparency". What steps are you taking to make the budget more transparent?**

I'd challenge anyone on the "lack" of transparency on the UC budget given the efforts by the Regents, the Office of the President and our campuses to create more budget forums, the many meetings held by me and my staff with faculty, staff, and student groups, and on-line access to budget information. There may be a need for a continuing education process and we stand prepared to help in any way we can, but I believe the days when the UC budget lacked transparency are long gone.

**How is your job distinct from the CFO, Treasurer, and EVP for Business Operations?**

Primarily, I represent UC on all support and capital outlay budget issues in discussions or testimony with the Governor's Office, legislature, Department of Finance and LAO. It is my role to

advise EVP Brostrom and President Yudof on the development of annual budget recommendations to the Regents and to provide updates on the Governor's or legislature's action regarding the UC budget. In addition, I oversee all non-state funding for capital facility projects, real estate transactions, sustainability, energy issues, and facility maintenance funding. The CFO, Treasurer, and EVP for Business Operations oversee accounting functions, investments, and the overall operation of the Office of the President, including Human Resources matters.

**How does your job intersect with the work of External Relations and State Governmental Relations (SGR)?**

There is a critical connection between the Budget Office and External Relations in our efforts to strategically prepare our budget message and develop a communications plan to the Governor, Legislature, and the public about the need to invest in UC. I work closely with SGR on both fiscal and policy issues in order to be prepared to state a University position on any issue that come up during the budget subcommittee hearings. I also coordinate with SGR regarding legislator and legislative staff briefings and our advocacy efforts in Sacramento on the UC budget.

**How can the Senate best help you in your important work?**

The Senate has been incredibly helpful in educating term-limited legislators on the impact of the state budget cuts. The Senate has pointed to attracting and retaining faculty to UC, the impact of increasing the student faculty ratio, and the need for graduate student support as examples of the impact of reductions in state funding. The Senate is the front line voice from the campus perspective on the need to invest more, not less, in UC. Legislators have told me that the Senate has paid them a visit and provided concrete and valuable information regarding support for the UC budget. I find the Senate critical in our advocacy efforts in Sacramento and the development of budget recommendations to the Regents.

***"The Senate is the front line voice from the campus perspective on the need to invest more, not less, in UC."***

# Changes to Post-Employment Benefits Under Discussion

The Academic Senate is working closely with the administration to ensure that the voice of the faculty is heard as potential recommendations for the future of UC's post-employment benefits are developed and disseminated.

Several factors have combined to focus energy and attention on UC retirement programs, prompting UC to empanel a presidential Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits (PTFPEB) to consider choices with regard to retiree health and pension benefits that could impact both current and future UC employees. In addition to the poor market performance of recent years, the resumption of employee and employer contributions to UCRP on April 15 – following a nearly 20-year contribution holiday – and the ongoing state budget crisis have helped force this discussion to the top of the agenda.

The PTFPEB has conducted its work under a specific charge, which includes a guiding principle that “The University of California is committed to providing competitive pay and benefits programs to attract and retain excellent faculty and staff to accomplish its mission for the people of California, while ensuring sustainable post employment benefits for current and future retirees.”

The timeline for the development, dissemination, and review of recommendations included initial consultations about preliminary options with the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), and UCFW's Task Force on Investment and Retirement and UCFW's Health Care Task Force. In addition, on March 31, the Provost Lawrence H. Pitts hosted an all-day budget “summit” with the Academic Council, UCPB, members of the PTFPEB, and key administrators to contextualize the PEB discussion within the parameters of the University's overall budget situation.

A series of campus town hall meetings is being planned for April and May. Systemwide Human Resources will hold open briefings on each of the campuses throughout April to discuss the issues, and in May, Academic Senate Chair Harry Powell and Vice Chair Dan Simmons will hold Senate-only discussions of the options on each campus. The PTFPEB is expected to submit its final recommendations to President Yudof in June, and the President will discuss the recommendations with the Regents in July. The Senate will begin its review of the President's recommendations in July, and discussions are expected to continue into the fall.

[Click to Read More](#)

## Schedule of Senate Post-Employment Benefits Forums

Senate Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons will visit campuses to discuss the Post-Employment Benefits task forces' work with Senate audiences. These meetings are in addition to briefings from UC Human Resources. Please check with your division office for exact times and locations.

UCB	April 29	UCR	May 5
UCD	May 10	UCSB	May 17
UCI	May 6	UCSC	May 27
UCLA	May 4	UCSD	May 3
UCM	April 22	UCSF	May 11

# Senate Responds to Criticism of Admissions Reform

The Academic Senate is responding to concerns about UC's new admissions policy with data, dialogue, and outreach.

In January, the Academic Council endorsed a [memo](#) from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) responding to external groups who are worried about the potential impact of the admissions reform policy on diversity and the ability of their communities and constituencies to obtain a UC education. Some Asian-American community groups have gone so far as to ask UC to overturn “Entitled to Review (ETR),” which is scheduled to take effect for freshmen entering UC in fall 2012. These groups point to simulations that project small declines in the admission of Asian-American students and some underrepresented groups, and small increases in white student admits under the new policy.

The new policy entitle all California freshman applicants to a comprehensive review of their applications if they meet three minimum markers of college readiness: Complete at least 11 of 15 UC-required college preparatory (“a-g”) courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade; maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better in these courses (GPA weighted and capped at eight semesters of extra credit for honors and advanced placement courses); and take either the SAT Reasoning Test or the ACT with Writing assessment.

The set of simulations in question is one of several conducted by BOARS and the UC Office of Institutional Research. All are highly speculative and some project more race neutral outcomes. UC and Academic Senate leaders have met with a number of community groups, as well as with legislators, legislative staff, school counselors, and students, to discuss the simulations and explain the goals and intent of the policy.

[Click to Read More](#)

## UCORP Paper Published in PLoS Biology

A manuscript collectively authored by the 2008-09 membership of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) was published in [PLOS Biology's](#) community page in January 2010. The manuscript, [University of California Research Seminar Network: A Prospectus](#), reflects the work of the entire committee and postulates improvements in the delivery of departmental seminars via web-casting and electronic archiving.

This accomplishment represents the first time that an Academic Senate paper, including authors from all 10 campuses and UCOP, has been published in a top-flight peer-reviewed journal. The effort was led by 2008-09 UCORP Chair James Carey (UCD, Entomology) and includes the perspectives of faculty in departments ranging from dance to medicine, the committee's undergraduate and graduate student representatives, and staff representatives from both the systemwide Senate office and information technology units at the Office of the President and some of the campuses.

Before the manuscript was submitted to PLoS Biology for peer review and publication, it was subjected to normal systemwide Senate review, leading to the Academic Council's imprimatur. The idea sprang from the committee's investigation of potential methods to increase synergy across the system, during which it became clear that disparate local efforts needed unification to allow real-time participation in seminars held at a distant campus or even across a single campus.

In addition to the manuscript's pending publication, a pilot project based on the ideas in the prospectus is being developed.

*Continued from page 1* The Master Plan's promise is clearly at risk, with all three higher education segments being forced to turn away many qualified students. We heard how the small reduction in UC enrollment and the much larger CSU cuts have pushed students into the CCC system where course offerings are being restricted drastically.

The three Senate leaders also met with student leaders, and together we spoke with state legislators and their staff. In addition, Vice Chair Dan Simmons and I met with the UC Student Association on February 7 in Merced. We agreed that rising fees and enrollment cuts across the three segments have serious repercussions for access, which is not just about admissions but involves a commitment from the state to fund the enrollment of qualified students.

Speaking of access, Council recently endorsed a [memo](#) from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) responding to external groups who are concerned about the potential impact of the new admissions reform policy—*Entitled to Review* (ETR)—on the ability of their communities and constituencies to obtain a UC education. As BOARS has worked on this policy over the past five years, concerns have been expressed from both sides of the political spectrum, including criticism that ETR would be an end-run around Proposition 209, and more recently, that the policy is unfair to underserved populations. In reality, ETR will cast the eligibility net more widely and allow more students in a larger number of California high schools to have their applications individually reviewed. ETR expands eligibility, but does not change individual campus authority over admissions decisions.

In admissions, as in all things, the periodic reexamination of practices and policies is an important function of effective governance. The UC Commission on the Future and its five working groups are doing just that, and I am hopeful that they will arrive at some helpful proposals.

Two recent California Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) reports—[Improving State Oversight of Academic Expansions](#) and [Greater Than the Sum of Its Parts—Coordinating Higher Education in California](#)—call for increasing the state's influence and control over the development and approval of new programs and schools at UC and CSU. I remind you that Daniel Coit Gilman, UC's first nationally recruited president, resigned in 1875 over the issue of legislative interference, stating "however well we may build up the University, its foundations are unstable, because it is dependent on legislative control and popular clamor." His resignation helped force the legislature to give UC autonomous status in the 1879 Constitution.

The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) met at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) in December. I am very pleased about the Senate's relationship with the leadership of the LLNL. They want to maintain LLNL's relationship with UC and foster more Senate involvement, and they have been eager to give us an up-to-date vision of the energy and climate-focused research at the labs. Scientists there appreciate that UC is driven primarily by a public interest mission rather than a profit mission.

We must continue working to persuade the public about the value of UC and how UC can serve the state. Robust faculty participation in Senate processes and energetic fulfillment of our shared governance obligations are paramount now and moving forward. The first recommendations from work groups to the UC Commission on the Future have already come out, and the full Commission will soon choose whether to endorse some or all of these recommendations or make others of its own. Meanwhile, the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits will hold a second round of public forums prior to issuing their recommendations. The review timelines will be short, but I urge you to participate as fully as possible at every opportunity. I welcome your suggestions, and look forward to working with you during the second half of my term.

— *Fiat Lux*, Harry



Chair Powell with Board of Regents Chair Russell Gould

## UPDATES and EVENTS

- ▶ The Academic Council sent memos to the President about:
  - ◆ [Adequate Funding for UCRP](#)
  - ◆ [UCAAD's Statement on Racist Incidents at UCSD](#)
  - ◆ [Report of the Undergraduate Effectiveness Task Force](#)
  - ◆ [Final Report of the UC Education Abroad Task Force](#)
- ▶ [Chair Powell's Remarks to the Special Joint Commission on the Master Plan](#)
- ▶ [Vice Chair Simmons' Remarks to the UC Commission on the Future](#)
- ▶ [Chair Powell 's and Vice Chair Simmons' letter on Senate Advocacy](#)
- ▶ [Post Employment Benefits Task Force](#) campus visits resume in April. Check the calendar by following the link.
- ▶ The UC Education Abroad Program is accepting applications for Faculty Directorships and Visiting Professorships (Short-Term Teaching Assignments). Please visit the [UCEAP website \(http://eap.ucop.edu/faculty/\)](http://eap.ucop.edu/faculty/) for details.

## Under Senate Review

Click [here](#) for a comprehensive list of current and past review items and check the [Tracking Log](#) for the progress of all issues.

- ▶ [UCPB's Position Paper on Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition](#) (due 4/16/10)
- ▶ [First Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future](#) (due 5/28/10)
- ▶ [Revised Compendium](#) and [Compendium Task Force Report](#) (due 5/28/10)

**THE SENATE SOURCE** is published periodically during the academic year by the Systemwide Senate to inform UC faculty about the activities of the Senate. Your comments are welcome: [senatenews@ucop.edu](mailto:senatenews@ucop.edu)

Henry Powell, 2009-2010 Academic Senate Chair  
Michael LaBriola and Kenneth Feer, Co-editors