



Notes From the Academic Senate Chair

Lawrence Pitts lawrence.pitts@ucop.edu

UC's BUDGET — NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

The Governor released his budget on January 10 and, given the size of the State's deficits, it is not surprising that UC's budget was cut substantially. The most chilling and potentially devastating feature of the Governor's budget was the 40% increase in graduate student fees (on top of a 45% increase in fees over the last 2 years), compounded by an additional 20% rise in fees for out-of-state students. This very serious problem was immediately recognized by the Regents, the administration, and faculty throughout UC. While out-of-state graduate students who are US citizens can qualify for in-state fees after one year, foreign graduate students, who are some of the best in the world, can never qualify as California residents.

The excellence of teaching and research at UC in part results from our attracting truly outstanding students to our graduate programs, many of whom remain in California after attaining their advanced degrees and who enrich the State financially and intellectually. The Academic Senate is working with the administration and the Regents to reduce the effect of increased graduate student fees as much as possible in the near term. The Governor and his advisors hold that since graduate education is more expensive than undergraduate education, graduate students should pay more. This simplistic view overlooks entirely the critical contribution graduate students make to the research and instructional mission of the university and to the health and wealth of the state. It is imperative that the Academic Senate, the administration, and the Regents, possibly with the help of the state Legislature, do everything we can to reverse this wrong-headed and short-sighted philosophy.

The Governor's overall budget cuts for UC of nearly \$375M are partly to be offset by the graduate and out-of-state fee increases, plus a 10% undergraduate student fee increase (on top of a recent 33% increase). Meeting the increased

continued on page 2

Should We Compete to Manage the DOE Labs?

- George Blumenthal

Do you think that the University of California should submit bids to continue managing the Department of Energy Labs at Livermore and at Los Alamos? All Senate faculty will have an opportunity to express their views on this question in a systemwide poll of faculty opinion to be held this spring. Before discussing that poll further, let me briefly review the events leading up to this decision.



ACSCONL members Janis Ingham (m) and George Blumenthal (Chair, r) with John Birely, AVP of Lab Programs

The University of California has managed the three Department of Energy (DOE) labs, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL), Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) and Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL) for roughly sixty years. Both the Regents and the DOE have periodically agreed to renew our contract to manage these labs, and the UC faculty has frequently provided its opinion regarding the renewal of these contracts. In 1990, the Senate held mail ballots on eight of the nine campuses, with 36% of the faculty favoring continued management and 64% opposed. Senate views had changed by 1996, when a mail ballot on six campuses showed that 61% of faculty supported renewing the contract, with 39% opposed.

Two years ago, in anticipation of renewal discussions taking place this year, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) constituted a subcommittee to examine, from a faculty perspective, how UC might better manage the labs. However, their report was brought to the Academic Council last spring just as the Secretary of Energy announced his intention to open the LANL contract to competitive bidding because of a series of widely publicized lapses in security and accounting at the labs. Subsequently, Congress passed legislation mandating that contracts for all three UC labs be opened for competition. We do not yet know exactly when this competition will occur, but a Request for Proposal for one or more of the labs could be released as early as summer 2004. The cost for UC to bid for each lab is estimated to be in the range of \$5-9 million, and presumably this money would come from either our lab management fee or industry partners. Ultimately, the decision

continued on page 2

UPDATES AND EVENTS

- ▶ **Your campus Senate now recruiting members! Be an active part of shared governance. If you are interested in senate service on either the divisional or systemwide level, [link here](#) to your local membership coordinator.**
- ▶ **Assembly Meeting** — On March 10, 2004 the Assembly of the Academic Senate will meet on the Clark Kerr Campus of UC Berkeley, from 10-4. Check the Senate web site later this month for the full [Assembly agenda](#).
- ▶ **Joint Meeting of the Chancellors and the Academic Council** — On March 3, Academic Council members will meet with the Council of Chancellors to discuss: shared governance in campus budget decision-making; efficiencies in the academic personnel process; and campus Senate office operations and resources.
- ▶ **SUTI** — President Dynes' [response](#) to the [Academic Council Resolution on Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information](#).
- ▶ **Oliver Johnson Award** — Nominations for the 2004 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate are due by March 12, 2004. See the new [Oliver Johnson web page](#) for more information on the award, the nomination process, and past recipients.
- ▶ **Scholarly Communication** — For updates on activities relating to scholarly communication see: the [summary report](#) of last fall's regional seminars on scholarly communications; the [letter to faculty](#) from the UC University Librarians and Academic Council Chair Pitts; and the Academic Council [Special Committee on Scholarly Communication](#) web page.
- ▶ **Bay Area Higher Education Recruitment Consortium** — The [Bay Area HERC web site](#) offers a searchable data base of academic jobs at colleges and universities in northern California, including positions at UC campuses.

Notes, continued from page 1

costs of these fees will be made more difficult for low-income students by the Governor's proposed limiting to 20% the portion of increased fees to be returned to student aid. The \$37.5M cuts also include a proposed increase in the student/faculty ratio, which would degrade the quality of UC's education, and which we will not allow. The University plans to take this \$35M cut as "undesignated"; agreeing to a worsening of the student/faculty ratio would be very hard to reverse in future budgets. The budget eliminates all funding for outreach. Finally, the budget calls for a 10% decrease in student enrollment for the 2004 entering class roughly 400 fewer freshman students next year for each campus.

The Governor's budget did include restoration of an \$80.5M cut in the prior budget, and \$34M for annuitant health care. It also included some minimal funding for UC Merced, which allows that campus to remain on target for admitting freshman students in Fall 2005, albeit under constrained circumstances. These new allocations, however, entirely fail to address the underfunding of UC over the past 3 years that amounts to **\$1.5B less than called for in the "Partnership"** with Governor Davis.

As you know, the Governor's budget proposal is only a starting point for a final allocation for UC and other state agencies, and will be the subject of intense discussion and likely modification over the next 5 months or longer. The Legislature eventually will have to pass a budget, and the entire process will depend on the fate of the bond measure allowing the state to borrow some \$15B. This debt will have to be repaid in the future, and even a rising state income will not correct the structural budget deficits anytime in the near future, so UC can expect continued budget constraints for several years at least. The Academic Senate, administration and Regents will do



UCM Professors Henry Forman and Peggy O'Day in new laboratory space

UC Merced Faculty Embark on Senate Work

- Michael LaBriola

The start of a new UC campus also means the start of a new campus senate. The thirteen founding UC Merced faculty members, who began arriving at temporary quarters in town last summer, are now working full time not only to build the campus and establish their own research programs, but also to learn the ropes of shared governance and establish a new divisional senate.

[Link to full article](#)

everything possible to argue for and secure the most favorable budget possible.

As a final budget-related point, I refer you to a [message](#) I am sending out to all faculty on the upcoming state ballot Propositions 55, 57, and 58. [Proposition 55](#) is an education capital bond measure that includes funds for UC construction projects. We are hopeful that this measure will pass, and I encourage you to learn how it and the other two propositions may affect your campus.

In closing, I sadly note the passing of Richard Goodman (UCLA), esteemed Academic Council member, Chair of UCPB, and member of ACSCONL, who died suddenly last month. Dick was a vital and effective Senate practitioner. He will be missed by all who knew him.

DOE labs, continued from page 1

whether or not to bid resides with the UC Board of Regents.

In response to this changing situation, the Academic Council established a new subcommittee last June, which reports directly to the Council. This group, called the [Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs](#) (ACSCONL), has two primary duties: 1) to provide timely input to the Office of the President on issues that must be faced prior to a decision about competition, such as whether and how to partner and terms to include in any bid; and 2) to provide educational background material to UC faculty and to solicit the views of the Senate regarding whether or not to compete for these contracts. The ACSCONL group has already concluded that there is no serious controversy about submitting a bid to continue managing the LBNL, since the research occurring at LBNL is all unclassified and closely connected to research taking place at UC Berkeley.

The other two labs (LLNL and LANL) conduct both classified weapons research and unclassified research, some in collaboration with

the campuses. In March, the Academic Assembly will be asked to approve a recommendation from both ACSCONL and from the Academic Council that the Senate conduct a poll of all Senate members on the advisability of bidding for these two labs. We are proposing to conduct this poll during the first week in May via the Internet. This will be the first systemwide electronic poll of all UC Senate faculty, and it will ask each member a series of questions intended to elicit the nuances of faculty opinion regarding the labs. In the months leading up to this ballot, ACSCONL will issue a series of "white papers" about the labs, and several campuses will hold town hall meetings to discuss UC's relationship with LLNL and LANL. About one week prior to the survey, Senate members will receive email instructions on how to participate in this poll. Once the poll results are tabulated, we will release them to the public. Your faculty representatives on the Board of Regents, Larry Pitts and I, will communicate the UC faculty views to the final decision makers, the Board of Regents.

Academic Senate
University of California
1111 Franklin St., 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

THE SENATE SOURCE

is published bi-monthly during the academic year (September–June), for UC faculty by the University of California Systemwide Senate.

Lawrence Pitts, 2003-04 Chair
Systemwide Academic Senate
Brenda Foust, Lead Editor
Betty Marton, Co-Editor

Send comments and questions to:
senatenews@ucop.edu

— Resolution on Educational Fee Waiver —

The Academic Council has sent a formal [resolution](#) to the President calling for an educational fee waiver for children, spouses and domestic partners of UC faculty and staff, to be phased in over a four-year period beginning July 2004. The Council believes an educational fee waiver would be an extremely useful tool in faculty recruitment, especially since competitive institutions offer this benefit. (See recent [history](#) of Senate educational fee waiver proposals.)

Under Senate Review

Unless otherwise noted, send comments to your [Divisional Chair](#) or relevant [Divisional Committee](#). Response date for comments follows listing.

- University Professor Appointment Procedures — under review by University Committee on Academic Personnel.
- [Amendment to SB 335](#) (implementation of whistleblower policies): Assembly vote on March 10. [Click here](#) for a comprehensive list of items currently under review.