



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE  
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502  
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

November 19, 2010

**DANIEL L. SIMMONS, CHAIR**

University of California  
Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

**Re: Downsizing Resolutions: UCLA and Academic Council**

The resolutions and the memo from President Yudof regarding downsizing were forwarded to all standing committees and the Faculty Executive Committee in each college/professional school. Responses were received from: Committees on Planning and Budget, Faculty Welfare, Academic Personnel-Oversight, Information Technology, Graduate and Undergraduate Councils and the Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Letters and Sciences.

The documents as presented seem somewhat repetitive with no clear discussion of the interrelations between the options listed. A shorter, more succinct document addressing the above mentioned questions would allow the committee to provide a more reasoned critique. In general, the Davis Division agrees that with diminishing resources, downsizing may be necessary. However, there is a concern that downsizing the number of faculty, support staff and facilities, with no change or even an increase in the number of students, will compromise both the research and teaching missions of the University. At the same time, it is recognized that decreasing the enrollment of undergraduates who are California residents is difficult to do from a public perception standpoint. Many of the solutions that have been proposed to help mitigate this problem, such as increasing the number of lecturers, are not consistent with maintaining the UC as the top public research university.

There were specific comments we also wish to pass along for consideration as the resolutions undergo further review:

Graduate Council was surprised that graduate education was not at all discussed in the documents addressing downsizing that were provided: 1) graduate student fees should not be raised corresponding with undergraduate fees because they are essentially revenue neutral. Further fee increases are likely to lead to a reduction in graduate student numbers, due to the undue burden on faculty research dollars and on the available TA budgets and other forms of student income. An example of the unintended consequences of fee-hikes are the non-resident tuition costs (NRT) which have compelled a number of graduate programs across the campus to essentially limit educational opportunities to residents. This is a short-sighted and dangerous path, given the international nature of today's research and scholarship; 2) graduate students should not be used to replace faculty as teachers and instructors at the expense of their education and research; 3) the essential role of graduate education for the research mission of the university should be emphasized. Excellent faculty research results in excellent graduate student applicants, which in turn help sustain a high quality research endeavor.

A vital component of any research infrastructure be it academic, corporate, or private institute, is access to, and holdings of, disseminated research materials. This is primarily the function of the library and its associated appendages. Without question, a world-class research university cannot exist without a robust library system and the current economic situation has not been kind to this critical organ of our institute. We would therefore like to see some words added to the resolution(s) that supports maintenance and proper growth of our libraries.

Some of our members have reviewed the initiative to increase online course work and encourage its further development. However, online coursework is not a substitute for face to face interactions, particularly for writing, laboratory or studio classes. Online instruction can supplement existing course work, but is not a solution to

reducing the size of UC without reducing student enrollments. A secondary concern is the initial investment required to mass produce online education and a lack of data to support the benefits.

We believe discretion is required concerning a moratorium on approval of major new building and funding commitment for design/design and construction. Buildings, including office and laboratory space, facilitate the success of faculty, such moratoriums on capital expenditures relating to buildings may impact faculty recruitment and retention over the coming years. Rather than a blanket ban on creating new schools and institutes. For example, large donations, such as the \$100 million donated to establish the Betty Moore School of Nursing at UC Davis, should not be turned down. Some exceptions should be put into this policy.

Some believe UC is in danger of losing quality students and faculty if we do not invest in Information Technology (IT) infrastructure. We agree that we can't incur added operational costs by making large capital investments right now, but in some cases IT capital projects are an important element in maintaining our ability to recruit students and faculty. Incoming undergraduates appear to expect that certain elements of IT infrastructure will be in place, and the bar is continually rising. It seems likely that in many cases cutting-edge IT infrastructure will be crucial in our ability to recruit prospective faculty members.

The resolutions discuss reducing the size of faculty and administrative staff in order to operate at a size that is affordable. The document does not address whether savings can also be made by reviewing many of the benefits that are largely afforded only to senior UC executives (e.g. housing & car allowances). In such a period of austerity, UC might foster more good will among its employees by ensuring that salary increases among executives are kept to a minimum (if at all).

There are two statements under "Impact on Access" that read much alike: "should the State of California once again recognize support for higher education as a budget priority," "if the people of the State of California once again recognize support for higher education as a budget priority." (p. 3). The language used gives the appearance of petulance on the part of the Senate, as it implies that the state does not consider support for higher education to be a budget priority. There is evidence that in fact the state does recognize support for higher education as a budget priority. UC fared better in the 2010-2011 budget than did many other parties. We would suggest something along the lines of, "should the State of California return to the level of support for higher education that it had provided in past years."

We applaud the emphasis placed on diversity as an important component of maintenance of faculty quality, which is clearly outlined in the UCLA document.

The statement on supplying financial aid to undocumented students should be removed. Whether one is for or against the statement, it may be in conflict with existing laws and may lead to further law suits.

Although non-resident students pay higher fees and thus bring in more revenue, only some majors will be sufficiently attractive to undergraduates and attractive to out of state students. We support the idea that out-of-state students can "cross-subsidize" our California -resident undergraduates. However, we question whether it is feasible to draw enough out-of-state students to keep or increase faculty numbers. Increasing class sizes is often impossible because of the lack of sufficiently large teaching classrooms, although we recognize that there may be other strategies for offering large classes. Still, the need for increased classroom capacity is counter to the suggestion that capital improvements stop until the budget improves.

Sincerely,



Robert L. Powell III, Chair  
Davis Division of the Academic Senate and  
Professor and Chair, Department of  
Chemical Engineering and Materials Science