



Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing)

November 5, 2010

UC Academic Senate review of two resolutions; 1) A resolution from Academic Council and 2) A resolution from UCLA, both resolutions address UC downsizing.

Administrative Partners (DANN TRASK)

November 9, 2010 12:17 PM

Dear Professor Powell,

The L&S Executive Committee has discussed the UC Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions and has the following comments:

- If new building is frozen, can new building monies already allocated be used for other purposes? If so, the criteria for the fund transfers should be clarified.
 - If academic programs are to be eliminated, clear and succinct criteria need to be presented as to how such decisions will be made.
 - Does the downsizing of number of faculty and academic programs also imply downsizing of the number of students, albeit on a temporary basis? How will these decisions be made?
- 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.

Sincerely,

Patricia C. Boeshaar, Chair
Executive Committee
College of Letters and Science

Affirmative Action & Diversity

November 2, 2010 1:25 PM

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee has reviewed and discussed the Request for Systemwide Review of Council Recommendation and the UCLA Statement on the Future of the University. Overall we applaud the emphasis placed on diversity as an important component of maintenance of faculty quality, which is clearly outlined in the UCLA document. We agree with the arguments presented and the point that it will be challenging to implement. However, there were some questions from the committee as well.

The first document indicates a need for an increase in revenue followed by the notion that in order to increase revenue a fee increase is needed. How might an increase in fees, though gradual, affect a diverse pool of student applications especially with regard to undergraduate applications? Also, the first document is making a big emphasis in giving priority to 'high quality faculty'. What parameters are used to determine the quality of faculty and how will that be assured? Will qualities related to diversity be taken into account when making this determination?

CAP Oversight Committee

October 29, 2010 2:15 PM

The Committee on Academic Personnel has reviewed Academic Council's recommendation and UCLA's statement on the Future of the University.

As related to the issues under CAP's purview, the primary issue we wish to call to your attention is the impact of the proposed restrictions on capital programs, including the 1-year moratorium on approval of major new buildings and the moratorium on funding commitments for the design and construction of major buildings. Since 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.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

November 1, 2010 4:13 PM

The Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed two documents concerning the future of the University of California.

Our only comment concerns some of the language used to describe state support. In particular, 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 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."

Faculty Welfare

October 18, 2010 4:19 PM

The FWC 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.

Graduate Council

November 5, 2010 3:08 PM

Graduate Council was surprised that graduate education was not at all discussed in the documents addressing downsizing that were provided.

Council suggests that the following provisos be added as basic principles for further development: First, 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.

Second, graduate students should not be used to replace faculty as teachers and instructors at the expense of their education and research.

And, third, 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.

Information Technology

November 1, 2010 10:56 AM

Re: Response to RFC “Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing)”

The Information Technology Committee has reviewed and discussed the Request for Systemwide Review of Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University. The committee did identify some issues and concerns, one of which reflects concern over discrepancy of benefits given to executives. Point 3b mentions 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).

A second concern is with actual cost of online education. With reference to point 9c: Committee members involved professionally with distance education/online education years ago stated that at that point in time, numerous studies showed that in aggregate online courses were more expensive than classroom courses, required more instructional staff time, yielded inferior learning outcomes, and generated lower completion and satisfaction rates. So as of some years ago, online learning didn't look like a way to save money or to maintain quality. However the same studies showed that online courses could be deployed to positive effect in certain specific programs (particularly professional and technical, where motivation levels are high and the skills being taught very specific) and to achieve certain specific aims (like access or, if/where there is flexibility in pricing, revenue generation).

The final concern is the idea of losing quality students and faculty if we do not invest in IT infrastructure. Regarding point 8: The committee is very sympathetic to the idea 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, perhaps particularly on this campus due to the mix of programs here, cutting-edge IT infrastructure will be crucial in our ability to recruit prospective faculty members. This point is addressed under 8a ("address the needs of core academic (teaching and research) programs"); The committee would like to underscore that an indefinite blanket ban on capital investments in IT is probably not a good strategy.

Francois Gygi, Chair

Information Technology Committee

Library

November 4, 2010 10:22 AM

TIMOTHY B. MORTON *10/26/2010 8:48 PM*

I couldn't agree more with Brian's powerful assessment of the mission-critical role of a library. Any library, in particular a university library, is the heart and soul of scholarship. Scholarship means finding out things that no one knew about before, and for the vast majority of us, that means using a library. Whether you're a student, a teacher or a member of the public, a university library is not just a convenience store for information. It holds objects (made of paper, bits and bytes, magnetic tape etc.) that sometimes never see the light of day. These objects are the precious resources we can't afford to ignore or to lose. And the staff that holds and cares for these objects until scholarship discovers them deserves more than a passing mention between fire precautions and radiation.

BRIAN H KOLNER *10/26/2010 2:50 PM*

I agree strongly with the basic points laid out in the "PROPOSED COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL" as well as the UCLA Division Statement on Academic Values. However, I feel that there is an omission that needs consideration as well as one issue that could be broadened in scope.

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. I would therefore like to see some words added to the resolution(s) that supports maintenance and proper growth of our libraries. The current budget crisis has already had a serious impact on our ability to continue important journal subscriptions, book acquisitions and staff support. To me this is a "mainline" issue that is on the critical path to research and scholarly excellence.

In addition, although I note a few words about the costs of management and administrative positions needing careful scrutiny (Section 7, UCLA Statement), I believe it could deal even more explicitly with the growth of high-level, nonacademic, administrators, whose salaries often exceed that of the faculty who actually plan and teach the courses, secure the extramural funding, participate in the shared governance of the UC, and conduct vigorous research programs, often occupying 60-70 hours per week, every week of the year. This condition has not gone unnoticed by colleagues outside the UC and can only hinder our prospects for hiring talented scholars in these tough economic times.

The current actions on this campus to deal with the budget situation seem to favor sparing these high paid administrators at the expense of the low paid staff who carry out the day-to-day support of the faculty as they attend to their teaching and research activities.

Planning & Budget

November 10, 2010 4:40 PM

Comment on Academic Council downsizing statement (Resolution):

CPB endorses the Academic Council downsizing recommendations. CPB does note that downsizing, if quality is maintained, will limit access.

Comment on UCLA downsizing (Resolution):

CPB for most part, endorses the UCLA downsizing recommendations.

It finds that in most cases the two documents put forward similar statements. It, however, has several disagreements with the UCLA recommendations.

- CPB feels 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.
- CPB does not agree that UC Merced should receive special treatment/exemption from cuts. It feels that it is important to preserve the high quality of the existing programs at the non-expansion campuses in order to preserve the overall reputation of the university. Giving UC Merced an exemption would increase the burden on the other campuses and start UC down the road to mediocrity everywhere.
- CPB feels that some discretion is needed, 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.

Undergraduate Council

November 5, 2010 1:22 PM

The Undergraduate Council reviewed the Academic Council recommendations and the UCLA Statement on the Future of the University at its meetings on Oct 8 and Oct 22. We particularly focused on the consequences of downsizing the University and the proposed moratorium on capital improvements.

The UGC is strongly opposed to reducing the number of faculty and staff at without reducing the number of students. There was considerable concern that increasing the student/faculty ratio would inevitably result in the loss of quality to the UC undergraduate experience. Reduced support for unit 18 Lecturers and TAs has already resulted in larger classes and significantly less accessibility to laboratory and writing programs, and further reductions will extend these issues to even more classes. UCD has recently increased writing opportunities for students by modifying the GE requirements, but providing appropriate feedback on student writing will be increasing problematic with less instructors. Writing and laboratory courses that require significant hands on time by faculty and instructors are a major component of what make the UC undergraduate experience so valuable and reducing their availability to students is a step in the wrong direction. The UGC is concerned that such reductions will lead to increased times to graduation at precisely the time UC is being encouraged to reduce times to graduation. Introductory courses are already filled with 2nd and 3rd year students, making it difficult for students to complete prerequisites for upper division courses in a timely manner. Weakening the majors by requiring less courses or increasing the number of electives will compromise quality and must be avoided to maintain the excellence expected from a UC education.

UGC understands that funding from the CA legislature does not currently cover the costs of all enrolled students. This is unacceptable and UC should only take the number of students who are paid for. Encouraging more out-of-state students has been suggested as a means to increase revenue. Although these students pay higher fees and thus bring in more revenue, only some majors will be sufficiently attractive to undergraduates to be attractive to out of state students. We also 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. The need for increased classroom capacity is counter to the suggestion that capital improvements stop until the budget improves. This is particularly true now when building costs and interest rates are at a historical low.

UGC has 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.

John Yoder, Chair
Undergraduate Council