Size and Shape

Recommendation 6: Strategic academic planning in a systemwide context – UCOP in conjunction with the Academic Senate should collaborate to develop an academic planning framework that takes into account campus priorities and resources in the context of systemwide resources. They should also work to make it easier for students to enroll in and obtain credit for courses offered throughout the UC system. In addition, UCOP and the Academic Senate should require greater curricular and programmatic collaboration across the system.

The cumulative impact of budget cuts over several years will be quite large. In such an environment the overall academic footprint of UC may be harmed without systemwide planning to ensure that quality and diversity of offerings are maintained. Cross-campus collaborations have the potential to reduce costs and leverage limited resources. We must recognize that critical thresholds of academic activity and quality cannot be maintained for every discipline on every campus.

However, striking the appropriate balance between system and campus needs is not as easy as it might appear. Trust must be built among faculty, students, and administrators regarding the System’s ability to do detailed systemwide academic planning. Moreover, coordination across campuses with different calendars: quarter vs. semester is quite difficult.

It is important to keep in mind existing bylaws. Specifically, Bylaw 312.III.A.1 clearly delegates authority to the Divisions to approve and supervise all courses and curriculum. Bylaw 51 states, in pertinent part, that “No change in the curriculum of any college or school shall be made by any legislative agency of the Academic Senate until the proposed change has been submitted to the formal consideration of the Faculty concerned.” Whatever collaborative synergies can be created must respect that individual departments and IDPs should, have control over which courses they will and will not accept toward the completion of a degree.

Recommendation 7: Campus Funding – Allocate undergraduate financial aid based on student need; maintain the undergraduate student self-help component of financial aid at the same level across all campuses. Endorse the proposal to fund the Office of the President by an assessment on campus resources based on all campus revenue. Change the funding model for the campuses by allowing campuses to retain the education fee increases generated by their own students and by readjusting the base funding formulas for the campuses. Do not automatically apply education fee increases to academic graduate students.

UCLA agrees with this general approach, understanding that the details of this model need to be worked out and, in some cases, phased in.
Recommendation 8: Enrollment – Recommit to the California Master Plan for Higher Education standard of eligibility for admission of twelve and a half percent of California high school graduates to the extent resident applicants are funded by the state; increase nonresident admissions to meet campus capacity; reaffirm the 60:40 ratio of upper division to lower division; move towards a 1:2 ratio of community college transfers to freshmen if the state is willing to increase state funding for upper-division instruction; consider additional measures to address excess time to degree; maintain or increase graduate student enrollment; support self-supporting terminal Master’s degrees; encourage studies of UC professional schools modeled on the recent UC Health Affairs report.

| Agree | X | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

UCLA generally concurs with these points, but notes that these aggregate goals may apply to the system, not necessarily every campus. For example, there is a range of ratios of freshmen:transfers, and this may be appropriate given the particular capacities of each campus. (UCLA has far more transfers than the 1:2 ratio would prescribe, for example.)
Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 5: Direct the Academic Planning Council at the Office of the President, by spring, 2011, to:

- Develop a position statement that makes it clear that any changes made to education and curriculum at the University of California should preserve or enhance educational quality.
- Develop and endorse a framework document that identifies general guidelines and parameters for educational quality at UC, and a set of measures that effectively describe factors related to quality. Those measures should be incorporated into a periodic systemwide assessment of quality. Measures of access and affordability should be included as components of quality in the performance of UC’s educational mission.

Additionally, the Commission on the Future should endorse the use of outcome assessment as described by the UC Senate Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force in the report entitled “UC Way to Educational Effectiveness” as a means of developing information showing success in meeting learning objectives in UC coursework.

Agree  Conditionally Agree  X  Disagree  No consensus  No Comment

With regard to the UC Way to Educational Effectiveness, the UCLA Academic Senate reviewed this report and submitted revisions before it could endorse the report. See http://www.senate.ucla.edu/issues/documents/12-18-09GarrelltoPowell_re.ReportoftheUndergraduateEffectivenessTaskforce.pdf

Recommendation 6: Improve the student transfer function by requesting that UC campuses publish the lower-division pre-major requirements they expect from students for admission to each major. This will help minimize the number of students transferring into a program without the lower-division courses needed to be admitted to their major of choice, and facilitate a reduction in the time to degree for transfer students.

Agree  X  Conditionally Agree  Disagree  No consensus  No Comment

This is already done.
Access and Affordability

**Recommendation 7:** Continue to allocate undergraduate systemwide financial aid funding to equalize expectations for student borrowing and work across all students at all campuses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation 8:** Provide additional financial support to middle-income families while preserving access for low-income families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation 9:** Explore options for achieving the twin goals of providing campuses flexibility in the fund source used to meet UC’s minimum commitment to undergraduate financial accessibility and improving financial accessibility for middle-income students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Research Strategies

Recommendation 1: Collaborate with foundations, businesses, industries and the national labs to provide internships and fellowships for undergraduate and graduate students, and opportunities for industry leaders to work with UC students, providing new sources of student support and reducing the overall cost of education.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

This is already done, but might be done more aggressively or be facilitated at the campus or systemwide levels.

Recommendation 2: UC should adopt the following as a systemwide research mission statement:

Research is central to the University of California’s mission to benefit California and society globally as we discover, interpret, apply and communicate new knowledge and innovations that ensure the quality education we provide our students, inspiring them to be leaders and contributors to the public good.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

UCLA agreed without comment on a similarly worded recommendation to “Proactively demonstrate the significant and long-lasting benefits that UC research provides to California and the nation and advocate at the national level for increased and sustained funding in research.”

Recommendation 3: Create innovative practices to engage the public with the goals and results of research to strengthen links between the historical service mission of the university and its 21st-century research mission.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | X | No Comment |
Recommendation 4: Maximize the UC library system’s capacity to support the University’s research mission by: enhancing and developing data curation techniques; extending systemwide acquisition and sharing of resources; expanding accessibility of physical and virtual library space; and promoting systemwide scholarly publishing initiatives.

This is an omnibus recommendation, some elements of which are highly meritorious. Hard to endorse at this level of abstraction, however. Key committees (e.g., COLASC) have not yet considered this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: Enhanced research paradigms are needed within UC:
   o Recommendation 5a: UC should build on its strength as a multi-campus system by improving the ability to create and support multi-campus and system-wide research programs and research training.

UCLA has opposed the notion of creating a “UC Grand Challenge Research Initiative” (see Recommendation number 3). So, although leveraging and supporting multi-campus research is something we support, it is important to see what the specific support apparatus looks like, and what the funding sources will be.

   o Recommendation 5b: Each campus should ensure that its academic structures will maintain the quality of research within UC.

Recommendation 6: Implement mentoring, career, and professional development opportunities for graduate students, professional students, and postdoctoral researchers.

Do we need to say this? Much is already in place.
Expanded Recommendations

Expanded Recommendation 1: Systematically collect and present information on the effectiveness of comprehensive academic program reviews by our campuses and Academic Senates including (1) the elimination of unnecessary program duplication, (2) intra- and inter-campus program consolidation, and (3) programs discontinued due to low enrollment, low degree production, and/or quality concerns, particularly those that are not responsive to state need or student demand. Request the Chancellors work with campus Academic Senates to reinforce that the program review mechanisms are designed to:

- encourage investment in new programs while recognizing budget constraints may require redistribution of resources to support them;
- ensure reappraisal of existing programs at regular intervals to determine whether to maintain, expand, contract or discontinue programs.

Program reviews are an integral part of shared governance. The second part of this statement (Request the Chancellors…) seems unnecessary. The mission of the Academic Senate’s Program Reviews is as follows: “The primary goal of the Academic Program Reviews is to evaluate the quality of UCLA’s undergraduate and graduate education. Reviews are intended to be helpful and supportive in (a) recognizing strengths and achievements, (b) promoting goal setting and planning, and (c) identifying areas in need of attention. Reviews should primarily seek perspectives useful to the units whose programs are under review and to their respective academic deans. They should also give Senate agencies and senior administrators an informed overview of the strengths, problems, and needs of academic units.” See [http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/](http://www.senate.ucla.edu/programreview/)

The first part of this particular recommendation asks campuses to present reports on only one aspect of the review process: eliminations and consolidations. Systematically collecting only this data would add no value to anything. If any reporting is required, it should be comprehensive, reflecting the effectiveness of the program review process in enabling innovation and facilitating program improvements, as well as in consolidating, discontinuing, etc.

Expanded Chancellors regarding their policies and practices of ensuring academic units are meeting core course teaching requirements through improved curricular design, better term-to-term planning of curricular offerings, and better alignment of faculty course assignments with workload policies.

Expanded Recommendation 2: Systematically collect and present information from the Chancellors regarding their policies and practices of ensuring academic units are meeting core course teaching requirements through improved curricular design, better term-to-term planning of curricular offerings, and better alignment of faculty course assignments with workload policies.

This adds an extra layer of reporting effort, with no obvious added value. Chancellors and EVCs are accountable for these things at the local level and through their own performance reviews.
Expanded Recommendation 3: Increase to $250 million per year in five years the income derived from self-supporting and part-time programs. The initiative will expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities, while generating revenues that may be applied in support of UC’s core instructional mission.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

The idea of expanding the programs is good, and most campuses are doing this to enhance revenues and access. The target, however, seems completely arbitrary.

Expanded Recommendation 4: Convert all UC campuses to a systemwide semester calendar.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

We have not had a formal discussion of this topic for several years. At the last consideration, faculty opinion was highly mixed, and the resulting vote was strongly negative. Some faculty feel that the semester model is preferable for academic reasons. Others are concerned that semesters provide less flexibility in teaching assignments and sabbatical leaves. The Faculty Welfare committee is the only committee that specifically addressed this recommendation; they are concerned that the conversion would create a large burden on faculty and staff at a time when campuses are already stressed and resource-constrained. The transition would be difficult and the benefits are unclear.

Expanded Recommendation 5: Increase successful community college transfers to UC.

| Agree | Conditionally Agree | Disagree | No consensus | No Comment |

UCLA opined on a similarly phrased recommendation (Recommendation 2, under Size and Shape: “Improve the student transfer function by developing more complete lower-division transfer pathways in high-demand majors.”) We agreed conditionally, noting that “UCLA already has established and effective transfer pathways; moreover the transfer pathways for high-demand majors at UCLA are also well developed. We do not see the benefit of enhancing transfer pathways to large majors that are already oversubscribed. There could be a benefit to small majors, however.”
Expanded Recommendation 6: Accelerate and broaden the pilot program on online instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>XXXXX</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

UCLA reviewed the Report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency. See http://www.senate.ucla.edu/issues/documents/01-15-10GarrelltoPowell_re.UCLAResponsetotheReportoftheSenateSpecialCommitteeonOnlineandRemote.pdf. In it, we noted that “There was consensus that online and remote education is no longer avoidable at the UC, but that implementing online and remote education programs should be implemented incrementally, with academic and financial analysis and review of existing programs guiding the development of future programs.”

Expanded Recommendation 7: Initiate planning for a coordinated approach to the delivery of online instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Expanded Recommendation 8: Recommendation 8: Increase faculty salaries from additional non-state resources where possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When previously asked if UCLA supports the recommendation to “Examine alternate faculty compensation plans,” we conditionally supported it, noting that “We caution that such an approach may further contribute to a two-tiered salary plan for faculty. There is a clear understanding that bringing faculty salaries up to market levels should remain a high priority for the UC, and we are cautiously supportive. The details of any such proposal will be key.”
From Faculty Welfare: looking to increase outside funding sources is probably necessary given the substantial salary gap at UC compared with other institutions. But UC must realize that this effort will affect a very small number of faculty and thus have a minimal impact on raising overall faculty compensation. UC should re-commit to raising the salary scales to be competitive with other universities.

Some faculty have expressed concerns about widening disparities across units, were participation in alternative compensation plans to be opened to new groups of faculty.

**Expanded Recommendation 9:** Establish a Presidential initiative to drive systemwide efficiency measures in our administrative and financial practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When asked if UCLA supports the recommendation to “Eliminate administrative redundancies across the UC system and promote efficiencies where possible,” we noted that “There is consensus that redundancies should be reduced; this should not be construed as an endorsement of a conducting large-scale, extensive study to identify redundancies. It should not be assumed that, in reducing redundancies, all functions should be moved to UCOP.”

**Expanded Recommendation 10:** Implement a “University of California Strategic Investment Program” (UCSIP) program to fund strategic investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

X | No Comment
COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE SECOND ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Response Template
Response from: UCLA

COVC Recommendations

COVC Recommendation 1: The Regents should direct the Office of the President to adopt, by fiscal year 2012, a campus-based budgeting model, in which the Office of the President and Regents’ affairs are budgeted through campus assessments.

Agree  Conditionally Agree  Disagree  No consensus  No Comment

COVC Recommendation 2: The Office of the President will direct all campuses and the Office of the President itself to adopt a single payroll system for the entire system by fiscal year 2013 and work rapidly toward the elimination of other administrative redundancies in human resource systems.

Agree  Conditionally Agree  Disagree  No consensus  No Comment

COVC Recommendation 3: The Regents should direct the Office of the President to coordinate with the campuses to provide, by academic year 2013, on-line courses that will satisfy the transfer articulation agreement with California Community Colleges, such that full satisfaction of the transfer general education core can be accomplished anywhere at any time. Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, generally as well as in self-supporting graduate-degree and Extension programs.

Agree  Conditionally Agree  Disagree  No consensus  No Comment

Our faculty have not yet discussed this recommendation and its implications, but has generally supported improving access for transfer students.
COVC Recommendation 4: The Regents will establish a simplified and re-named fee structure by academic year 2013. The education and professional fees will be “tuition”, the registration fee will be “student services” fee. When recommendation 1 is enacted, all fees will remain on the campus generating them. In the interim, there will be no change with respect to fees for professional students (i.e., the former professional fees will remain on the campus generating them). Furthermore, the Regents will adopt, by 2013 a multiyear fee schedule for undergraduate tuition, with fee increases set at less than ten percent a year for each cohort, subject to the declaration by the Regents of a fiscal emergency requiring the schedule to be temporarily modified.

UCLA concurs with simplifying and renaming the fee structure, and with keeping the revenues on the campus that generates them.

As for the multi-year fee schedule: When UCLA opined on the recommendation that UC “Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering cohort of new undergraduate students,” we conditionally agreed. We commented “Any such policy must be careful to ensure that (1) students and their families can reasonably anticipate a fee increase from one year to the next, and (2) that the UC has the flexibility to respond to externally created budget crises (e.g., unplanned State budget allocation shortfalls).

Moreover, it does not make sense that students from two different cohorts could conceivably take the same course, but pay different fees for it. One suggestion for managing these concerns is to have two options: (A) students may opt to have a set fee schedule at a higher rate, or (B) may opt to go year-to-year, taking their chances of either paying more or less. There are grave concerns about implementing this recommendation.”

COVC Recommendation 5: The Regents will direct the Office of the President to aggressively pursue increases to research overhead recovery. The Regents and the Office of the President will engage public officials to ensure that the university receives fair reimbursement for federal grants and contracts (at least parity with private peer institutions) and the Office of the President will provide policy to the campuses limiting the use of university resources without fair overhead compensation.

Agree X Conditionally Agree Disagree No consensus No Comment
COVC Recommendation 6: The Regents will develop a multi-year advocacy campaign designed to generate both private and public support for the research and instructional mission of the university. Measurable benchmarks for this campaign, for both the private and public sector, will be developed by the Office of the President and provided to the university community annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCLA agreed without comment to a similarly worded recommendation.

COVC Recommendation 7: The Regents will direct that each campus with undergraduate students will, by 2014, have a common, semester-based calendar. Further, the Regents direct the Office of the President to identify transition support for campuses changing to the semester system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Conditionally Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No consensus</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Same as Expanded Recommendation 4: We have not had a formal discussion of this topic for several years. At the last consideration, faculty opinion was highly mixed, and the resulting vote was strongly negative. Some faculty feel that the semester model is preferable for academic reasons. Others are concerned that semesters provide less flexibility in teaching assignments and sabbatical leaves. The Faculty Welfare committee is the only committee that specifically addressed this recommendation; they are concerned that the conversion would create a large burden on faculty and staff at a time when campuses are already stressed and resource-constrained. The transition would be difficult and the benefits are unclear.