November 9, 2010

Daniel Simmons  
Chair, Academic Council  
University of California

In Re: Academic Council and UCLA’s Statements on the Future of the UC

Dear Dan,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the two statements regarding the future of the University of California. Upon receipt, I specifically requested review by the Council on Planning and Budget, the Faculty Welfare Committee, and all the FECs. As is our custom, all other committees were welcome to opine, if they so chose.

The UCLA Senate Executive Board, which speaks for the Division on such matters, reviewed all responses (please see attached). The Board was most compelled by the UCLA Statement, and therefore endorses it over the Academic Council Statement. Even so, the Board expresses reservations about the Senate’s taking a firm stance on either statement, given the work currently underway by the UC Senate Special Committee on the Future of the UC. Board members raised the concern that endorsing either statement at this time would be premature without having a chance to consider them in light of the recommendations of the Special Committee.

The UCLA Academic Senate looks forward to receiving the Report of the Special Committee soon for evaluation and provision of comments.

Sincerely,

Ann Karagozian  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Jaime R. Balboa, CAO, UCLA Academic Senate
October 20, 2010

To: Ann Karagozian  
Academic Senate, Chair

From: Shane White  
Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair

Re: Senate Item for Review: Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed the Senate Item for Review: Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future at their meeting on Tuesday, October 12, 2010. The committee agreed that it is difficult to endorse either of the statements on the Commission on Future. The Committee believes that the real issue is whether the University is going to be the engine of discovery and growth for the State of California; as of present, many see the University as a drain on the State.

The Committee believes that we should be moving towards a model where the State shares the long term trajectory of State funding with the University, and allow the campuses to figure out what to do with the funds, instead of micromanaging how money is spent. The recommendations do not address the larger thematic or the mechanics of what the University really does.

Cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Dottie Ayer, Assistant to Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Brandie Henderson, Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
MEMORANDUM

College Faculty Executive Committee
A265 Murphy Hall

October 20, 2010

To: Ann Karagozian, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

From: Raymond Knapp, Chair
UCLA College Faculty Executive Committee

Re: College FEC response to “Proposed Commission Recommendation from the Academic Council” and UCLA’s alternative statement, regarding “UC Commission on the Future: First Round of Recommendations from the Working Groups”

Thank you on behalf of the College Faculty Executive Committee for the opportunity to review and opine on the “Proposed Commission Recommendation from the Academic Council” and UCLA’s alternative statement, regarding “UC Commission on the Future: First Round of Recommendations from the Working Groups,” and thank you also for presenting these documents to us at our meeting of October 8, 2010.

Our discussion focused on the two elements you emphasized in your presentation, and how they are balanced somewhat differently in the two documents. Specifically, both documents emphasize the importance of attracting and retaining extraordinary faculty, and both documents also express concern that UC’s growth be managed more stringently during the ongoing financial crisis. As we understand it, the intention of UCLA’s alternative statement was to soften somewhat the proposed moratorium on building, while at the same time to argue more broadly for the importance of faculty remuneration and benefits.

In a discussion somewhat abbreviated for lack of time, arguments were made for both sides of both issues, and we elected not to take a vote to support either statement. In our discussion of the first issue, concern was expressed that the focus should more squarely on attracting and retaining faculty, and that the attempt to broaden this concern to staff, in this context, was ill-advised. We were most divided over the issue of continuing to build; while some argued that not to build at all would be a kind of stagnation, and not responsive to our continuing need for space to support our fundamental mission, others argued that even privately funded building would entail the accumulation of additional public debt, which would undermine our ability to remain competitive in other ways, including salaries.

The College FEC appreciates the consultative process and opportunity to provide you feedback on these statements. You are welcome to contact me at knapp@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.
cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Joseph Watson, Chair, Undergraduate Council
October 19, 2010

Professor Ann Karagozian  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future

Dear Professor Karagozian,

The Council on Planning and Budget was not able to discuss the competing statements on the University’s future prepared by the Academic Council and the UCLA Senate. However, we did participate in the discussion and drafting of the UCLA statement last spring. We did hold an email discussion and vote over the past seven days. All members of CPB who participated indicated that they prefer the UCLA statement, which allows for greater campus autonomy and does not call for a halt to capital projects.

Respectfully,

David Lopez  
Chair, UCLA Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Andy Leuchter, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Robin Garrell, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
Jaime -

The SEAS FEC met last week and discussed this item. A quorum was present, but no direct vote was taken. After a discussion, all the committee members were requested to respond officially by email as to their opinion.

The SEAS FEC response is: The committee supports this proposal.

COMMENTS:

Some reservations were expressed over the cost of administrative services and any increase in such costs.
Dear Ann,

Below are the responses from the FEC of the School of Theater, Film and Television to the four proposals from the Academic Senate.

**Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future:**

The committee cannot endorse the proposal until and unless the following revisions are made:

1. The need for student support, both undergraduate and graduate, must be addressed.

2. There is an exception to the provision to halt capital projects. The committee feels strongly that when building and equipment is integral to core curriculum, such projects should be funded.

3. The provision for downsizing faculty is removed. Due to the current economic crisis, downsizing and other budgetary restraints are inherent in the charge of each department.

The vote was unanimous.

Sincerely,

Joe Olivieri
FEC Chair
School of Theater, Film and Television
MEMO

Date October 16, 2010

From Andrea Fraser
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of the Arts and Architecture

To UCLA Academic Senate
Jaime Balboa, CAO

RE SOAA FEC response to Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future

The Faculty Executive Committee of the School of the Arts and Architecture reviewed the Academic Council and UCLA Statements on UC’s Future, as requested by the chair of the UCLA Academic Senate. At its October 15 meeting, the SOAA FEC voted to endorse the statement drafted by the UCLA division. However, we did not vote specifically to endorse it as an alternative to the statement drafted by the Academic Council and submitted to UC COTF. As the Academic Council statement was submitted to the UC COTF, and as that body has completed its work, this question appeared moot. Therefore, our vote should not be taken as a vote against the Academic Council statement, but simply an endorsement of the UCLA division statement as written.