



320 STEPHENS HALL  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

July 23, 2010

HENRY POWELL  
Chair, Academic Council

*Subject: UC Commission on the Future expanded and second round recommendations*

Dear Harry,

The Berkeley Division thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the expanded and second round COTF recommendations. I have synthesized the Divisional comments on the response template, and have included comments from some of our committees. Because the recommendations arrived after spring semester, our responses reflect a less vigorous form of consultation than we would prefer to give for such an important topic, and especially given the striking nature of some of these recommendations.

In general, the Division thought that the COVC recommendations were a model for the process, as they were well focused on the immediate goal of reducing the budget gap.

As with the first round of Working Group (WG) recommendations, Berkeley agreed with many of the sentiments expressed by the Groups, and the underlying vision of a great constellation of research universities. However, we continue to remain concerned that the WG process seems to emit proposals with little prospect for significant revenue gains, or with genuinely transformative (as opposed to incremental) change. As to the latter, the use of the COTF process for incremental, "normal science" proposals threatens to undermine ordinary processes of university governance. We also were concerned that many of the recommendations would seem to entail large amounts of additional upstream reporting and synthesis, both offending principles of departmental and campus autonomy and overstraining diminishing administrative resources.

We were, by contrast, deeply concerned with the Expanded Recommendations from UCOP. The underlying theory, expressed in the comments to recommendation 5, that the University must locate its distinctive value in the Upper Division, seemed to many a betrayal of two-thirds of our students and undergraduate curriculum, to misunderstand the nature of a four-year education, and to threaten the ability of campuses to generate future generations of philanthropic support, on which they must depend. While we strongly support the role of transfer students within UC, we believe the value UC can provide those students comes from their inclusion within residential, four-year (and graduate) campuses.

We were, second, deeply concerned by the aggressive (even rash) schedule of implementation discussed for the online pilot – a pilot program we continue to support. While there is discussion of the need to act boldly with a long-term vision, the actual timetable for

implementation, which would seem to offer only one cycle of evaluation for courses before significant programmatic decisions are made.

We also note that many of the Expanded Recommendations seem to presuppose the system of online instruction being discussed as a pilot – and more generally seem to presuppose a shift from the current system of faculty-led, department and school-based academic advising to a system of self-advising by students educating themselves from an online template. We regard this as pointing towards an abdication of our responsibility as educators.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Christopher Kutz". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a light blue rectangular background.

Christopher Kutz  
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor of Law, Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program

## 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Berkeley agrees with 6a and 6b, insofar as it repeats what is already standard policy, but is concerned that what is portended is a more intrusive and time-consuming systemwide review that will yield little benefit. New proposals currently must address the need and further resources available for particular programs of study within the system and the nation more generally. An over-focus on “UC” programs may falsely suggest a greater depth of resources than students (whose scholarly identity is and will likely remain campus based) will encounter.

Berkeley has serious concerns about 6c. While we agree that the transfer / cross-credit process needs substantial improvement, we worry that rendering credit automatic would make a hash out of departmental efforts to define and innovate curricula, and would gravely undermine their intellectual autonomy. The issue is not one of differing judgment of quality, but of differing contents – similarly-named courses within the same departments at different campuses may cover different material at different depths, and there is reason to fear students seeking to substitute courses from different campuses will be underprepared. Furthermore, it is impossible to know from the recommendation how serious a problem this is, whether there really is substantial demand for other UC courses. Among graduate students, for example, the issue is usually one of receiving credit for courses from other local universities (e.g., Stanford/Berkeley, UCLA/USC).

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Berkeley supports 7a and 7b, and believes that we must also rationalize the basic funding system for the campuses, per 7c. But we are of course very worried that implementing 7c, to the detriment of Berkeley in the absence of other funding sources, would be a blow to Berkeley’s quality and standing that it can ill afford now. Therefore, we urge a cautious and slow period of transition. We do have some concerns about 7a, namely that an overly redistributive form of

financial aid policy as between campuses will create disincentives for campuses to pursue philanthropic support for their own students. We strongly support 7D.

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Berkeley generally agrees with the spirit of this recommendation, but does not understand how it will save money. The commitment to the Master Plan must be contingent on the availability of state funding. The recommendation also must be contingent on the strength of the transfer pool – a pool under threat by budget cuts. We also believe that having a substantial population of 4 year students is a critical component of the overall intellectual and social environment of the campus, and is also crucial to cultivating future alumni support, so are wary of too rapid an increase in transfer students.

## 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We agree with the views here, but believe graduate education should figure in them.

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

### 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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

The sentiment is terrific; the concern is where the money will come from.

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Berkeley strongly believes that campus flexibility is crucial.

## 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We are in favor of further opportunities for students, but do not think the costs of administering these programs have been addressed, nor the liability issues.

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We universally found this statement awkward, difficult to parse, and uninspiring (especially the rather flatfooted phrase “the quality education”).

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

x	Agree		Conditionally Agree		Disagree		No consensus		No Comment
---	-------	--	---------------------	--	----------	--	--------------	--	------------

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.

	Agree	x	Conditionally Agree		Disagree		No consensus		No Comment
--	-------	---	---------------------	--	----------	--	--------------	--	------------

We recognize the extraordinary value of multi-campus resources like the telescope, but in general worry that a push to create system-level research efforts will suck up rather than save funds, and believe that research efforts should emerge organically.

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

x	Agree		Conditionally Agree		Disagree		No consensus		No Comment
---	-------	--	---------------------	--	----------	--	--------------	--	------------

Does any campus not do so?

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

x	Agree		Conditionally Agree		Disagree		No consensus		No Comment
---	-------	--	---------------------	--	----------	--	--------------	--	------------

## 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

**While we agree that program discontinuation presents a problem – it is hard to push anyone into pulling the plug – we are very skeptical that a systemwide approach will yield net benefits. What is said here, of course, is merely that best practices will be shared – but the recommendation suggests a stronger central role for UCOP and the systemwide Senate overall, and we believe this will be enmeshed in ugly politics.**

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

This recommendation will consume significant amounts of staff, dean, chair, and faculty time, with little likelihood of benefit from a systemwide review.

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We believe self-supported graduate programs have an important place at Berkeley and in the system (but do not know how realistic this target is.) We strongly support the principle that there be clear guidelines to distinguish these programs from state-suppprted programs, and have a number of concerns about cannibalization of resources, especially faculty time for teaching or research. We frankly resent the implication in "Challenges" that the Senate is merely obstructionist on this issue, and we are very concerned that the suggestion that such

programs be funded through loans may lead to unwise university investments – clear business plans must be shown.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We believe that regularization would have benefits, and that there are some pedagogical advantages to longer teaching periods (and campuses could get more teaching out of the same number of faculty). Bu of course Berkeley would not need to pay the transition costs.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

While of course we support an increase in successful transfers, we worry about abdicating campus responsibilities to ensure the fitness of students to their programs, and worry further that rendering transfer credit automatic may lead to the admission of underprepared students. We also think that attempts to align the many different campus curricula with the community college system will stifle curricular development and may risk our accreditation.

We vehemently disagree with the stated goal that, “Simply put, the goal is to place the emphasis of the value of a UC education on the upper division coursework.” It is insulting to our exceptional students to suggest that they spend their first two years killing time. Surely our goal should be to translate the quality of a UC lower division to the community colleges by innovating lower division education. Comments by our COCI are particularly pertinent on this point.

Expanded Recommendation 6: Accelerate and broaden the pilot program on online instruction.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We strongly support a pilot program to investigate online teaching. But we regard the timetable gestured at here as incompatible with the goal of having a research-driven evaluation of a significant number of courses, which would presumably need to be taught more than once to be fully realized. We have grave concerns about funding the pilot through private loans, which could lead to serious conflicts of interest. We do not understand where the teaching staff

will come from. Finally, we note that this one set of recommendations has filled the airwaves with talk of selling online degrees, distracting us from a more useful mission of trimming costs and refining our programs.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Our concerns noted above apply here. We also note the creep in our purported mission, now to educate all Californians, whereas the Master Plan calls for educating the top 12.5%. We believe fulfilling the Master Plan should be our goal.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We have grave concerns about the inequities that may arise from such a program, the shifting of faculty incentives away from teaching and non-salary oriented forms of research, and the diminishing of our competitiveness in the sciences as against soft-money medical school appointments. Indeed, it appears that many of our competitors are moving in the opposite direction, to 10 or 11 month salaries.

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

Assuming the investments are sound, this is good.

Overall, we were dismayed by the Expanded recommendations, which generally shift curricular responsibilities away from departments and campuses either to students themselves (pursuing largely online degrees) or to the system. Many of the recommendations seem predicated on the rolling-out of the online model, a model we do not yet believe has been tested to ensure its performance of the goals of a broad and deep education.

## COVC Recommendations

**Overall, we liked the COVC recommendations much more, and believed that they (uniquely) represented an attempt to make recommendations with significant fiscal impact.**

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We agree, provided that the timetable is realistic for their evaluation.

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

We agree, but believe research services must also improve.

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.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conditionally Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	No consensus	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Comment
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	------------

See above.

July 15, 2010

CHAIR CHRISTOPHER KUTZ  
BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: Second-Round Recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future

We are pleased to comment on the second-round recommendations of the UC Commission on the Future, confining our remarks once again to the issues that are most relevant to our committee's responsibilities.

We continue to be concerned about the recommendations regarding online course offerings and alternative faculty compensation plans.

Recommendation 6 acknowledges "numerous" challenges to online courses, such as the "absence of any agreed upon understanding about how to review an online course for the purposes of its Senate approval" and the "absence of any agreed definition of educational quality or mechanisms for assessing [the] learning effectiveness of online as compared to traditional forms of instruction." While the report characterizes these challenges as "tractable," we view them as serious and fundamental. Furthermore, we remain concerned that the report envisions "systemwide" review of courses that would be "made available across or between campuses;" we see no reason why individual campuses could not review such courses on their own, without any systemwide intervention. In general, we believe that the proposal should do more to ensure faculty control over curricular design and implementation at the departmental as well as campus level.

Recommendation 8 considers alternative sources of faculty compensation that would "allow adding a salary increment above the salary provided by the current faculty compensation plan." The expanded recommendation does not adequately address our initial concern that research and teaching might be skewed by the financial incentives of such compensation programs. We are equally troubled by the expectation that "a faculty member's salary will be negotiated annually, in light of available funding sources." This expectation seems impossible to reconcile with our normal campus review process: first, in that annual assessments of faculty would place an unmanageable burden on campus reviewers; and second, in that the recommendation envisions a process of *negotiation*, not review. We would strongly oppose any new compensation program that might undermine the faculty's role in sustaining scholarly independence and excellence.

In conclusion, we suggest a revision to the proposed systemwide research mission statement set forth in Recommendation 2. The phrase "quality education" seems ill-considered. We recommend a more formal and dignified characterization of our mission: at the very least, we would hope to see emphasis on "*the excellence of the education we provide our students.*"

Jeffrey Knapp  
Chair

JK/mg

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 19, 2010

CHAIR CHRIS KUTZ  
BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

*Re: New Committee on the Future Recommendations*

Dear Chris,

Please accept these short comments from CEP regarding the second-round Commission on the Future recommendations. The comments are necessarily brief because I am about to leave on a major research trip.

CEP generally applauds the second-round recommendations, as many of them focus on the nature of a UC undergraduate education and its relationship to the research mission of the University. This is the cornerstone of the Size and Shape recommendations. We are cautiously supportive of the plans to examine across the system the nature of undergraduate offerings and to encourage multi-campus and cross-campus initiatives where feasible. We do not think these will harm Berkeley, they may result in some enhanced revenue opportunities, and they may occasionally offer a Berkeley student something that is not available here (or, more likely, is only available in a restricted way). It is difficult to predict if the proposals to reform the campus funding model are good or bad for us--as the report says, "the present system by which the campuses are centrally funded is completely lacking in transparency." We strongly support the move to decouple undergraduate and academic graduate student fees, as the increases in the latter are only shooting ourselves in the foot. For all fully-sponsored externally-funded graduate students, there are many more that departments and grant holders fund, and increasing their fees is self-defeating. We are cautious about plans to increase the proportion of upper-division students.

We are very supportive and enthusiastic about the Education and Curriculum proposals to protect and enhance the quality of a UC education. By itself this proposal sounds like apple pie, but it is grounded in an empirical assessment of that quality. Rather than beginning with a wishful statement about what UC quality should be, the proposal, using UCUES data, tries to define what it actually has been in the experience of real UC undergraduates. The results point unequivocally to the experience of studying with instructors who, whether GSIs or full professors, are connected to the research mission of the University. The summary of their findings are on page 25, and I won't repeat them here, but again and again they mention the direct and indirect importance of having UC faculty and the Academic Senate as the determinant factors in the quality of the undergraduate experience. They also emphasize the importance of collaboration and of studying alongside other top-notch students, the sensitivity to diversity that results from in-class contacts, and the fostering of intellectual curiosity and honesty.

Again let me emphasize that this is not wishful thinking; these are empirical conclusions drawn from the results of the UCUES surveys. No one comes to the University of California expecting a small-college experience, but they do come here in order to study with research-oriented instructors and to develop their intellects alongside a cohort of peers.

We pass on the opportunity to comment on Access and Affordability and Research-related proposals.

How different these proposals are from those of the Administration, particularly the emphasis on headlong development of distance learning. Again I can't rehearse all the arguments against this, but will just name a few. The proposal calls for a schedule that simply won't allow time for adequate review. It disregards concerns about funding. It is not at all grounded, indeed it runs against, the very qualities that make a UC education distinctive. Where is the pool of research-oriented instructors going to come from? To take on educating everyone from Sheboygan to Shanghai will entail massive hiring of lecturers and adjuncts, the opposite of UC quality. Finally, the faculty have repeatedly shown that we don't want to go there. That is our right. Even if we are wrong-headed Luddites, if we are missing an opportunity to go into a brave new world, if this could be the financial salvation of the University, we as the Senate still have the right to say no. We have made it clear that we say no. Up until now the Senate has been enormously cooperative in the wake of the financial disaster that we face. Does the Administration really want to take us on in a full-fledged fight over this?

Keep up the good struggle over the next month.

Respectfully submitted,

Ignacio Navarrete, Chair  
Committee on Educational Policy

IN/ew

July 20, 2010

CHAIR CHRISTOPHER KUTZ  
Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

Dear Chair Kutz:

We provide here a response to the Second Round Working Group recommendations and the "Expanded Recommendations" from UCOP to the UC Committee on the Future that we see as relevant to our role as Berkeley's Committee on Courses of Instruction.

**Second Round Education and Curriculum Working Group Recommendations.** We support the intent of both recommendations – to seek to provide and monitor over time a wide range of measures of academic and educational quality, as well as of access and affordability [WG 3 Rec # 5, pg 22] and to improve the student transfer function by requesting that UC campuses publish their lower-division pre-major requirements if they do not already do so [WG 3 Rec #6, pg 51]. **With regard to improving the student transfer function, we note that UC Berkeley, for example, already does this for every major through ASSIST;** students who have a strong desire to transfer to Cal already have a very clear path laid out for them on how to do so and should not find themselves with many (or any) “holes” to fill once they arrive. **With regard to educational quality, a number of the recommended metrics for quality should indeed be monitored over time, both by individual campuses and systemwide.** We are particularly interested in what fraction of the best freshman applicants and the best CCC transfer applicants ultimately choose to come to UC, as well as what our students do after graduation and their satisfaction with how well UC prepared them, and how these metrics may change over time. Indeed, we are concerned about a decline in these metrics if a number of *other* recommendations in this most recent package are implemented which we feel may serve to undermine the confidence that both the top high school graduates (and their families) and the taxpayers of California have in the quality of a UC education, particularly those that appear to represent a devaluation of the first two years of a UC education (see below).

**Second Round Size and Shape Working Group Recommendation 6C: Revise SR 544 to facilitate cross-campus course credit transfer (pg 8).** We agree that the *mechanics* of how students pursue and receive permission to enroll in cross-campus courses is archaic and unnecessarily burdensome and should be updated. However, requiring that students have advice from their major departments through faculty and staff advisors and that they ascertain that they will receive credit by their college or major department remain good ideas into the foreseeable future and should continue. Thus, we do not support changing the intent of SR544 (that students should be advised as to whether a cross-campus course will result in credit for their campus-based major) to what is recommended here (to allow automatic cross-campus transfer to all lower-division general education courses and perhaps upper-division courses), as we think it is likely to do more harm than good, at least in the near future. It may seriously risk extending the time to graduation if students do not have faculty advice on what courses will serve them well in their particular major and will satisfy their major requirements. It would also be logistically slow and clumsy since this "automatic credit" approach would be the equivalent of setting curricula that all 9 undergraduate campuses would effectively have to approve. It is therefore also likely to stifle innovation and flexibility since undergraduate courses and curricula are not set in stone and evolve over time. While we can see the eventual benefits of cross-campus curricular cooperation and innovation, we are not there yet, and to implement such a sweeping change ahead of letting it evolve organically (albeit with encouragement from the administration, we're sure) is risky and premature for the reasons noted above. **Thus, we recommend that the logistics but not the intent of SR544 be revised, particularly since the logistics of advising and permissions should become much easier as new student course**

management systems and databases come online in the near future that students, faculty, and staff will all have access to, thus greatly simplifying both advising and registration. UC Berkeley, for example, is on track to implement the beginnings of such a system this year (through a product called U. Select, an add-on to DARS) and then eventually through the Kuali student system for which there are a variety of requirements designed to meet these needs.

**Expanded Recommendations from UCOP.** It is difficult to argue at face value against "increasing *successful* [our italics] community college transfers to UC" [Exp. Rec. #5, pg 82] and exploring the quality, costs, and relevance to UC of fully online undergraduate courses through a pilot study [Exp. Rec. #6 and #7, pg 86 & 89] (which in the First Round recommendations were promised to be funded by donors, overseen at all levels by faculty, and thoroughly studied by higher education scholars). However, the proverbial devil is in the details, and there are a number of details spread throughout the entirety of the Expanded Recommendations that, taken together, paint a disturbing picture of the future of undergraduate education at UC, perhaps best summarized by the statement on page 105:

**"Simply put, the goal is to place the emphasis of the value of a UC education on the upper division coursework."**

While this specific statement is part of a bullet point arguing that the process of transfer students receiving credit for UC major requirements for lower division courses they took at community colleges should be more straightforward and transparent (a goal we do not disagree with), this vision also permeates numerous other places, including the ideas that we should (1) move to "better align" our UC courses with those taught at CCCs (even to the point of using a common numbering system) and (2) "err on the side of boldness" to rapidly move toward teaching the 25 top enrollment undergraduate "gateway" courses in fully online versions.

With regard to (1), we note the following pattern of suggesting we should "align" UC's courses with those of the CCCs in the Expanded Recommendations:

- Moving towards a common course numbering and course descriptor system with California Community Colleges, including
  - *not only* "requir[ing] that all campuses recognize the common course numbering at the CCCs...using the common course descriptors, as opposed to individual course outlines, to determine transferability and applicability to degree requirements (i.e., articulation)" [pg 104, Exp Rec #5], *but also*
  - suggesting that CSU and UC [specifically "perhaps all segments"] should use the same course numbering system [pg 105, Exp Rec #5],
  - and that switching to the semester system, which would require curricular re-design by the seven quarter-system campuses "could be leveraged to further align UC courses with CCC courses" [pg 101, Exp Rec #4], and
- "Request[ing] that the faculty initiate a review of streamlined transfer preparation pathways from CCCs to the University that would include... the development a common GE pattern across CSU and UC" [pg 107, Exp Rec #5]

We do not believe that homogenizing the first two years of a university education state-wide across UC, CSU, and the CCCs through a common course numbering and descriptor system is a good idea for students at any of the 3 segments. Besides the fact that the needs and goals of the majority of students within each segment are often quite different from the other segments, we also believe that such an effort will be nearly impossible to achieve logistically and will almost certainly stifle innovation, minimize flexibility as fields change, and create unprecedented stagnation. Furthermore, why would UC want to "better align" new UC courses to those already offered at CCCs?

In any case, we note that California **already** has an agreed-upon GE pattern for all community college students that is accepted at any UC or CSU, called IGETC (Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum). Each CC decides which of their courses make up their IGETC, and they certify that it is complete. If a UC campus receives this certification on a student's transcript, that student does not need to complete any additional GE courses at any UC. Furthermore, we understand that the State Legislature is considering a bill this summer that would require UC and CSU to consider GE complete if the student has earned an AA or AS degree; this is a common model in other states and on its face may not be of great concern since the bar for GE coursework toward a degree would be higher than that for a transfer path. Indeed, if this bill passes, then none of the work described in these expanded recommendations to come to a common course numbering system would be necessary even if it were desirable.

In addition, we feel that **articulation of a vision to homogenize the courses and curriculum among the UCs, CSUs, and CCC's, combined with the statement about placing "the value of a UC education on upper division coursework,"** could soon guarantee that the very top percentage of California high school graduates will not elect to go to UC but to the private peer institutions that we compete with. Yet not only are these top 3 to 5% of California high school graduates important to maintaining the academic excellence at UC that all of our students and faculty benefit from, these students will also become increasingly important as alumni donors to the university in the future, especially if state support continues to erode. **Academically and financially, we cannot afford to begin losing students to our private (and some public) peers** by homogenizing the first two years of a UC undergraduate education with CCCs and CSUs.

Likewise, we are concerned that the vision of moving many **large enrollment lower division courses online** – and the publicity it is also receiving in the press that also includes proposals for online UC bachelor's degrees – will also lead to a devaluation and potentially a decrease in quality of the first two years of a UC education as well as the perception by the public that we plan to increasingly devalue it. For this reason, we do not agree that we should "err on the side of boldness" with regard to the online pilot project. Rather, we provisionally support a careful and thorough pilot project that is led by faculty each step of the way and a sober and independent scholarly study of the pedagogical outcomes, as well as a transparent financial model that accurately reflects the true costs and time and resource commitments for UC instructors, UC teaching assistants, and UC staff. Overall, while we believe that some courses in some cases can most likely be taught well online, the ultimate question for UC is what quality at what cost? We anticipate that a pilot project will provide much-needed data to help us answer these questions and will help us more reliably predict whether it is possible to maintain quality and on what scale, but for now they are still open questions.

With regard to the timing of such a pilot study, we are surprised by **Expanded Recommendation 7** implying that results from the "2010-2011 Pilot Program" will be ready in time for the UC President to **"make recommendations to the Regents on whether and how the University will implement and institutionalize online instruction no later than Fall 2011"** [pg. 112]. Funding has yet to be secured, and important details that will need to be included in any RFP (e.g., who will hold intellectual rights; how would the course be disseminated beyond UC?) will surely depend on the source of funding and donor requirements. (And, by the way, we strongly object to UCOP **"entering into appropriate commercial relationships or contracts to expedite the Pilot Program ... [e.g.] an unsecured loan"** [pg 108] on the **"net revenue"** that **"in the longer run would be comfortably into the 9-figures"** [pg 113].) Innovative proposals for online courses – ones that will go beyond simply putting classroom lectures on the web and beyond what others have tried before with perhaps mediocre results – will require at least some time for creative and collaborative thinking (e.g., between faculty, and between faculty and technology experts). Next, the courses must be developed and prepared for a particular term. Then the courses must be taught. In fact, they should be taught more than once, as inevitably

improvements will need to be made after teaching them once and faculty and staff workloads – critical for the financial and resource modeling – will be difficult to assess based on only the first time the course is taught. Finally, an independent scholarly study of the results, which in the most desirable cases will enable comparison of face-to-face versus online course outcomes when possible, has been promised as part of the online pilot project draft prospectus, and such a study will be the foundation on which the faculty, administration, and even public opinion can rest. While we imagine that the study/ies will be ongoing during the development and deployment of the courses, it will still take a finite amount of time to synthesize, compare, and write up the results. [Note that we have not included Academic Senate review of the courses before they're taught because the time required for this is extremely short compared to any of these other steps.] **Thus, it is impossibly optimistic to think that the needed information and results will be ready for campuses and the President to make decisions about quality and costs by Fall 2011 (just 12 to 17 months from now). In fact, such an incredible timeline undermines the credibility of the whole effort.** Even with a more realistic time frame, we urge that the process not be rushed, which we feel will guarantee its failure (or at least its hum mediocrity). **While we are all for efficiency and expediency in this process, it should not be rushed to the extent that this becomes a predictable debacle.**

We would also like to note that all the "noise" generated in these controversial recommendations and elsewhere – proposing that we educate tens of thousands of undergraduate students online and that the next step is online bachelor's degrees through UC and even UC Extension [e.g., **Exp. Rec #7, pg 111**] – is distracting us from the arena in which some argue we may be able to more easily provide quality online courses, certificates and degrees to students who have already completed their liberal arts education and for which the market is such that revenue for departments could more easily be generated – that is, at the graduate level in some specific, targeted areas.

Finally, **we note that the push for top-down control of courses and curricula that appear in a number of the Second Round and Expanded Recommendations seems unwarranted in many instances.** We gave an example earlier in this document that transfer students who are accepted to UCB as, e.g., English majors, already know what courses and prerequisites they need to have taken at CCCs before they get to Berkeley through ASSIST, and that therefore efficiency (in terms of minimizing time to graduation) is attained without requiring centralized regulations regarding what courses should count for what majors. We also note that several colleges at UCB began a decade or more ago to "streamline" the number of required upper division units when new majors or changes to existing majors are reviewed by the administration and the Senate – indeed to be at or below UCLA's "Challenge 45" (i.e., reducing upper-division requirements for a major to 45 quarter [or 30 semester] units), which is referred to in several places in the recommendations. These "efficiencies" in place at Berkeley are in part due to long-standing enrollment pressures and consequent resource limitations, but they have been successfully implemented in ways that we feel maintain quality by allowing local departmental and campus control over courses and curricula. **Thus, we believe that there are already existing models at Berkeley and likely on other campuses that show that efficiency, academic and educational quality, and the best use of limited resources is best determined at the campus and departmental levels.** Of course, ideas for efficiencies that local faculty and senate divisions might implement can and should be encouraged by the campus and central administrations, particularly by providing supporting data to show what problems exist (e.g., are some campuses really "overspecialized" in their courses and curricula for some undergraduate majors [**Size & Shape Rec 6B, pg 7**]?) On what campuses and in which majors do transfer students take significantly longer to graduate and what are the stumbling blocks/courses that may be lengthening the time to graduation?). Balancing the evidence, then, we feel it will do more harm than good for UCOP to attempt to "strike the appropriate regulatory balance as well as an accommodation between faculty judgments and the goals of the [transfer] student and of the UC system more globally)" [**Exp Rec #5, pg 106**]. Rather, we believe that faculty, made aware of

various issues through data on majors, courses, and curricula provided by the campus administrations and UCOP, for example, are capable of making – as well as best qualified to make – such course and curricula decisions in the interests of both students and the UC in a manner that maintains both excellence and access.

Sincerely,

Kristie A. Boering  
Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction