



320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

May 21, 2010

HENRY POWELL
Chair, Academic Council

Subject: UC Commission on the Future recommendations

I write to offer you this summary of the views of Berkeley faculty on the COTF initial recommendations. I attempted to synthesize the majority views of our committees, as well as individual departments and deans whose views I also solicited; I have noted strong minority views where appropriate.

Let me say by way of preface that while everyone appreciated the work of the members of the Working Groups, the overall review of the recommendations was very negative. The major overall criticisms were as follows (and I recognize that they are not entirely consistent):

- (1) Most of the recommendations are incremental, not significant, and their implementation should be left to ordinary incremental processes – especially since it is evident that few of the recommendations have significant revenue or savings potentials, and few could claim to point to a “future” of UC.
- (2) More generally, many people felt that, with one exception, the recommendations lacked any sort of unifying vision of the nature of the institution or its future. Such a vision needs to be defined, in order to give the recommendations point and motivation. The one exception were the recommendations of the Education group, which did seem to represent a vision of the university as mostly concerned with the “throughput” of a clientele, with all resources focused on the latter two years of education, thus devaluing the four year baccalaureate experience. The underlying agenda of using tenure line faculty more “efficiently” was also seen as dangerously undermining the mission of the university.
- (3) There was disappointment that none of the groups seemed to address a central and obvious question: whether the structure of UCOP and the ten campus federation is suitable for our future. Failure to consider in any significant way the nature of the ten campus system, except insofar as it might be a source for administrative efficiencies (as opposed to a problem), was seen as especially egregious.

- (4) There was a general fear that the mildness of most of the proposals was a deliberate attempt to lay the stage for much more sweeping recommendations from UCOP.
- (5) Many of the recommendations were perceived as threatening the autonomy of both campuses and disciplines, in the name of greater efficiency. Niche majors and second majors felt especially threatened.

It gives me no pleasure to offer mainly criticism of an effort to save the university, but there you have it.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Christopher Kutz". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

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

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Size and Shape

Recommendation 1: Increase the number and proportion of non-resident students at the undergraduate level. (pp. 14-18) (Similar to FUNDING STRATEGIES Rec. # 6, pp. 92-94)

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

There is very broad (90%) agreement that NR enrollment should be increased, at Berkeley to the 20-25% range, conditional on funds flowing back into educational programs and that students rank in the top half of admits.

Recommendation 2: Improve the student transfer function by developing more complete lower-division transfer pathways in high-demand majors. (pp. 19-21)

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

While everyone would like to make the transfer process smoother, there is serious, widespread concern that this recommendation would entail centralized curricular control of majors – something that all Berkeley respondents strongly feel should be left to campuses and departments.

Recommendation 3: To improve the student transfer function, enhance the ASSIST website for greater user-friendliness and improved capabilities. (pp. 22-23)

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

Recommendation 4: Examine the utility of practice doctorates for allied health professions in terms of national healthcare quality and costs, UC and CSU missions, and the future needs of California residents. (pp. 24-26)

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

There is general but not universal agreement that CSUs should be permitted to offer, e.g., audiology degrees.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response

Recommendation 5: Eliminate administrative redundancies across the UC system and promote efficiencies where possible. (pp. 27-28) (Similar to FUNDING STRATEGIES Rec. # 2, pp. 80-83)

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

There is strong agreement on this point, though some worry that what may be perceived as redundancy is, in local contexts, valuable customization. There is also a worry that over-centralization might lead to inefficiencies of its own – we need to maintain client-centered support, however the work is configured. (There is widespread agreement that we currently have a system of much too much local optimization and redundancy.)

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Education and Curriculum

Recommendation 1: Manage educational resources more effectively and efficiently to (1) increase the proportion of undergraduate students graduating in four years, (2) create a pathway for undergraduate students to complete degrees in three years, (3) make more effective use of faculty resources, and (4) maintain or improve the undergraduate student experience. (pp. 29-35)

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

This drew sharp disagreement in many respects. All favor four-year paths to degree (and we note that, for freshman admits, average time to degree is 4.01 years at Berkeley, so we are there). But the three-year degree was seen as something not to be promoted, because it undermines the goal of a liberal arts education, and essentially outsources a year of college to high school and the AP program. While existing pathways to three-year degrees can be kept, this should not be pursued. (I note that some respondents worried less if the three years involved summer teaching.) It was also felt that the three-year path would move students into familiar majors, neglecting ones that get discovered en route.

To the extent that making more effective use of faculty resources means expanding the use of lecturers, there was more disagreement. Many felt that this is again a path towards developing a research rather than teaching and research faculty, and that this would be unhealthy. A significant minority, however, saw this as the least bad way to cope with the budget crisis.

Recommendation 2: Continue timely exploration of online instruction in the undergraduate curriculum, as well as in self-supporting graduate degrees and Extension programs. (pp. 36-39)

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

There was general cautious support for exploration and development of online teaching as a supplement to what we do – and very broad concern about any rush into online degree programs, which are seen as threatening the quality of education, at least until more data are collected. Models of online discussed by Chris Edley, with a remote faculty “owner” and most instruction taking place by non-tenure-line instructors, brought serious concerns about a watering down of educational quality.

There was greater support for deploying a range on online courses to help with crowded gateways and to better prepare community college students. The idea of a UC AA degree also meets with support sufficient to justify its exploration.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Recommendation 3: Expand use of self-supporting and part-time programs to expand opportunities for a UC education to existing and potential students, working professionals, and underserved communities. (pp. 40-45)

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

There was broad agreement that such programs should be encouraged, provided that they are faculty-driven and do not crowd out other students.

Recommendation 4: Develop a systemwide academic planning framework that incorporates campus goals within the context of priorities identified for the University as a whole. (pp. 46-48)

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

Coordination itself is fine, but most respondents expressed serious concern that this is a proposal for top-down, systemwide academic planning at the expense of campus autonomy and innovation. Such a process would inevitably be political, and too far removed from the relevant knowledge base to be wise.

Preliminary Recommendation: The working group seeks UC input on its forthcoming recommendation on quality. (pp. 49-54)

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

Most were surprised that the Working Group did not begin from this point. There is also concern that the item suggests we do not currently have a way of determining UC quality. Indeed, our departments, personnel committees, and course of instruction committees, have very thorough, well-defined indices of quality.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Access and Affordability

Recommendation 1: Reaffirm UC's commitment to access for California students. (pp. 55-57)

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

Yes – but respondents recognized the tradeoff against maintenance of excellence, e.g., in the endorsement of NR enrollment increases, and perhaps the need for further fee increases.

Recommendation 2: Reaffirm the University's commitment to be financially accessible for all undergraduate students admitted to UC. (pp. 58-60)

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

Recommendation 3: Reaffirm the University's commitment to fulfilling graduate education's role in serving UC's research enterprise, UC's teaching mission, and the diverse knowledge and workforce demands of the State and beyond. (pp. 61-63)

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

There was universal agreement about the value of graduate education – but a wish to distance from the implicit suggestion that graduate students should be valued as a cadre of underpaid instructors. At Berkeley there is a strong suggestion that the funding mechanism for graduate students, and the relation of that mechanism to the TAS budget, is basically broken.

Recommendation 4: Re-establish UC financial aid eligibility for undocumented California high school graduates. (pp. 64-66)

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

There is universal agreement here.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response

Recommendation 5: Adopt a multi-year fee schedule for each entering cohort of new undergraduate students. (pp. 67-69)

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

Views were mixed on this, some seeing this as attractive, other worried it would straitjacket us.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response

Access and Affordability Continued

Recommendation 6: Rename the Education Fee and the Professional Degree Fees (but not the Registration Fee) as “tuition.” (pp. 70-72)

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

There was general agreement with this, provided that pdfs stay with the unit.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Funding Strategies

Recommendation 1: Develop a multiyear advocacy campaign aimed at grass roots opinion leaders throughout the State of California to foster public and political support for the University as a major priority for state funding. (pp. 75-79)

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

Recommendation 2: Design and implement a system to identify, promote, and adopt the best administrative practices within the UC system. (pp. 80-83) (Similar to SIZE and SHAPE Rec. # 5, pp. 27-28)

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

Recommendation 3: Revise practice and policy on charging indirect cost recovery for non-federally funded research. (pp. 84-85)

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

There was moderate agreement with this point, though serious concerns were voiced by the humanities and social sciences, who were worried about losing out on research funds that make a definite contribution to departmental fixed costs. There needs to be a way to ensure UC's role in working with foundations.

Recommendation 4: Improve indirect cost recovery rates with federal agencies. (pp. 86-87)

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

A majority agreed that we should raise rates, but a significant number (of scientists and engineers) disagreed, on the ground that grants are not elastic, and that this will simply amount to a tax on research, with no corresponding benefit to the researcher. There is

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response

a strong sense that our relatively low ICR rates are matched by our relatively low quality of services for researchers, and any attempt to raise rates should find a way to improve services to researchers.

Recommendation 5: Adopt a multiyear strategy to replace student fees with tuition, generate new revenue to protect academic quality, and strengthen university planning. (pp.88-91)

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

It was felt that this would be difficult to reconcile with the intricacies of the Reg Fee.

Funding Strategies Continued

Recommendation 6: Increase enrollment of nonresident undergraduates. (pp. 92-94) (Similar to SIZE AND SHAPE Rec. #1, pp. 14-18)

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

Recommendation 7: Advocate for a Pell Augmentation Grant to Institutions (“Pell PLUS”). (pp. 95-100)

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

Recommendation 8: Examine alternate faculty compensation plans. (pp. 101-102)

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

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response

There was virtually universal passionate disagreement with this suggestion, which seems to reflect a med school, soft-money mentality. Indeed, even science faculty felt this would undermine the main comparative value of a state-funded position. There was also concern about the idea that faculty could buy themselves out of teaching. If, however, this is a suggestion for how faculty might add supplements to their hard 9-month salaries and current summer salaries, there was support.

Recommendation 9: Allow for the possibility of charging differential tuition by campus, as a means of mitigating potential future enrollment impacts on some campuses. (pp. 103-106)

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

There was quite broad agreement with this idea.

WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS Berkeley Division Response

Research Strategies

Recommendation 1: The University of California must recover a greater share of the costs of research sponsored by outside agencies and make its management of those funds more transparent to ensure accountability to its sponsors and its researchers. (pp. 111-116)

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

Everyone agrees with the goal of transparency. Respondents were split on the value of hiking the icr rate, though a majority saw a need to increase these rates.

Recommendation 2: UC must ensure continued excellence across a broad spectrum of cutting-edge research. To aid in this effort, UC should (1) prioritize internal funds to support world-class research in disciplines where extramural funding options are limited; (2) motivate the development of large-scale, interdisciplinary, collaborative research projects to capture new funding streams; and (3) augment and enhance opportunities for graduate student research and support wherever possible. (pp. 117-121)

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

While there was general agreement with (1) and (3), there was very sharp disagreement with (2), which seems to value large-scale interdisciplinary projects for their own sake, regardless of the merits of that approach. (The EU has wasted a lot of time and money by prioritizing such research at the expense of disciplinary, individual work.) It seems too indiscriminating an approach.

Recommendation 3: Create multicampus, interdisciplinary “UC Grand Challenge Research Initiatives” to realize the enormous potential of UC’s ten campuses and three national laboratories on behalf of the state and the nation. (pp. 122-125)

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

This was generally seen as a poor idea, and a way to waste a lot of money and build up administrative bloat. It was felt that collaborative research arises better from the bottom up. Note that some of the sciences, which already make use of such multi-campus initiatives, do favor their continuation, as a way to expand visibility of UC.

**WORKING GROUP FIRST ROUND RECOMMENDATIONS
Berkeley Division Response**

Recommendation 4: Streamline risk management practices to increase the efficiency of the research enterprise, making optimal use of faculty researchers and administrative staff support. (pp. 126-129)

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

There was strong agreement that current practices at UC are too risk-averse, and that over-compliance imposes serious costs.

Research Strategies Continued

Recommendation 5: 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 investment in research. (pp. 130-131)

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

Additional Comments and General Observations

Please see cover letter.