

REMARKS TO THE UC COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE  
DECEMBER 8, 2009  
Daniel L. Simmons  
Vice Chair, UC Academic Senate

I begin with a Lesson about the Academic Senate and a Disclaimer.

The Academic Senate is a bottom up organization. Its authority flows from standing committees and from representative divisional assemblies on each campus, or the system wide assembly. No single person can speak as a representative of the Senate's position until a position is derived through the Senate's formal consultation processes and has been adopted by its senior bodies. Harry Powell and I are representatives of those positions. A conversation with either or us, or with any individual faculty member, is not formal consultation with the Senate. This means that the views I express here are solely my own and do not represent positions of the Academic Senate.

The Senate consultation process has served the University well for over 80 years. While the pace of consultative decision making is often frustrating to persons used to a top down hierarchical structure where an individual executive can command a direction, the consultation within the University faculty brings together multiple talented and dedicated individuals, with a diversity of viewpoint and expertise to vigorously (occasionally too vigorously) debate issues and find a resolution. In my many years of experience as a faculty member, Senate leader, faculty representative to the Regents, and a brief stint of incarceration in the Office of the President as an associate provost, I have formed the opinion that there is no place in the University where one can hear open vigorous and informed debate of the quality that I regularly encounter in the Senate executive councils on the campuses and at the Academic Council itself. Another important point about those debates is that historically the focus of decision making at the Academic Council is on the University of California as a system. We must protect both the integrity of the University as a ten campus system, yet at the same time protect the seminal stature of our top campuses.

I cannot overstate the point the President Yudof made at the first meeting of this Commission. The Commission will make recommendations and to the extent that those recommendations involve the exercise of the authorities delegated to the Senate, the Senate will review and implement or reject recommendations within the course of its processes for representative decision making. It is for this reason that the work of this Commission must incorporate and coordinate with the work of the Senate. The work of this Commission will have credibility with one of its most important constituents, the faculty, only with openness and inclusion of faculty views. As Harry has described to you, we are doing our best to facilitate active interchange between working groups and the Senate standing committees, the Academic Council and each of the divisions, but you have to understand that the credibility of the work of this Commission is being undercut by the rush to judgment, the chaos involved in informing the faculty of the workgroup membership, the fact that the work group membership is questioned on many campuses as not being representative, the fact that listening sessions on the campuses have been poorly received by many faculty, but also appreciated by many others. I urge you to keep faith with the faculty by making it absolutely clear that President Yudof's statement to the

Commission and to the Senate, that the Senate will review and implement the recommendations of the Commission in accord with the authorities delegated to it by the Regents, will be honored in the work of this Commission. I appreciate Chair Gould's comments this afternoon supporting this position.

This Commission was born out of financial crisis. Our fundamental problem is that there is simply no money and absent state support, there are no remaining easy prospects for solving the budget issues. Nonetheless, this Commission purports to make recommendations for the long-term future of the university. Please recognize the point made by David Gardner at the last meeting: the University of California has evolved to be the best in the world at what it does. I repeat, the University of California is the world's best institution of higher education in that it provides the state and nation with a research program that has nurtured more Nobel laureates than any other university in the world and at the same time it educates an extraordinarily diverse student body representing students from all income levels and including members of all of the communities of the State of California. The University of California and the California Master Plan for Higher Education are the envy of the world.

The University has evolved its excellence over a period of 140 years—we are not going to come up with recommendations over a few months that will be smarter than the historic evolution of the institution towards ever higher levels of achievement across a system of ten campuses. I urge caution by recognizing that there is no silver bullet that will solve the problems generated by the State of California's failure to meet its statutory promise to provide capacity in higher education for California's high school graduates.

Our work must be guided by the fundamental principles that have formed the University of California: Access, Affordability and Quality. But we must ask ourselves, affordable access to what?

The essence of what we do, our primary mission is to provide—

A quality undergraduate education at the world's best research university.

If we take steps in response to the immediate state funding crisis that have a negative impact on affordability, so that students have to pay a higher portion of the cost of their education — if and when the people of the state of California reawaken to the benefits that the University provides to the economic, social, and cultural development of the State, and the people once again begin to provide for the public benefit of higher education—then the University can flick a switch and lower the burden of fees.

If we restrict access by reducing enrollments to levels that the University can afford to maintain within its declining state support--if and when the people of the state of California reawaken to the benefits that the University provides to the economic, social, and cultural development of the State, and the people once again begin to provide for the public benefit of higher education, we can open the doors to more classrooms and hire faculty to teach increasing numbers of students,

But, if we respond to this crisis by dissipating the world class research faculty of the University of California by providing faculty with incentives to move elsewhere such as lowered compensation, incentives to move elsewhere in the form declining support for the research program, including failing to provide for the talented and dedicated professional staff of the university who are vital to our research and education programs, if we provide the faculty with incentives to move elsewhere by not being able to support graduate students, or incentives to move away from an institution that cannot renew the faculty with bright young talent—If we do these things, then we will lose the world-class research quality of the University. If and when the people of the state of California reawaken to the benefits that the University provides to the economic, social, and cultural development of the State, and the people once again begin to provide for the public benefit of higher education, it will be too late. The research base that distinguishes the University of California from the State University, from other institutions that provide unlimited access such as the University of Phoenix, will be gone. We can lose that advantage in a matter of a couple of years. We are teetering on the verge of this happening as we meet in this room. If and when it happens, it will take decades for the University of California to recover—if ever.

For all of us who have devoted our careers to the University of California, affordability and access to public higher education are key components of our dedication to the institution. The affordable access to education at a major research university is at the heart of what we do—it is the reason that many of us work for the University of California for much less compensation than we could earn in the private sector, or indeed, at a private university for that matter. We are dedicated to providing access to higher education to all segments of California's diverse population. That is the promise of the California Master Plan, indeed, that is the promise made on the creation of the University of California in 1868.

Nonetheless, our response to this short term crisis has to be to protect the quality of the research faculty who have built the great institution called the University of California.

In that regard, what we do, our mission to provide a world class education program at a research university, is not to provide a program of instruction via a video monitor. While there are important reasons to explore improvements to education that might be achieved with on-line programs, I do not believe that the faculty of the University of California will come to accept the idea that an undergraduate education at a research university is deliverable at a distance over a computer. There is a place for that business, but leave it to the University of Phoenix or others who do not strive to educate students in an environment where they encounter professors who are engaged in the discovery of new knowledge.

All of that said, there are important issues on the table for this Commission to address.

I think we should give some thought to the lower-division program on our campuses. I don't suggest that curriculum be standardized across the University, but we have evolved such detailed lower-division pre-requisites for majors that students are often unable to get a broad education in the lower-division years that prepare them for a range of options. Structuring the lower-division as a period of more general education preparing a student for multiple possible directions with focused discipline based education in the upper division years would have several

advantages. It would broaden minds. It would help students make informed choices of majors. It would simplify design of the lower-division curriculum. And it would facilitate transfer from Community Colleges. There is also a potential role for distance education in this context. But also please respect the wisdom and responsibility of the faculty on each campus for establishing the curriculum and degree requirements for the campus. The presence of different approaches within the University is also one of our strengths.

The work groups on finance and on size and shape need to examine the allocation of core funding among the campuses. On a per student basis there are substantial differences in the funding provided to the various general campuses as a result of allocations of different fund sources and allocations created under state funding models that no longer exist. Differential per student funding might be appropriate, but the work groups should examine (as I believe they are) the relative allocations of core funds and provide justification for differentials beyond historic accident. This may well be the hardest issue before this Commission because there are winners and losers among the ten campuses.

We also have numerous funding streams from the same source, such as the education fee and the registration fee, both of which are mandatory system wide fees paid by students. Yet these fund sources somehow turn green money into money of different colors. The finance work group should give some thought to simplifying the division of allocated funds into different pots and perhaps separate in-coming revenue from the allocation of campus expenditure budgets. The way in which we earn revenue, and the way in which we spend it might be separate issues, but recognizing that some activities must be held accountable on a profit and loss basis.

In the same vein, the work group on finance should examine the allocation of non-resident tuition. Our current structure provides an incentive to individual campuses to increase enrollment of non-resident students as a way to augment the campus budget with the direct return of non-resident tuition. As one senior administrator has commented to Harry Powell and me, we should not look at non-resident students only as source of money; we should be considering the educational value of incorporating students from other states and countries. Also, as one campus might benefit financially from enrolling a higher percentage of non-resident students, that campus imposes a cost on the other campuses. There is a political cost as the public asks questions about using capacity for non-residents at a time when we are reducing enrollment of California residents. In addition, if we are to maintain our promise of access to the top 12 ½ percent of high school graduates, when one campus fills seats with non-resident students, enrollment of resident students shifts to other campuses. I have asked the University Committee on Planning and Budget to explore this issue.

I am struck that there is no direction to the work groups to examine the administrative structure of the University. A thorough self-study requires that we deal with this question, especially in the face of our external and internal critics who seem to suggest that we can solve our budget crisis by cutting back on administrators, especially in Oakland.

I have mixed feelings about this issue. On the one hand many on the campuses complain about resources directed to the central office in Oakland. On the other hand the central

administration is crucial to sustain the University of California as a coherent system. The office of the President undertakes numerous critical functions, not the least of which is representing the University to the government in Sacramento. That office, along with the Academic Senate, is critical to the maintenance of our uniform standards of quality, including standards for appointment and promotion of faculty—one of our greatest strengths.

While many complain about the growth of administration, the absence of analytical support and the loss of historic knowledge in the recent down-sizing of the Office of the President severely undercuts the ability of the University to provide research and analysis of the issues that we face. I fear that we have cut too deep. Many ask for transparency and accountability from the University. Transparency and accountability requires people and systems to produce the information, which costs money. The Commission needs to ask whether resources are appropriately marshaled for these functions. This issue is also important at the campuses where there is a lot of concern over administrative growth that exceeds enrollment growth.

Finally, again while not on the Commission agenda, the Commission should ask questions about executive compensation. As I heard Chancellor Desmond-Hellman point out early this Fall, a world class research faculty requires a world class infrastructure and it deserves a world class administration. Just as with top faculty, we have to spend money for competitive salaries to attract top people. On the other hand, over the last 20 years or so, one or another controversy over executive compensation has done great harm to the public trust in the University of California. Top flight administrators are essential for a \$21 billion enterprise. But the controversies over executive compensation have done more overall damage to public trust that is translated into an erosion of public support, than all of the good produced by high paid executives. Some regularization of our approach to compensation of academic administrators might help avoid our difficulties with executive compensation. We need to couple that with recognition of the availability of talent within our own house and develop talent management policies that help talented faculty evolve the skills to become talented administrators.

My final comment is to thank all of you here, and all of the persons who are willing to devote their time and energy to the work of this Commission by serving on the work groups on top of their regular workloads, and in the face of salary cuts for University members, without additional compensation, for your work. I truly hope that the work of this Commission will help us find the way forward into the future.

Whose University – It is the University of the people of the State of California. We are merely its trustees, its employees, and its current beneficiaries. It is our collective responsibility to protect this precious resource for the future of the state, the nation and the world.