

UCSF Senate Executive Council Report

February 2017



ITEM ONE. Academic Council. The Academic Council has, or is in the process of endorsing UCOP policy statements on President Trump's Executive Order on entry into the U.S. for persons of specific nationalities:

“We are deeply concerned by the recent executive order that restricts the ability of our students, faculty, staff, and other members of the UC community from certain countries from being able to enter or return to the United States.

While maintaining the security of the nation's visa system is critical, this executive order is contrary to the values we hold dear as leaders of the University of California. The UC community, like universities across the country, has long been deeply enriched by students, faculty, and scholars from around the world, including the affected countries, coming to study, teach, and research. It is critical that the United States continues to welcome the best students, scholars, scientists, and engineers of all backgrounds and nationalities.

We are committed to supporting all members of the UC community who are impacted by this executive action.”

Other UCwide issues include the planned increase in undergraduate tuition, and the Regent's plan to set a limit for non-state-resident enrollment. Non-resident enrollment has proven to be an important source of revenue for State Universities that are not adequately funded by public resources (NYT story of several months ago on this is of interest). In addition, enrollment of nonresidents, particularly international students, provides important diversity, which benefits in-state students. Non-resident funds contribute to financial aid for in-state students, particularly at UCB, UCLA and UCSD. The Senate recommended to the Regents a policy that maintains the enrollment, but ensures that funds raised by enrolling non-resident-students directly benefits California students:

“Campuses shall report on their investments of nonresident tuition revenues made to improve access and the quality of education. The Regents will limit nonresident enrollments on any campus where resident undergraduates are disadvantaged by further expansion of nonresident enrollments. Each year, system-wide enrollment plans for both residents and nonresidents will then follow from the adoption of a sustainable financial plan that ensures UC's quality on every campus.”

The Senate has also been asked to give input into a Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on controlled substances. Two items in the revision are noteworthy:

1. chemical precursors of controlled substances- the existing policy requires that precursor chemicals be treated in the same manner as controlled substances, but precursors are regulated through the chemical suppliers, so the existing policy is redundant.
2. background checks- a requirement for background checks by UC for personnel who handle controlled substances is being considered, versus continued reliance on the Federal DEA for this (which only requires a

signed statement by the individual that they have not been convicted of a felony. The recommendation is to defer to PPSM-21 (defines a personnel screening program that is required by law) that requires specific background checks for all policy covered staff who have access to or handle controlled substances. The policy covered staff would complete a screening form that includes the felony question, whether they have used controlled substances that were not prescribed, or have they ever lost a controlled substance permit in the past. So this extends the self reported data collected regarding history with controlled substances.

The Council and Assembly is also calling for nominees for 2017-2018 Vice Chair of the Academic Council (presumed Chair, 2018-2019. We should think about whether any of our UCSF colleagues would be interested in this work, which requires a commitment to work from UCOP x 2 years. The idea candidate would have extensive Senate experience. Jim Chalfant wrote:

“I request your assistance in nominating candidates to serve as Vice Chair of the Academic Council in 2017-18. The person selected will serve as Vice Chair of the Academic Assembly, the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council, and as a Faculty Representative to the Regents. Outlined below are the procedures adopted by the Academic Council for nominating and selecting the next Vice Chair.

In order to encourage participation in the nomination process and to promote general awareness of Senate leadership succession, please distribute this invitation widely. I ask that it go both to colleagues within the immediate circle of your Senate work and to members of respective divisions broadly.

The procedures are as follows:

- 1. Candidates may nominate themselves or be nominated by a current or past Council member.**
- 2. Candidates must submit to Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter ([Hilary Baxter@ucop.edu](mailto:Hilary.Baxter@ucop.edu)) a one-page *curriculum vitae*, a one-page statement of challenges and priorities for the Senate, and a simple statement indicating a willingness to serve as Vice Chair and then Chair of the Academic Senate, if elected. Candidates should be aware that the position is a full-time assignment at the Office of the President in Oakland.**
- 3. Candidates are urged to submit their materials by March 13, 2017.**
- 4. Candidates must be able to attend the March 22nd, 2017, meeting of the Academic Council to make a brief presentation and to participate in an interview with Council members. The Academic Council will make its selection of a nominee at its March 22nd meeting, and will forward its nomination to the Assembly for action at the Assembly’s meeting on April 12, 2017.**

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.”



ITEM TWO. The \$48 Million Fix. Our colleague, Stan Glantz and Chris Newfield have relaunched an attempt to reclaim the California Master Plan for higher education. To fully fund UC, CSU, Community Colleges, including in-state Graduate and Professional students, the proposal calls for approx. \$9.5 Billion annual fund raising via an income tax surcharge (median \$48, 90% percentile income \$1114). The full proposal is posted on the Senate

Website. Something to think about. I fear, however, that President Trump may transfer Medicaid funding to block grants, after which providing medical coverage for limited income Californians will dominate all state budget considerations.



ITEM THREE. Endowment Funds. UCSF has done a remarkable job in raising donated funds for the campus, including the most recent Diller gift of \$500 million (\$200 million for students, \$200 million for faculty, \$100 million for Chancellor to utilize). Additionally, UCSF may engage in a fund-raising campaign. Thus, this may be a good time for our Division to give some thought to how we think the funds for faculty should be distributed. It must be kept in mind that \$500 million is not instantly available at one time, the gift is a commitment to provide the funds over multiple years. We might weigh in on:

- Are there faculty who may not attract individual donors (grateful patients, etc) due to the nature of their work, and thus may benefit most from an unspecified gift?
- How should funds be distributed across the Schools and Programs?
- Should the funds be targeted for recruitment, retention or other?
- Should the funds be targeted to early career vs. late career, etc.



ITEM FOUR. Space. Building and renovation continues to be a major campus activity. The campus continues to evolve its approach to getting faculty input; requests for input are consistent. Most recently the campus is asking that the intended occupants of new spaces organize their own governance, within the constraints of the design. There may be an opportunity for the Senate to focus on facilitating communications between the building-specific groups, and to ensure that past history and experience from other buildings inform on-going decision making. Thus the EC and the Division need to make final decisions regarding how Senate Space activities will be organized.