

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE  
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ



## NOTICE OF MEETING TELECONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, April 11, 2012  
10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Each Division will arrange a teleconference site for its members. For information on how to participate individually from another location, please refer to the email message accompanying the electronic copy of this Notice.

<b>I.</b>	<b>ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>	
	Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of February 15, 2012	2
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, February 15, 2012	8
<b>III.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</b>	<b>8</b>
	▪ Robert Anderson	
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST</b>	<b>8</b>
	▪ Lawrence Pitts	
<b>V.</b>	<b>SPECIAL ORDERS</b>	
	A. 2012-13 Assembly Meeting Schedule [INFORMATION]	8
<b>VI.</b>	<b>REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES</b>	
	A. Academic Council	
	▪ Robert Anderson, Chair	
	1. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2012-13 Assembly [ACTION]	8
	2. Ratification of the 2012 Oliver Johnson awardee [ACTION]	10
	3. Report on Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (Linda Bisson, ACSCANR Member) [INFORMATION]	15
	4. Issues related to Senate Membership [DISCUSSION]	16

<b>VIII.</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [INFORMATION]</b>	<b>16</b>
	▪ <b>William Parker, UCFW Chair</b>	
	<b>A. Negotiated Salary Plan Task Force</b>	
	<b>B. Faculty Salaries Task Force</b>	
<b>IX.</b>	<b>PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>16</b>

## I. Roll Call

### 2011-12 Assembly Roll Call April 11, 2012

#### **President of the University:**

Mark G. Yudof

Carrie Noland  
Charles Zender

#### **Academic Council Members:**

Robert Anderson, Chair  
Robert Powell, Vice Chair  
Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB  
Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD  
Craig Martens, Chair, UCI  
Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA  
Susan Amussen, Chair UCM  
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR  
Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD  
Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF  
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB  
Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC  
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS  
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA  
Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD  
Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP  
Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP  
William Parker, Chair, UCFW  
John Crawford, Chair, UCORP  
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

**Los Angeles (8)**  
Malcolm Gordon  
Jennifer Krull  
Timothy Lane  
Alan Laub  
Susanne Lohmann  
Joseph Nagy  
Monica Smith  
Richard Steinberg

**Merced (1)**  
Wolfgang Rogge

**Riverside (2)**  
Jodie Holt  
Thomas Morton

**San Diego (5)**  
John Hildebrand  
Douglas Magde  
Lorraine Pillus  
Peter Wagner  
Eric Watkins

**San Francisco (3)**  
Farid Chehab  
David Gardner  
Wendy Max

**Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)**  
John Foran  
Vicki Scott

**Santa Cruz (2)**  
Joseph Konopelski  
Marilyn Walker

**Secretary/Parliamentarian**  
Jean Olson

#### **Berkeley (6)**

Steven Beissinger  
Daniel Boyarin  
Ralph Catalano  
Allen Goldstein  
Jeffrey Perloff  
Patricia Zambryski

#### **Davis (6)**

Trish Berger  
Theodore DeJong  
Richard Grotjahn  
Joseph Kiskis  
Krishnan Nambiar  
Saul Schaefer

#### **Irvine (4)**

Christopher Leslie  
Tahseen Mozaffar

## MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

February 15, 2012  
MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

**I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, February 15, 2012 by teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson presided and called the meeting to order at 11:00 am. Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed that there was a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

**II. MINUTES**

**ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the June 8, 2011 meeting as noticed.**

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

Chair Anderson asked for and received approval to change the order of business to accommodate the president's schedule.

Rebenching. Chair Anderson reported that the Rebenching Task Force is approaching consensus. The task force has agreed to most of the basic principles outlined in the Senate document submitted last July for allocating state funds among the campuses, including the principle that each student of a particular type should be funded at the same level, regardless of which campus they attend. The plan is to accomplish rebenching without reducing current levels of funding for any campus by making use of potential new revenue sources to augment funds where needed (e.g., the University may take over lease-revenue bond payments for University buildings from the state, renegotiate the debt at a lower rate over a longer payback period, and use a portion of the money freed up to fund rebenching efforts). He reported that the administration is contemplating a phase-in period of eight years, but Senate representatives on the Task Force feel that is too long.

Faculty Salaries Task Force report. Chair Anderson noted that the Faculty Salaries Task Force recently released its report. There was consensus among the Senate and administration representatives regarding future increases. The model for allocating increases is adapted from a method used at UC Irvine. He stated that the administrators are concerned about where the funding for increases would come from.

Admissions. Chair Anderson stated that applications for admission increased by 19.1% overall, and by 9.8% from California residents, despite recent fee increases. Applications for transfer decreased by 4.2% overall and by 5.7% from the California Community Colleges, possibly due to the difficulty of getting into the classes required for transfer at the community colleges. There has been a large increase in non-resident applications (from 21,095 last year to 33,001 this year). In addition, this year there is a new admissions process. Previously, the top 12.5% of high school

students were identified by a mechanistic process and guaranteed admission to a UC campus. In the new system, the top 9% statewide (measured by test scores and GPA) and the top 9% of each high school class by class rank are guaranteed admission. The two groups should overlap to a substantial degree. A large number of additional applicants will be deemed entitled to review and will be reviewed more holistically than in the past.

Provost and UCSD Chancellor searches. Chair Anderson reported that the president hopes to make recommendations for both of these positions at the May Regents meeting.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT**

Budget. President Yudof reported on recent negotiations with the state regarding the 2012-13 budget. The state budget includes an augmentation of \$90M intended, but not earmarked, for UCRP. The University has proposed increasing that amount to \$180M in 2013-14 and \$270M in 2014-15, but the governor does not want to commit funds more than one year at a time. The University is also trying to negotiate flexibility on its debt service, specifically, its lease-revenue bonds, as well as a multi-year budget plan. He reported that there will be presentations on the three major ballot initiatives to raise revenues at the March Regents meeting. President Yudof stated that he is conducting budget meetings with Chancellors and Senate representatives from each campus focusing mostly on how the campuses are responding to the state's disinvestment. He stated that in his opinion, campuses have done a good job in holding down expenses. But he noted that under the rosier scenario, the University will experience three to four years of mounting deficits due to the rising employer contribution to UCRP. While the Regents have "tuition fatigue," if the University suffers further cuts, there will be no choice but to turn to tuition.

#### **V. SPECIAL ORDERS**

##### **A. Consent calendar [None]**

**B. Annual Reports.** Chair Anderson noted that Bylaw 120.D.3 requires that standing committee annual reports be included in the first Assembly agenda of each academic year. He invited comments or questions about the reports.

#### **VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**

#### **VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

##### **A. Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) [INFORMATION]**

Chair Anderson stated that UCR&J is responsible for interpreting Senate bylaws and regulations. Any ruling they issue is forwarded to the Academic Council for comment. If applicable, Council sends comments to UCR&J, which considers those comments before finalizing its ruling. The final ruling is reported to the Assembly for information; the Assembly does not take action. If the Assembly disagrees with the ruling, it could propose a change to a bylaw or regulation, which would be subject to Senate processes of deliberation. These Legislative Rulings were submitted to Assembly in June as drafts and became effective at that time. UCR&J provided additional language that summarizes the procedural history of these rulings but does not change their substance. UCR&J now submits them in final form.

1. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.A.** addressing the definition of “residence” was presented as an information item.
2. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.B** regarding the eligibility of an associate dean to serve as a member of the Assembly was presented as an information item.
3. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.C.** regarding the scholarship requirements for undergraduate students was presented as an information item.
4. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.D** about voting rights of *Ex officio* members of Senate committees was presented as an information item.
5. **Legislative Ruling 6.11.E** on the relationship of the Academic Senate with faculties of schools and colleges offering postbaccalaureate, first professional degree programs leading to the award of M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., D.Pharm. and J.D. degrees was presented as an information item.

**B. Academic Council**

**1. Proposed revisions to [SR 480](#) (language credit) [ACTION]**

[Bylaw 145.B](#) gives BOARS plenary authority to advise the president “on matters relating to admissions of undergraduate students” and to “regulate the examination and classification of all applicants for admission to undergraduate status.” BOARS proposed a revision to SR 480, regarding how transfer credit for courses taken in a language other than English is to be awarded to students whose secondary school education was largely in that language. Council approved the proposed amendment and UCR&J has found it consistent with Senate Regulations. It is in the purview of the Assembly to amend Senate Regulations. BOARS Chair Bill Jacob noted that UC admissions evaluators objected to the existing SR 480 as vague and reported that it was not being applied uniformly. BOARS’ proposed revision clarifies the intent of the regulation; it does not substantively change SR 480. He stated that if a student completed nine years of education in another language, then a course in that language is transferable only if the subject of the course is literature, not language acquisition.

**ACTION: Assembly unanimously approved the proposed revisions to SR 480.**

**2. Proposed Memorial to the Regents [ACTION]**

Chair Anderson stated that a Memorial is a vehicle used to communicate the views of the Senate directly to the Regents through the President on matters of great import and historically has been used sparingly. A Memorial may go to the Regents only after it is approved by a vote conducted by ballot distributed to all Senate faculty. After submitting the Memorial text, Council’s drafting committee noted that the specific form of advocacy promoted is not permissible. Council’s drafting committee determined that the wording as adopted by Council contained some technical errors, and that it would be unwise to ask the Assembly to adopt it as written. The drafting committee prepared a revised version, which it wishes to present as a substitute motion. A substitute motion is a form of amendment to substitute the new text for the original text. The substitute motion was circulated to Assembly members by email on February 10 and posted to the Senate’s website on the same day. John Crawford, chair of UCORP, moved to amend the motion on behalf of the drafting committee. Chair Anderson noted that debate should focus on the wisdom of using the substitute motion wording rather than the original wording. If the amendment is adopted, then Assembly will debate the wisdom of initiating a Memorial.

A member asked for a justification for the substitution. Chair Crawford stated that Council was advised by the Office of General Counsel that the original version implied that the Regents would authorize the use of University resources if they chose to endorse a ballot. It is not permissible under state law to use University resources to advocate on behalf of a candidate or a ballot initiative. If we do not adopt substitute language that is consistent with state law and university policy, we can not go ahead with the main motion.

**ACTION: The motion to amend the Memorial by substitution carried (with one abstention).**

Assembly then discussed the main motion, which was whether to proceed with the proposed Memorial. Several members made suggestions to clarify terminology and those technical changes were approved by consensus.

A member inquired about the purpose of the Memorial, since faculty members have the right as individuals to advocate under the Constitution. A member of the drafting committee responded that it would be helpful for faculty to refer to the Regents' support of specific measures when the faculty are engaged in advocacy efforts. In addition, the Memorial could garner publicity. Finally, it is important to demonstrate that the faculty are taking action and are in solidarity with the students.

A member objected that a Memorial is premature, since we do not know what measures will be on the ballot, and is necessarily too vague. Memorials should be used sparingly and should be specific and substantive. This proposal does not rise to the level that justifies a vote of all the faculty.

A member opined that the Memorial tacitly expresses disapproval of the Regents and suggests they are not doing their job. A member countered that under normal circumstances, the president and the Regents work with the legislature. However, this is a crisis, and faculty can not stand by silently; we should take action to protect the University.

A member asked if the language of the Memorial is intended to support one ballot initiative over another. Why not specify the measures we want them to support? A member of the drafting committee replied that the political situation is evolving too rapidly and the question of which measure or measures to endorse is complex. The Memorial simply requests that the Regents take a position, when appropriate.

A member commented that many faculty may not support the Memorial and it would make the Senate look ineffective, and could even undermine advocacy efforts, if the vote is not dramatically in favor of the Memorial.

A member asked if the Memorial would have an impact on the Regents. Chair Anderson responded that from his experience as Faculty Advisor to the Regents, he believes that it will have some influence.

**ACTION: Assembly approved distribution the Memorial, as amended in discussion, for a vote of the Senate faculty on all ten campuses (47 in favor; 12 against).**

**3. Proposal for a Negotiated Salary Plan Pilot Project [DISCUSSION]**

Chair Anderson stated that after receiving extensive comment via systemwide review, the Academic Council objected strenuously to the proposed APM 668, which would have established a negotiated salary plan for general campus faculty similar to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Provost Pitts then issued a letter establishing a negotiated salary pilot program for the four campuses with medical centers, excluding UCSF. Chair Anderson objected to this, and the provost agreed to withdraw the pilot program and establish a task force that would address Senate concerns with the proposed negotiated salary plan. The task force will include four administrators, representatives from UCFW, UCAP and UCPB, and Vice Chair Bob Powell. It is scheduled to issue a report on June 15, which will be reviewed systemwide.

**VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]**

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

CCGA Chair Rachael Goodhue moved to extend the meeting by 20 minutes in order to consider an item of new business. The motion was seconded and carried.

Per [Bylaw 120.D.4](#), Chair Anderson asked for Assembly's consent to add an item of New Business. Assembly unanimously consented to the addition of an item of New Business.

Chair Goodhue stated that on February 9, CCGA approved a proposal to establish a Master's of Professional Accountancy (M.P.Ac.) self-supporting degree program at UC Riverside. Because this is a new degree title at UCR, the Assembly must authorize its addition.

**ACTION: By majority vote, the Assembly approved the addition of the M.P.Ac. as a degree title at UC Riverside.**

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 pm.

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Senate Chair  
Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 15, 2012



## Appendix A – 2011-2012 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 15, 2012

### President of the University:

Mark G. Yudof

Carrie Noland (alternate)

Charles Zender

### Academic Council Members:

Robert Anderson, Chair

Robert Powell, Vice Chair

Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB

Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD

Craig Martens, Chair, UCI

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA

Susan Amussen, Chair UCM

Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR

Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD

Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC

William Jacob, Chair, BOARS

Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA

Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD

Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP

Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP

William Parker, Chair, UCFW

John Crawford, Chair, UCORP

James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

### Berkeley (6)

Christina Maslach (alt. for Steven Beissinger)

Paula Fass (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)

Philip Stark (alt. for Ralph Catalano)

Allen Goldstein

Jeffrey Perloff

Patricia Zambryski

### Davis (6)

Jeffrey Williams (alternate for Trish Berger)

Theodore DeJong

Richard Grotjahn

Joseph Kiskis

Krishnan Nambiar

Saul Schaefer

### Irvine (4)

Christopher Leslie

Tahseen Mozaffar

### Los Angeles (8)

Noah Goldstein (alt. for Malcolm Gordon)

Timothy Lane

Alan Laub

Susanne Lohmann

Joseph Nagy

Jennifer Krull (alt. for Jesse Rissman)

Monica Smith

Ninez Ponce (alt. for Richard Steinberg)

### Merced (1)

Wolfgang Rogge

### Riverside (2)

Jodie Holt

Thomas Morton

### San Diego (5)

John Hildebrand

Douglas Magde

Lorraine Pillus

Peter Wagner

Eric Watkins

### San Francisco (3)

Farid Chehab

Steve Warren (alt. for David Gardner)

Wendy Max

### Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)

John Foran

Vicki Scott

### Santa Cruz (2)

Joseph Konopelski

Marilyn Walker

### Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson

- III. **Announcements by the Chair**
- IV. **Announcements by the Provost**
- V. **Special Orders**

**A. 2012-13 Assembly Meeting Schedule [INFORMATION]**

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.b.](#), the following dates for the 2012-2013 Assembly meetings were set in consultation with the President of the Senate and the Academic Council: December 12, 2012 and February 13, April 10 and June 12, 2013.

**VI. Reports on Special Committees [NONE]**

**VII. Reports of Standing Committees**

**A. Academic Council**

**1. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2012-13 Assembly**

[Senate Bylaw 110. A.](#), which governs the election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly, states: “The Assembly elects a Vice Chair who is a Senate member from a Division other than that of the incoming Chair, to assume office the following September. The Academic Council submits a nomination. Further nominations may be made by the Assembly members from the floor, and on written petition by twenty-five Senate members. The Vice Chair also serves as Vice Chair of the Academic Council. The following year the Vice Chair becomes Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council. Neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair may serve as a Divisional Representative.” In accordance with this bylaw, the Academic Council is submitting its nomination of Professor William (Bill) Jacob for the 2012-2013 Vice Chair of the Assembly. Professor Jacob was selected as the Council’s nominee at its March 21, 2012, meeting. Professor Jacobs’ qualifications and personal statement are as follows:

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH  
BILL JACOB**

Department of Mathematics Phone: (805) 893-8048  
University of California, Santa Barbara Fax: (805) 893-2385  
Email: [jacob@math.ucsb.edu](mailto:jacob@math.ucsb.edu)

**Professional Preparation**

1974	University of California, Berkeley, Mathematics B.A.
1979	Princeton University, Mathematics Ph.D.
1979–1981	University of California, Los Angeles, Math Dept (Hedrick Asst. Prof.)
1981–1982	University of California, Berkeley, Math Dept (NSF Post. Doc.)

**Academic Appointments**

1989–	Professor of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara
1987–1989	AMS Centennial Fellowship/Visiting Assoc. Prof., University of California, Berkeley
1986–1987	Researcher/Number Theory Year, Math Sciences Research Inst., Berkeley
1984–1985	Visiting Asst. Prof., Math Department University of California, San Diego
1982–1989	Asst./Assoc. Prof., Math Department, Oregon State University
1981–1982	University of California, Berkeley Math Dept (NSF PostDoc)
1979–1981	Hedrick Asst. Prof., Math Department, University of California, Los Angeles

## **Academic Senate Committees and Related Duties**

University of California – Systemwide

2006-2008	UCSB Representative to Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
2008-2010	Vice Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
2010-2012	Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
2010-2012	BOARS Representative to Academic Council
2007-2012	Member and BOARS representative on UC Admissions Processing Task Force
2009	Search Committee Member, Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships
2009- 2010	Member, ICAS Mathematics Competency Statement Committee
2009-2011	Co-Chair, Career Technical Education a-g Advisory Committee
2010-2012	Member, Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS)
2011-2012	Search Committee Member, Associate Vice President of Undergraduate Admission

University of California, Santa Barbara

2004-2008	Undergraduate Council
2004-2006	Member, Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS)
2006-2008	Chair, Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS)
2006-2008	Enrollment Planning Committee, UCSB
2008-2012	Member, College of Creative Studies Mathematics Steering Committee
1989-2012	Mathematics Department Undergraduate Committee

## **Public Service**

1992-2003	Co-Director, South Coast Mathematics Partnership (K-12 Teacher Ed Collaborative)
1994, 1997	California Department of Education, K-8 Mathematics Instructional Resources Panel
1997	California Department of Education, Mathematics Framework for K-12 Committee
2005	California Math Council, First Walter Denham Memorial Award for Public Service
2005-2012	UCSB Center for Mathematical Inquiry, Director and K-12 Program Coordinator
2008-2012	Member, Santa Barbara County K-16 STEM Council
2010-2012	Member, Harding University Partnership School Council

## **Bill Jacob**

### **Statement of Challenges and Priorities for the Senate 2012-2014**

The primary challenge facing the University of California continues to be the financial crisis and the priority for the Senate must be to respond in ways that seek to preserve the strength of UC as a system. Scholarship at UC is a gem we have to defend without compromise, and while an earlier generation of Californians saw to it that a great University was built, it is the faculty that made the institution what it is today. The Senate's efforts have to be directed towards determining how resources are allocated to ensure continued excellence, and the Senate must also take the lead in assuring that UC's accomplishments in research, teaching and service are promoted in ways that increase public support for UC.

The involvement of the Senate in seeking competitive remuneration for UC faculty has to remain a top priority, extending well beyond the work of the current Taskforce. The recent role played by the Senate in the post-employment benefits discussions is an exemplar of how the Senate can engage proactively for the benefit of all UC employees. This level of effort will be needed to stay on top of the rebenching formulae into the foreseeable future to ensure equitable reinvestment in new faculty and infrastructure across campuses. The Senate must also monitor issues that define the quality of our research and professional environment, for example by continuing to press for more support for graduate education,

protecting MRUs when warranted, carefully scrutinizing proposed APM changes, assuring flexibility in merit reviews, defending academic freedom, and continuing to support pay equity. The experiences of undergraduate and graduate students define UC in the public eye and the Senate is the body with the responsibility to ensure the quality of their education. Targets for resident versus nonresident undergraduate enrollment will remain controversial and the Senate needs to ensure funding and access issues are considered in a balanced and strategic manner. Similarly, the Senate must continue to monitor Self Supporting Program proposals and fees. A rapidly changing landscape will require faculty involvement in transfer articulation and online course evaluation (both in a-g and UCOE) and the Senate leadership is going to have to nudge increasingly busy faculty to remain involved. We need to embrace innovation when proven, but never allow outside pressures to propel UC in any direction without careful examination. UCEP's recent response to WASC is an example of how UC can play a leadership role in articulating responsible accountability measures.

The well being of the University of California has been important to me throughout my life. Both my boys are third generation UC graduates and professionally I have had the privilege to teach at four UC campuses. I am a staunch defender of the vital role of UC within California higher education and because of my passion about access issues I have been involved in Admissions and various K-16 collaborations for many years. In my leadership roles I strive to put the big picture on the table so that all points of view are considered and also so that we can be proactive and ready for what may lie ahead. I am an activist by instinct but at the same time a close listener striving to develop consensus, and I think this should characterize how the Senate approaches its work.

### **ACTION REQUESTED: Election of the 2012-2013 Assembly Vice Chair**

#### **2. Ratification of the 2012 Oliver Johnson Award**

The Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the academic Senate is given biennially to a member or members of the UC faculty who has performed outstanding service to the Senate. Its broader goal is to honor, through the award to the recipient, all members of the faculty who have contributed their time and talent to the Senate.

Nominations for the award are made through Divisional Committees on Committees to the Universitywide Committee on Committees (UCOC). UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council. John Oakley (UCD) and Sandra Weiss (UCSF) were chosen as the awardees by the Academic Council at its meeting on March 21. The Assembly is asked to ratify the Academic Council's choice of recipients of the 2012 Oliver Johnson Award.

#### **Nomination of John Oakley (UCD) for Oliver Johnson Award**

The Davis Division Committee on Committees is delighted to nominate Professor John B. Oakley for the Oliver Johnson Award. Professor Oakley has had a significant impact on campus and Universitywide faculty governance, served the Academic Senate with distinction and has successfully worked with a variety of university constituents concerning Academic Senate issues.

#### Outstanding and creative contributions as evidenced by major impact on faculty governance

Professor Oakley took over leadership of the Universitywide Academic Senate on March 13, 2006 under difficult and unprecedented circumstances, replacing the previous Senate Chair without the usual transition period. He then served over one and one-half years, until August 31,

2007 earning the admiration and support of the President's Office, the Regents, and the faculty of the University.

Throughout this period, he served with great skill in keeping the Academic Senate balanced and on track. He had exceptionally strong relations with all concerned. During this period, among his many achievements, Professor Oakley worked effectively in guiding the Senate's input in the transition of the three University Laboratories operated with the US Department of Energy from plenary UC management and ownership to a shared arrangement and partial independence as LLC's. Professor Oakley led this transition as a member of the committee working with Bill Ecklund, Senior Litigator in the General Counsel's Office and with the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI).

#### Sustained excellence in serving the Academic Senate

Both before and after Professor Oakley's exemplary service at the Universitywide level, he served for years with the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, serving on at least 6 difference committees and in the Representative Assembly. His service spanned the period from at least 1986 through 2011. His most recent service has been as Vice Chair of the Executive Council from 2009-2011. Other critical committee service includes Planning and Budget, Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Responsibility, and the Future of UC Davis. Professor Oakley also served at the Universitywide level on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare from 2002-2005.

#### Exceptional abilities in working with different university constituents effectively

As noted at the outset, Professor Oakley's most outstanding characteristic has been his ability to work with Administration, Faculty, and the Regents, bringing these parties together for greater understanding and an effective working relationship, if not perfect agreement. He was notably successful in these efforts as Universitywide Senate Chair.

Professor James Chalfant, a current member of the Davis Division Committee on Committees and Chair of the University Committee on Planning and Budget stated: "I had the privilege of working with John as a member of our divisional Faculty Welfare Committee, and then served on UCFW while John chaired that committee. I chaired the divisional CPB while John was vice chair, so we continued to interact on a wide variety of subjects. More recently, he and I have continued to serve together as members of UCFW/TFIR. Throughout that time, I have found John to be remarkably effective as an advocate for the faculty role in shared governance, for his appreciation for the Senate's procedures and protocol, and for his tireless commitment to protecting UC's excellence. As an advocate for the faculty, he was instrumental in calling attention on the part of UCOP and The Regents to the critical need for closing the competitiveness gap for UC faculty salaries; I distinctly remember John's critical role in convincing President Dynes that there was no higher priority, and no more critical issue, than improving UC's recruitment and retention by protecting the faculty salary scales and restoring their competitiveness.

On a more personal level, I've benefited tremendously from John's commitment to mentorship. I have been influenced greatly by his willingness to spend time discussing the Senate with me, and I'm proud to call John one of a handful of very influential mentors I've worked with in that

regard. To me, John epitomizes the values, the commitment to excellence, and the tireless effort at engaging with both faculty colleagues and the administration to make the University better.” The committee received the following quote from former Academic Council Chair, Michael T. Brown, Professor of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology, UC Santa Barbara: "The challenges that met John during his term as chairship of the Senate were unprecedented. UC had been rocked by a number of exposés, many focusing on longstanding compensation practices. The Regents lacked apparent confidence in the Office of the President and that had a huge destabilizing effect on the University of California -- the future of academic leadership of UC was very much in doubt. During Chair Oakley's term, the Regents began the reorganization of the Office of the President, the then-President late resigned, and the first-ever Chief Operating Officer, the former Provost, was appointed. Moreover, there were changes to UC's role with the National Labs, they now being managed by a consortium of business and academic enterprises in the wake of safety and security breaches. The Senate, itself was challenged in its role a stabilizing agent given the necessity of removing the previous Senate chair, leading to John ascending to the Chair early -- he has the distinction as having the longest term (year and a half) as chair of the Senate. The challenges were great but John's leadership met these challenges. His high standing as an academic, the brilliance of his intellect, his command of the policy issues, and his ability to argue Senate positions compelling effectively steadied the Senate, the Regents, and the entire governance structure of UC at a most difficult time. He spent long hours behind the scenes navigating rough waters, but shared governance was not only maintained; it in some ways reached an apex under his leadership. It is impossible to overstate the significance of the Senate during this time to the governance of UC, nor the significance of John's stewardship of the Senate."

### **Nomination of Sandra Weiss (UCSF) for Oliver Johnson Award**

It is with great enthusiasm that the UCSF Division of the Academic Senate and the Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate Leadership nominates **Professor Sandra J. Weiss, Ph.D., D.N.Sc.** for the 2012 Oliver Johnson Award.

Professor Weiss is a member of the Academic Senate who has consistently demonstrated, through her service to her school, campus, and university, an unparalleled dedication to the system of shared governance at the University of California as outlined below and in the attached biosketch.

#### **Criterion 1: Outstanding and Creative Contributions as Evidenced by Major Impact on Faculty Governance**

##### **Divisional Level**

During Professor Weiss' tenure as Chair of the UCSF Academic Senate, she created new structures and processes that substantially improved the faculty's role in shared governance. Most notable was the development, with Chancellor Martin's support, of a Strategic Planning Board. This board was conceived in response to committee concerns over the lack of opportunities to give input regarding matters pertaining to the allocation of campus resources. In order to bridge the gap between resource allocation and academic planning needs, Professor Weiss convened groups consisting of members from the Senate and Administration. That effort yielded a proposal for a Strategic Planning Board that would be co-chaired by the campus Senate Chair and the

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Board received approval and served as an effective coordinating and advising body throughout the stewardship of Chancellor Martin. During her term, Professor Weiss also established mechanisms for addressing growing concerns by Senate faculty whose appointments were in the 'In Residence' series. She created a task force which engaged in round table meetings and full Senate deliberations. This effort resulted in a report that was submitted to the Systemwide Senate. As Vice Chair of the Academic Council, she continued her advocacy at the Systemwide level by chairing a joint task force consisting of Senate representatives and campus Vice Chancellors. Their recommendations for policy change resulted in new protections for 'In Residence' faculty across all campuses.

Other outstanding contributions included: 1) an agreement with the Chancellor for the Senate Chair to serve on his Executive Committee (a group traditionally composed of Senior Vice Chancellors) and 2) an established agenda item for divisional Senate meetings that involved a dialogue with the UC Provost or one of the Vice Presidents of the University. Both of these changes resulted in a more informed administration regarding faculty views and perspectives as well as increased awareness by Senate members of important issues facing the campus and University.

Lastly, under her stewardship as the Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the Committee worked closely with the Vice Chancellor to improve the process for stewardship reviews of Department Chairs, Institute Directors and Deans. Clear guidelines and new procedures were established for everyone involved in these reviews, thereby improving the timeliness and integrity of the reviews.

### **Systemwide Level**

During her tenure as Vice Chair and Chair of the Academic Council from 1996 to 1998 there were many evolving issues requiring strong Senate input. Of special note was the establishment of UC Merced in which Professor Weiss played a key role in fostering methods and structures for effective Senate input in the recruitment and appointment process of faculty for the creation of academic planning bodies. She also served on the founding Steering Committee for the UC Digital Library, developing academic guidelines for this new venture.

In collaboration with her predecessor, Duncan Mellinchamp, she worked with the President and Provost to improve financial support for Academic Senate staffing and allocation of space resulting in increased staffing and for the first time Senate leadership, the President, and the Provost were all located on the same floor. This supported effective communication and access allowing the President to draw on the Senate to remain informed, thereby strengthening the Senate voice.

During her leadership of the Council, Professor Weiss established a Senate Health Sciences Committee. Prior to this time, there was only an administrative health sciences committee responsible to the Vice President, consisting primarily of Deans and hospital directors. This new Senate committee provided a mechanism for the Senate to advise the Council and President's office on key academic issues facing the health sciences in the University.

Professor Weiss also worked to improve the Senate's influence with the Regents. She created a designated time at each Council meeting for dialogue with key UC regents to discuss pending

issues. This helped inform the Regents, assured broader faculty input, and cultivated a stronger relationship between faculty and the Regents. With the Chair of the Board of Regents, she worked to assure Senate representation on all key Regent committees during her time as Council Chair. Important decisions were often made at these committees prior to the full Board meeting. A designated time was also established during the Regent's meeting for the Council Chair to report. These accomplishments made a tremendous difference in the Senate's ability to have a meaningful voice.

Lastly, when the Provost established the Task Force on Research Climate in response to concerns regarding the lack of adequate support for faculty's research mission, Professor Weiss was tapped as Chair. She brought together a diverse group of faculty and Vice Chancellors for Research across the campuses to organize supporting data, prioritize concerns and develop specific strategies to address the concerns. The report of this task force continues to be a resource regarding environmental supports and constraints to research in major Universities. As a result of broad University discussion about the recommendations, a number of important changes were made on campuses, including the availability of bridge funding from Offices of Research for faculty whose programs of research might be in jeopardy due to lapses in funding. Professor Weiss also presented the key findings and recommendations of the Task Force to the Regents, informing them of the resource needs of faculty in generating knowledge.

## **Criterion 2: Sustained Excellence in Serving the Academic Senate**

### **Divisional Level**

As indicated in her biosketch, Professor Weiss has had a broad range of involvement in her campus Senate over the last three decades. She continues to be an active voice within the UCSF Senate, currently as a member of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget. She also serves as a Senate representative on many administrative committees such as the Neuroscience Resource Allocation Committee for the campus Clinical & Translational Science Institute (CTSI). Professor Weiss continues to be actively involved in Academic Senate activities in her school, the School of Nursing, including as an elected faculty representative to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan Committee and Chair of the Doctoral Program Council.

### **Systemwide Level**

Her efforts to support the larger UC mission began in the early 1980s when she served on an intercampus committee to facilitate joint curricula across campuses. While her initial university-wide work focused primarily on the health sciences, her contributions quickly expanded to the more general academic mission of the University. Her biosketch shows the breadth of committees on which she has served as a Senate representative, from Research Policy to Planning and Budget. She is recognized for her ongoing responsiveness to requests to have her name forwarded for potential Systemwide Senate service. For example, recently chaired the Stewardship Review of the UC Berkeley Chancellor and is involved in a UC Systemwide task force to develop intercampus coursework.

## **Criterion 3: Exceptional Abilities in Working with Different University Constituents**

### **Divisional Level**



During her tenure as Chair of the Divisional Senate, Professor Weiss created a climate of openness and exceptional collaboration among different groups of faculty and between faculty and administration. She was known for divisional Senate meetings that filled large rooms such as UCSF's largest lecture hall. She created highly relevant agendas, building on the most urgent concerns of a broad range of the faculty. She also chaired meetings with respect and acknowledgment of all views on the issues. Even in meetings during times of tension between Department Chairs and faculty, each constituency would leave feeling as if its concerns were being addressed.

Professor Weiss also developed a new structure for her Executive Committee that included the Chairs of each School's Faculty Councils and the Parliamentarian. Prior to this, the Chair's Executive Committee typically consisted of the Vice Chair and Secretary of the Divisional Senate. Her more inclusive approach assured that a broader base of concerns was being addressed by the campus Senate and that stronger support for governance was available across the Senate structures of the Schools. It has now become established procedure for the Executive Committee to include Chairs of the various school councils. She brought this same inclusive approach to her role as Chair of CAP, inviting input from the non-Senate faculty regarding their review processes and created new policies for involvement on ad hoc committees that attempted to address clinical faculty concerns.

Renowned for her good working relationships with the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and other administrators in all of her Senate roles, such partnerships have engendered improvements in Senate involvement; improvements that were driven by mutual respect and collaboration rather than conflict.

### **Systemwide Level**

This same collaborative approach has pervaded her system-wide Senate work. A number of individuals who served with Professor Weiss when she was Chair of the Academic Council have noted her skill in working effectively with diverse faculty groups and with the administration. In addition, she scheduled regular meetings with the heads of University staff and student groups. She also fostered and improved relationships with the Academic Senates of the California State University and the Community College Systems, chairing a consortium of Senate representatives from these institutions that addressed many common concerns in public education. Through her work with this consortium, she generated a unified and effective response to the legislature when a blue ribbon commission had proposed that tenure should be abolished in all of California's public colleges and universities. Further evidence of her collaborative ability was provided by the UC President in his comments to the Regents about Professor Weiss' leadership while she was Council Chair. He noted that she had fostered highly effective relationships with his office and the Regents, resulting in an ideal model of joint governance within the University.

We consider Professor Weiss to be the most deserving member of our faculty to receive the Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the Academic Senate as she typifies the best of UC faculty leadership. Accordingly, the UCSF Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate respectfully requests your favorable consideration of Professor Sandra Weiss as this year's recipient of the Oliver Johnson Award.

**ACTION REQUESTED: Ratification of 2012 Oliver Johnson Awardees**

3. **Report on the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources [Linda Bisson, ACSCANR Member] [INFORMATION]**
4. **Issues relating to Senate Membership [DISCUSSION]**

**VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [INFORMATION]**

- **William Parker, UCFW Chair**
  1. **Negotiated Salary Plan Task Force**
  2. **Faculty Salaries Task Force**

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**