

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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



VIDEOCONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, February 8, 2017

10:00 am - 1:00 pm

To participate in the videoconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place. If you are off-campus, you may join the video and internet audio from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS, or Android at <https://UCOP.zoom.us/j/432157236>

Or join by phone: 1 408 638 0968 or +1 646 558 8656 (US Toll)

Meeting ID: 404-330-560

I.	ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS	1
II.	MINUTES [ACTION]	
	Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of April 13, 2016	2-6
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, April 13, 2016	7
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	
	▪ Jim Chalfant	
IV.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST	
	▪ Aimée Dorr	
V.	SPECIAL ORDERS	
A.	Consent Calendar [NONE]	
B.	Annual Reports [2015-16]	
	Academic Council (Council)	8
	Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI)	17
	Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC)	21
	Academic Freedom (UCAF)	26
	Academic Personnel (UCAP)	28
	Affirmative Action, Diversity and Equity (UCAADE)	31
	Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)	35
	Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)	43
	Committees (UCOC)	49
	Educational Policy (UCEP)	51
	Faculty Welfare (UCFW)	54
	Libraries and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)	59
	Planning and Budget (UCPB)	63
	Preparatory Education (UCOPE)	67
	Research Policy (UCORP)	69

VI.	REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES	
A.	Academic Council	
▪	Jim Chalfant, Chair Academic Council	
1.	Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaw 125 [ACTION]	74
2.	Amendments to Academic Personnel Manual Sections 015 and 016 [ACTION]	76
B.	Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs	
▪	Kwai Ng, Chair, CCGA	
1.	Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree at UCSF [ACTION]	108
VII.	REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]	
VIII.	UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]	
IX.	PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]	
X.	UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]	
XI.	NEW BUSINESS	

I. Roll Call

2016-17 Assembly Roll Call February 8, 2017

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano

Henry Weinstein

Academic Council Members:

James Chalfant, Chair

Shane White, Vice Chair

Robert Powell, Chair, UCB

Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCD

William Parker, Chair, UCI

Susan Cochran, Chair, UCLA

Susan Amussen, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Kaustuv Roy, Chair, UCSD

Ruth Greenblatt, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Olof Einarsdottir, Chair, UCSC

Henry Sanchez, Chair, BOARS

Kwai Ng, Chair, CCGA

Amani Nuru-Jeter, Chair, UCAAD

Theofanis Tsoulouhas, Chair, UCAP

Barbara Knowlton, Chair, UCEP

Lori Lubin, Chair, UCFW

Isaac Martin, Chair, UCORP

Bernard Sadoulet, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (8)

Roman Koropecjy

Purnima Mankekar

Hanna Mikkola

Frank Petrigliano

Ninez Ponce

E. Richard Stiehm

Dorothy Wiley

Kym Faull

Merced (1)

Patricia LiWang

Riverside (2)

Thomas Cogswell

Jodi Kim

San Diego (5)

Lorraine Pillus

Anna Joy Springer

Nadine George

Gail Heyman

Gentry Patrick

Berkeley (5)

Alexis T. Bell

Kristie Boering

Peter R. Glazer

Christopher Kutz

Miryam Sas

San Francisco (4)

Marek Brzezinski

John Feiner

Leah Karliner

Laura Wagner

Davis (6)

William Casey

Stephanie Dungan

Robert L. Powell

Brenda Schildgen

Scott Stanley

Richard Tucker

Santa Barbara (3)

Bjorn Birnir

Julie Carlson

Andrew Norris

Santa Cruz (2)

Kimberly Lau

Dorian Bell

Irvine (4)

John Dobrian

Karamet Reiter

Timothy Tait

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George J. Matthey

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 13, 2016

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, April 13, 2016. Academic Senate Chair J. Daniel Hare presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Hilary Baxter called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: Assembly approved the minutes of the February 10, 2016 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**▪ J. Daniel Hare**

New Pension Tier: The Regents approved the President's recommendation for a new pension plan that caps pensionable earnings at the limit set by the Public Employees Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) for UC employees hired on or after July 1, 2016. New employees will have a choice between two retirement plan options: a stand-alone 401(k)-style Defined Contribution (DC) plan, or a Defined Benefit pension plan with the PEPRA cap and a 401(k)-style supplemental benefit. The plan responds to the Academic Council's recommendation to offer faculty a DC supplement that begins on the first day of hire and the first dollar earned. Some policymakers and members of the UC community have expressed concern about the inclusion of a DC option; however, no employee will be required to accept the DC plan.

Statement Against Intolerance: The Regents adopted a policy statement of [Principles Against Intolerance](#) after accepting a last minute amendment to the Statement's pre-ambule proposed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAAF) and endorsed the Academic Council. The amendment clarified that "anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism" rather than "anti-Zionism" should be considered discrimination, to distinguish anti-Semitism from anti-Zionism, a political viewpoint protected under the First Amendment.

UC Transfer Pathways: Eleven more UC Transfer Pathways have been approved and added to the systemwide Pathways website, in addition to the ten existing Pathways. In addition, the Senate has developed a procedure for adding smaller, specialized majors on specific campuses to an existing Pathway, in recognition that the Pathways may provide sufficient pre-major preparation for related majors. UC has started the work of analyzing and addressing gaps in articulation for specific courses in the Pathways between each of the California Community Colleges and the nine undergraduate UC campuses.

CLEP Exam Review: The Senate has identified groups of faculty from each campus who will review seven College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams for possible UC credit.

Joint Committee on Faculty Discipline: The Joint Committee submitted its final report to the President on April 4. It concludes that although existing policies are fundamentally sound, they need to be better understood by faculty, students, and administrators. The Committee is also recommending that the University work toward greater systemwide alignment of campus Title IX processes, Chancellor's discipline processes, and Senate Privilege and Tenure processes.

Budget Audit: A state audit released on March 29 criticizes UC's nonresident admission practices and the "compare favorably" standard for nonresident admission. It claims that UC has admitted many nonresidents with lower qualifications than California residents based on GPA and test scores; that UC deliberately lowered admissions standards to replace revenue lost in the budget crisis; and that UC is failing to meet the CA Master Plan provision related to nonresident admission. The audit argues that UC should have responded to the state budget cuts with more aggressive cost savings programs. The President's [response](#) to the Auditor and UC's report [Straight Talk on Hot-Button Issues](#) counter the assertions by noting that UC is meeting its Master Plan obligation to all state-funded California residents, and that campuses evaluate applicants on 14 comprehensive review factors, not only GPA and SAT. UC also notes that the audit is based on an outdated interpretation of the 1960 Master Plan standard for nonresident admission. Language in the 1960 Master Plan stating that nonresidents should be in the "upper half of those ordinarily eligible" was dropped in the 1987 revision, and is no longer relevant in the context of comprehensive review and increased selectivity.

Discussion: BOARS Chair Aldredge stated that campuses have interpreted the compare favorably standard as requiring the average qualifications of residents and nonresidents admitted to a campus to be comparable. He added that the Auditor posits that there has been no official revision of the 1960 Master Plan, only subsequent proposed recommendations that were never formally adopted.

An Assembly member observed that UC campuses do not share identical disciplinary procedures for cases of faculty accused of misconduct. Senate Chair Hare stated that campuses have separate investigation and hearing processes. The main variation relates to Title IX processes. In some cases the reporting lines for and oversight of the Title IX office are unclear, although the vast majority of cases are settled before reaching the P&T hearing stage.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

- **Aimée Dorr**

State Audit Hearing: The Joint Legislative Audit Committee received a copy of [Straight Talk on Hot-Button Issues](#) prior to the Committee's April 6 hearing on the Auditor's report. UC's Chief Financial Officer and its Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions represented UC at the hearing and refuted the Auditor's claims about nonresident admission and enrollment. The UC team highlighted problems with the audit's methodology and noted that the University guarantees a place at UC to all eligible California residents, a promise it does not extend to nonresidents. Moreover, the University expects campuses to enroll nonresidents only after they enroll their share of state-funded residents. The UC representatives also emphasized that UC

campuses have dramatically increased the admission and enrollment of CA resident undergraduates who are Pell Grant recipients, first-generation college-goers, and underrepresented minorities, over the past decade. They also discussed the University's commitment to enrolling 10,000 new California resident undergraduates over the next three years, including 5,000 this year, with growth concentrated at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD, the three campuses with the highest nonresident enrollment. The UC team also stated that most of the administrative staffing growth at UC has occurred in the Health Sciences and is supported by non-State funds. During the hearing some legislators expressed support for the University's position and questioned the basis for the audit, but others are expected to introduce bills that attempt to address issues identified by the Auditor.

Enrollment Plan: UC campuses admitted 15% more California resident freshmen this year, positioning the University to meet its goal for enrollment growth. The University's 2016-17 enrollment plan divides the responsibility for growth across the campuses, and assigns freshmen and transfer targets to each campus based on their typical rates of yield. The systemwide plan also calls for aggressive increases in summer enrollment, as well as additional winter and spring quarter admissions, as needed. UCOP and the campuses are also discussing strategies for accommodating the additional enrollments, which include increasing the number of students assigned to a dormitory room, identifying new and temporary housing facilities, expanding and reorganizing course schedules, and increasing online course offerings.

Discussion: Assembly members observed that UC has agreed to accept new resident undergraduates at half the marginal cost rate of \$10K per student, a rate that already underestimates the true cost of education. The enrollment growth will be difficult for campuses to absorb, and the funding rate is unsustainable over the long term. UC classrooms are already oversubscribed and campuses have few options for accommodating new students. Many students will be unable to secure the classes they need for a timely graduation unless campuses identify new space and hire additional faculty. Provost Dorr noted that time-to-degree is a component of every discussion about enrollment growth. UCOP recognizes that the enrollment plan poses challenges to timely graduation, and is working with the campuses on plans for accommodating the teaching demand with new ladder-rank faculty and graduate students. UCOP is diverting funds to campuses formerly used for nonresident financial aid to help meet their total cost of instruction needs.

Budget Framework Initiative: UC has completed several of the initiatives required of it in the budget framework agreement with the Governor, including the identification of transfer pathways for the top 21 majors, three-year degree pathways for 10 of the 15 most popular majors, new online courses for undergraduates, enhanced time-to-degree advising, and data to better identify at-risk students. Other initiatives are ongoing, including the enhanced use of summer session, efforts to reduce upper division major requirements, the piloting of activity-based costing, and the use of adaptive learning technology. Additional work is also ongoing to inform students and counselors about the UC Transfer Pathways, and to ensure that every pathway can be achieved by any California Community College student.

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

▪ **J. Daniel Hare, Chair**

1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the 2016-17 Assembly

Chair Hare introduced UC Los Angeles Professor of Dentistry Shane White, the Academic Council's nominee for 2016-17 Assembly vice chair and 2017-18 chair. At Chair Hare's invitation, Professor White made a statement and left the room at the Los Angeles division. Chair Hare asked for any additional nominations from the floor, and hearing none, asked for any objections to Professor White's nomination. Hearing none, he moved that the Assembly give its unanimous consent to his election.

ACTION: The Assembly voted unanimously to elect Shane White vice chair of the 2016-17 Assembly.

2. Ratification of the 2014 Oliver Johnson awardees

Chair Hare stated that the Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Senate Service is presented every other year to a Senate member or members in recognition of lifetime service to the Academic Senate, outstanding and creative contributions to faculty governance, and exceptional abilities in working with different University constituents. The award is governed by procedures adopted by the Academic Council, in which each Senate division is asked to nominate a candidate and the University Committee on Committees selects two names to forward to Council. Council then selects an awardee or awardees from the two nominations it receives, and asks the Assembly to ratify the choice. This year, Council voted to honor both UCOC nominees—UCB Professor Robert Anderson and UCSD Professor Katja Lindenberg.

ACTION: The Assembly ratified the nominations of Professors Katja Lindenberg and Robert Anderson as the 2016 recipients of the Oliver Johnson Award.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

The Davis Division introduced a motion supporting the possibility of conducting a confidential ballot vote at Assembly meetings conducted in a teleconference format. It was noted that the motion is not related to any item of today's items of business. The Senate office agreed that it would investigate potential mechanisms for enabling confidential electronic voting that can authenticate eligible voters and accommodate alternates.

ACTION: The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously by voice vote as follows:

Whereas, the option to require vote by ballot is a fundamental element of parliamentary procedure, and

There currently exists no known practicable method for voting by ballot in a teleconference environment,

Be it resolved that, a procedure be implemented to enable voting by ballot during teleconference meetings of the Assembly and Academic Council, and

That this procedure be consistent with Bylaw 95.A.2, which states, “For electronic voting, the appropriate Secretary shall utilize a system which verifies each voter’s identity and which maintains security.”

VII. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [None]

VIII. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar [None]

IX. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]

X. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: J. Daniel Hare, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 13, 2016

Appendix A – 2015-2016 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 13, 2016

President of the University:

Janet Napolitano (absent)

Academic Council Members:

J. Daniel Hare, Chair

James Chalfant, Vice Chair

Robert Powell, Chair, UCB

Andre Knoesen, Chair, UCD

Alan Terricciano, Chair, UCI

Leobardo Estrada, Chair, UCLA

Cristian Ricci, Chair, UCM

Jose Wudka, Chair, UCR

Robert Continetti, Chair, UCSD

Ruth Greenblatt, Chair, UCSF (absent)

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, UCSB (absent)

Donald Brenneis, Chair, UCSC

Ralph Aldredge, Chair, BOARS

Valerie Leppert, Chair, CCGA

Colleen Clancy, Chair, UCAAD (absent)

Michael Stenstrom, Chair, UCAP

Tracy Larrabee, Chair, UCEP

Calvin Moore, Chair, UCFW

Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair, UCORP

Shane White, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Alexis T. Bell

Peter R. Glazer (absent)

Kris Gutierrez

Miryam Sas (absent)

Theodore Slaman

Davis (6)

William Casey

Andrea J. Fascetti

Richard Tucker

Robert L. Powell

Chris van Kessel

Fran Dolan

Irvine (4)

Joyce Keyak (alt for Sameer Ashar)

David Kay

Karamet Reiter (absent)

Timothy Tait

Los Angeles (8)

Roman Koropecjy

Dorothy Wiley

Purnima Mankekar (absent)

Hanna Mikkola (absent)

Ninez Ponce

E. Richard Stiehm (absent)

Frank Petrigliano (absent)

Christopher Tilly (absent)

Merced (1)

Robin Maria DeLugan (absent)

Riverside (2)

Mary Gauvain

Jodi Kim

San Diego (5)

Nadine George

Grant Goodall

Joanna McKittrick

Gail Heyman

Gentry Patrick (absent)

San Francisco (4)

Farid Chehab (alt for Marek Brzezinski)

John Feiner

Steven Cheung (alt for David Saloner)

Laura Wagner

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann (absent)

Eric Matthys

Xiaorong Li (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Olof Einarsdottir

Dorian Bell

Secretary/Parliamentarian

George J. Matthey

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. It acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters, advises the President on behalf of the Assembly, and has the continuing responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern. The Academic Council held eleven regular meetings and additional conference calls during the 2015-16 year to consider multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular import for the year include:

BUDGETARY ISSUES

Monthly Budget Briefings

The President, Provost, and other senior UC leaders updated Council each month about the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, enrollment planning, UCRP funding, the state audit of the University, proposed legislation affecting the University budget, and other budget matters. Administrators briefed Council on their efforts to inform and educate legislators and UC Regents about the University's cost-saving initiatives, options for adjusting cost drivers and revenues, and the revenue needed to maintain UC's excellence and accessibility. Council members emphasized the need for UC to educate state officials and the general public about UC's research and graduate education roles and the need to reinvest in academic quality through measures such as reducing the student-faculty ratio; increasing funding for faculty start-up costs; providing competitive total remuneration for faculty; and increasing graduate student support to competitive levels. A subset of Council members also participated in monthly budget briefing teleconferences for faculty and senior administrators hosted by the Provost.

Enrollment Funding

Council discussed an agreement with the state to add 5,000 resident undergraduates to UC campuses in the 2016-17 academic year and an additional 2,500 in each of the following two years, at per-student funding rate that is far short of the \$10,000 marginal cost figure used in the past. In September, Council Chair Hare sent a [letter](#) to President Napolitano outlining concerns about how the then-pending agreement could strain the University's infrastructure and impair its ability to meet its teaching, research, and public service missions. At several meetings, Council members discussed challenges associated with accommodating the new enrollments and concerns that instructional quality could suffer without a proportional number of additional faculty and staff and new physical infrastructure to support a larger student population. UCOP administrators described their work with campuses to establish specific and realistic enrollment targets, new mechanisms to increase student housing and other facilities, and efforts to secure full marginal cost funding for future enrollments.

Budget Framework Initiative

A standing Council agenda item focused on the role of Senate divisions, systemwide committees, campuses, and UCOP in the implementation of "programmatic initiatives" included in the budget agreement with Governor Brown (the "Budget Framework Initiative"). Senate leaders identified specific initiatives in which Senate divisions and committees should be involved or consulted, and asked Senate division chairs to identify appropriate review bodies and experts on each campus. The systemwide Senate led the initiative to identify transfer pathways for the top 20

majors. BOARS considered the use of C-ID as a supplemental numbering system for UC courses, and UCEP examined policies on the University's acceptance of use of alternative credits. All campuses successfully identified three-year degree specifications for 10 of their top 15 majors and met a 40% progress benchmark in the initiative to reduce the number of upper division courses required for a major to the equivalent of one full year of academic work. Other initiatives are ongoing, including the enhanced use of summer session, the piloting of activity-based costing, and the use of adaptive learning technology.

UCRP Borrowing Plan

In November, following advice from UCFW and its Task Force on Investment and Retirement, Chair Hare sent a [letter](#) to Chief Financial Officer Brostrom expressing Council's support for a UCOP plan to borrow from internal sources for investment in UCRP. The plan continues a path pursued three times since 2011 and will enable the University to cover the Actuarially Required Contribution (ARC) in each of the next three years.

Budget Audit

Council discussed a state audit critical of UC's nonresident admission and enrollment practices, responses to the audit from [the President](#) and the [University](#), and other UC efforts to counter assertions made in the audit that UC gives priority in admission to nonresidents and admits many nonresidents who are less qualified than residents. Consultants from the Offices of Admissions, State Governmental Relations, Budget, and President's Immediate Office updated Council regularly about the audit and legislative efforts to address the audit's recommendation. In his [May 2016 remarks to the Regents](#), Chair Hare publically challenged the State Auditor's claims that the faculty lowered admissions standards to admit more nonresidents, and noted that campuses base admission decisions on 14 comprehensive review factors, not just GPA and test scores.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES

Retirement Options Task Force

Senate Chair Hare, Vice Chair Chalfant, UCPB Chair White, and UCFW Vice Chair Lubin served on a Task Force charged by President Napolitano to design a retirement plan for new UC employees that includes a pensionable salary cap aligned with the Public Employee Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) and that also preserves the competitiveness of UC retirement benefits and the financial sustainability of UCRP, and produces cost savings. Chief Operating Officer Nava, Vice President for Human Resources Duckett and Executive Director Schlimgen worked closely with the Task Force and joined Council regularly in the fall and winter to update the faculty on progress. The Senate conducted an expedited review of the Task Force's final report and recommendations in January and February. The Senate chair and vice chair also collaborated on a [Guide to Reviewing the Report](#). On February 10, the Assembly of the Academic Senate passed a [resolution](#) opposing the imposition of the PEPRA cap on the University in the absence of compensating increases to total remuneration. Council followed-up with a [letter](#) to the President summarizing comments received during the systemwide review, which described how the proposed options could hurt the University, and advocated for options that would be least harmful to UC's ability to recruit and retain faculty. The Regents' final plan responded to Council's recommendation to offer faculty a Defined Contribution supplement that begins on the first day of hire and on the first dollar earned, irrespective of one's salary below the PEPRA cap, to help address concerns about a supplement being too small and starting too late to be effective.

Faculty Salaries and Total Remuneration

Council was concerned about UC's competitive total remuneration gap for faculty, particularly in the context of the new pension tier. Council emphasized the need to close the gap for all faculty and to increase cash compensation for faculty hired under the new tier to address the gap. The President pledged to address the issue of faculty salary competitiveness, and Council discussed her plan to continue a 3% salary program for faculty, in which 1.5% would be allocated as an across-the-board increase to the academic salary scales, and the remaining 1.5% to a discretionary salary program designed by the campus. Council members discussed the effectiveness of a similar program implemented last year, reviewed the campuses' distribution of the discretionary awards, and advised UCOP on how campuses should report on the distribution this year. Council members also emphasized the centrality of UC's peer review merit and advancement system in judging faculty quality, and the importance of maintaining salary scales with a meaningful connection to the rank and step system. They urged UCOP to preserve the link between the scales and excellence by focusing salary actions on the published salary scales.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

The Council was engaged in the University's effort to update and improve policies on sexual violence and sexual harassment, including clarifying reporting procedures and resources for responding to prohibited conduct, and to clarify and improve processes for investigating and adjudicating cases in which faculty are accused.

Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

In October, Council issued [comments](#) on a revised Presidential Policy for the investigation, adjudication, and sanction of student-on-student incidents of sexual violence, assault, and harassment. Council expressed support for efforts to clarify and strengthen current policy, and also recommended ways to clarify provisions related to mandatory reporting responsibilities for faculty, graduate students, and others; protections for graduate students; privacy and confidentiality provisions; disciplinary procedures; and the relationship of the policy to law enforcement and Senate Privilege and Tenure processes.

Joint Committee of the Administration and Senate

Later in fall 2015, President Napolitano empaneled a Joint Committee co-led by Senate Chair Dan Hare and Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca to examine systemwide and individual campus policies and practices for the investigation, adjudication, and sanction of incidents of sexual violence, assault, and harassment involving faculty and academic personnel. The Committee issued a draft report and recommendations in February. The results of the systemwide Senate review of the recommendations were summarized in a [March letter](#) from Council to Senior Vice President Vacca. The President accepted several of the recommendations, but also asked the Committee to reconvene and provide additional recommendations in six areas by July 31. The Supplemental Report of the Joint Committee responded to the President's request. Council discussed the supplemental report and sent comments to UCOP in July.

ADMISSIONS ISSUES

UC Transfer Pathways

The Senate led an effort to continue implementation of a [Transfer Action Team](#) recommendation to streamline transfer admission from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to UC by aligning the preparation requirements for specific majors across UC campuses. In October, Council Chair Hare and Provost Dorr hosted three meetings of campus faculty delegates to develop 11 additional UC Transfer Pathways – lower division course sequences recommended to

CCC students as preparation for transfer admission into a given major at all nine undergraduate campuses. A total of 21 Pathways have now been approved and are detailed on a [systemwide website](#). Division Chairs helped monitor the review and approval of the proposed Pathways on the campuses. Council received regular briefings from Senate and UCOP leaders on the campus review, and UCOP's efforts to identify articulation gaps between specific CCC and UC campuses for specific course expectations. The Senate also developed a procedure for adding smaller, specialized majors on specific campuses to an existing Pathway.

Course Identification Numbering System

In October, guests from the CCC joined Council to discuss the use of the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) at CSU and the CCC, the benefits of C-ID for CCC students navigating the transfer path, and for colleges and universities wanting to streamline course articulation reviews, and the possibility of endorsing the use of C-ID at UC. The Council chair asked BOARS to lead the Senate's consideration of C-ID as a supplemental numbering system for lower division UC courses identified as comparable with CCC and CSU courses. Council supported a plan endorsed by BOARS for a pilot approach to C-ID that would maintain the existing systemwide articulation review process to determine the initial UC transferability of CCC courses, and to pilot the use of C-IDs at the second level of review, for the course-to-course articulation of a select number of UC Transfer Pathways. BOARS also found unanticipated problems in its deployment of C-ID at the CCC, which raised concerns that BOARS will study next fall.

Nonresident Admissions

Council discussed BOARS' ["Compare Favorably" report](#) on 2015 nonresident admission outcomes and a request from the President for a Senate review of current nonresident admission policy in the fall, to clarify the policy's compliance with the Master Plan and its consistency with the University's freshman admission goals, comprehensive review policy, and holistic review processes.

Berkeley Letters of Recommendation Pilot

Council reviewed an analysis of the UC Berkeley letters of recommendation pilot project and its role in admissions outcomes on that campus. Council was concerned about data suggesting that the Pilot may have had a differential impact on underrepresented students. Despite a recommendation from BOARS to continue the pilot for another year, Council voted to oppose both the continuation of the UC Berkeley letters of recommendation pilot project and the expansion of the pilot project to all applicants.

GRADUATE EDUCATION ISSUES

Degree and School Approvals

Following recommendations from CCGA, Council approved the following schools and degree programs:

- [Master of Legal and Forensic Psychology Degree Program at UC Irvine](#) (10/15)
- [Master of Public Affairs degree program at UC Berkeley](#) (11/15)
- [Master of Nursing Science Degree Program at UC Davis](#) (11/15)
- [Herb Alpert School of Music at UC Los Angeles](#) (12/15)
- [Master in Social Science degree program at UC Los Angeles](#) (1/16)
- [Master of Chinese Economic and Political Affairs at UC San Diego](#) (2/16)
- [Master of Human Computer Interaction and Design degree at UC Irvine](#) (2/16)

- [Master of Laws in American Law at UC Irvine](#) (4/16)
- [Master of Computer Science at UC Irvine](#) (5/16)

One proposal meriting special consideration at Council was the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music. The CCGA chair spent a portion of the December meeting describing the School's unique path to full realization and approval, and its benefits to UCLA and the UC system.

Graduate Education Advocacy

Council members consistently emphasized in consultation sessions with Senior Managers the importance of seeking state funding for graduate education and communicating to the state the importance of graduate education in relation to UC's role as a research university.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ISSUES

Alternative Credits

The Council chair asked UCEP to lead the Senate's consideration of policies for "alternative credit" coursework and exams taken outside of UC prior to matriculation with the goal of providing credit that will help students graduate sooner. Council endorsed UCEP's plan for the evaluation of seven College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams for possible UC credit by systemwide UC faculty committees composed of faculty from every UC undergraduate campus. Senate division chairs identified faculty representatives to the committees; however, the Senate ended its consideration of CLEP after learning that the College Board was willing to provide full exams to faculty review teams only in proctored, in-person sessions, or test guides with only sample questions.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Openness in Research Proposal

In January, Executive Director of Research Policy Analysis Streitzi joined Council to discuss a preliminary proposal for an "Openness in Research" policy that would clarify existing UC policies on not accepting publication and citizenship restrictions in research agreements, and allow campuses a new ability to accept publication and/or citizenship restrictions imposed by the federal government for national security reasons. Several Council members spoke in favor of moving the policy forward for systemwide discussion, and Executive Director Streitzi agreed to send forward a formal draft policy to the Senate for discussion at some point in the future.

UC MEXUS Review Report

In May, Council reviewed the Joint Senate Review Committee's 15-Year "Sunset" Review of the UC Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC MEXUS), a Multi-campus Research Unit based at UC Riverside. UCORP led the review in consultation with UCPB and CCGA. Council forwarded the report and a [recommendation](#) for continuation of UC MEXUS to Provost Dorr.

DIVERSITY ISSUES

Best Practices for Diversifying the UC Faculty

In January, Council [endorsed best practice recommendations](#) from the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity for recruiting, retaining, and promoting a diverse faculty that focus on hiring more President's Postdoctoral Fellows (PPFs) and Chancellor's Fellows (CFs) into UC faculty positions. The recommendations describe how the University can make better use of the PPF and CF programs by implementing more standardized processes

across campuses for hiring via the programs. Council asked the Provost to distribute the recommendations to campus Executive Vice Chancellors and Vice Provosts for implementation.

Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140

The Council approved and the Assembly ratified a proposal from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to change its name to the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity.

STATEMENT AGAINST INTOLERANCE

Council Chair Hare served on a Regents Work Group empaneled to adopt a set of Principles Against Intolerance in response to a series of anti-Semitic incidents on UC campuses. The Council outlined its concerns about the final report of the working group in a [March letter to the President](#). Council asked the President to request an amendment to the statement's contextual pre-amble proposed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF), clarifying that "anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism" rather than simply "anti-Zionism" should be considered discrimination, to distinguish anti-Semitism from anti-Zionism – a political viewpoint protected under the First Amendment and academic freedom. The Regents incorporated the amendment into the final [Statement of Principles](#) they approved in March.

CYBERSECURITY

Chief Information Officer Andriola joined Council in January to discuss revisions to systemwide policy and other actions underway to shore up UC cybersecurity. He also addressed faculty concerns about privacy and academic freedom in relation to a new systemwide cybersecurity threat detection program implemented in the wake of a UCLA security breach that is monitoring UC internet traffic for suspicious and potentially malicious activity. The CIO returned to Council in March with the Chief Privacy Officer of the cyber-security firm FireEye to discuss additional and optional, threat detection capabilities being offered to campuses. In April, Senate division chairs summarized campus discussions about the potential adoption of FireEye. The CIO worked closely with the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications to channel faculty views to the Cyber Risk Governance Committee (CRGC). In May, Council endorsed a UCACC plan for the addition of Senate faculty representatives to the CRGC and its technical Advisory Board.

GOVERNANCE

Governance of UC Health

In September, Council reviewed a UCFW statement expressing concerns about a proposal to streamline the governing structure of the UC Health Enterprise through a new Regents' Health Services Committee. The Council chair invited comments from Senate divisions and committees, and sent a [memo](#) to President Napolitano summarizing their concerns about the purview of the new committee, the removal of the faculty advisory role, and the addition of non-Regent voting members. In November, the Regents addressed the concerns in a revised proposal that added a Senate representative to the Committee. Council agreed to a process for nominating a Senate representative, and ultimately selected UCSD Professor Emeritus Joel Dimsdale as its nominee to serve through June 30, 2017.

Regents Bylaws Review

Council met with the Regents Analyst to discuss proposed changes to the Regents' governing structure and documents, including a proposal to move Regents Standing Order provisions related to the organization and powers of the Senate to a new set of Regents Bylaws. Council members supported efforts to increase the clarity and brevity of the Senate-related provisions, and cautioned against changing language that could impact the substance or understanding of the Senate's authority.

Professional Activities of SMG Members

Following a discussion of events related to the Davis chancellor, Council passed a [resolution](#) asking President Napolitano to conduct an expedited review of policies and procedures governing compensated outside professional activities undertaken by Senior Management Group employees and, in consultation with the Senate, to implement any needed changes in those policies. Council later discussed proposed changes to policy limiting SMG outside professional activities.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

Presidential Briefings: President Napolitano joined Council meetings to exchange views with faculty about a range of topics, including the University budget, political climate, enrollment funding, transfer admission, diversity, health care and benefits, alternative revenue sources for the University, the progress of her initiatives, capital planning, the investigation into the Davis chancellor, proposed legislation affecting the University, and shared governance.

Vendor Changes for UC Medical Plans: UCFW Health Care Task Force Chair Robert May briefed Council on upcoming changes to the third-party administrator for UC's self-funded health plans—UC Care and the UC Health Savings Plan, slated to take effect in 2017.

Electronic Communications Policy: Managing Counsel Michael Troncoso provided an overview of UC policy on non-consensual access to UC employees' electronic communications permitted during an internal investigation, in the context of UC's internal audit function, the Electronic Communications Policy (ECP), and state and federal law.

OTHER ISSUES

Resolution on Non-Consensual Searches of Electronic Communications: Council discussed UC's policies for non-consensual access to employees' electronic communications permitted during an internal investigation. Council passed a [resolution](#) stating that a search of the electronic records of the Academic Senate, a Divisional Senate, or of any Senate committee without consent is an extreme and excessively intrusive measure, warranted only in the most extraordinary circumstances, and to be avoided whenever possible and should only be done following consultation with division or Systemwide Senate leadership, as appropriate.

Guiding Principle for Search Waivers: In April, Council sent a [letter](#) to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing comments from systemwide Senate reviewers about a set of [proposed Guiding Principles](#) for the use of search waivers in academic hiring at UC.

Dissolution of ACSCANR: Council voted to dissolve the Academic Council Special Committee on Natural Resources (ACSCANR), and approve a charge for a UCPB Task Force to take the lead for the Senate on issues concerning the ANR/AES budget

Revisions to Senate Regulations 417 and 621: Council approved BOARS' [recommended modifications](#) to Senate Regulation 621, clarifying the standardized examination credit students may present to the University, and its [recommended modifications](#) to Senate Regulation 417, addressing UC applicants who complete coursework at a college while enrolled in high school.

Oliver Johnson Award: Council voted to name Professor Robert Anderson of UC Berkeley and Professor Katja Lindenberg of UC San Diego recipients of the 2016 Oliver Johnson Award for distinguished Senate service.

UCRS Advisory Board: Council voted to appoint Professor David Brownstone of UC Irvine to fill a vacancy on the UC Retirement System Advisory Board left by Senate Vice Chair James Chalfant, effective July 1, 2016, and ending June 30, 2018.

Open Access Progress Report: Council reviewed a letter from the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication, transmitting the California Digital Library's October 2015 [progress report](#) on the implementation of the Senate's Open Access policy.

Elective Disability Insurance Program: Council sent the Vice President for Human Resources a [letter](#) supporting UCFW's concerns about a proposal from Human Resources to change the Elective Disability Insurance Program policy from an "own occupation" standard to an "any occupation" standard.

Pension Tier Communications and Elections Guidelines: Council sent the Vice President for Human Resources a [letter](#) supporting UCFW's concerns about the election guidelines for faculty employees hired under the 2016 Pension Tier and specific features of the communication plan for the new tier.

Sustainable Investing Policy: Council discussed resolutions passed by the Santa Cruz and San Diego divisions in support of divestment from fossil fuels, and advice from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction about the Senate Memorial process. Council asked UCSD and UCSC to work together to consolidate the language in the resolutions for further discussion in the fall.

REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)

Council reviewed several proposed modifications to the Academic Personnel Manual. In May, it [endorsed](#) proposed [revisions](#) to APM 360, outlining the criteria for appointment and promotion in the Librarian series, and to APM 210-4, providing instructions to review committees that advise on appointment and promotion. In May and June, Council discussed [proposed revisions](#) to APM policies defining the duties and responsibilities of the non-Senate Clinical Professor (APM 278) and community-based Volunteer Clinical Professor (APM 279) titles, the appointment and advancement criteria for Clinical Professors (APM 210-6); and a new policy covering non-faculty clinical associates (APM 350). Council [endorsed](#) the new APM 350, but requested additional refinements to the other APM sections.

TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Council members participated on the following task forces and special committees:

- Retirement Options Task Force
- Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate
- Academic Planning Council

- Chancellor Stewardship Review Committees
- Vice President Search Committees
- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Steering Committee

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

The Board of Regents: The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. The Chair also participated on the Regents work group to draft a Statement on Intolerance.

ICAS: 2015-16 was UC's turn to organize and chair the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS), which represents the faculty Senates of the three higher education segments. The Senate Chair and Vice Chair and the chairs of BOARS, UCOPE, and UCEP attended ICAS meetings in Oakland and Sacramento.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our gratitude to all members of the UC Office of the President for their hard work and productive collaboration with the Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank the senior UC managers who, as consultants to the Academic Council, were vital to our meetings: President Janet Napolitano; Provost and Executive Vice President Aimée Dorr; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Nathan Brostrom; Associate President and Chief Policy Advisor Nina Robinson; Chief Operating Officer Rachael Nava; Chief Information Officer Tom Andriola; Chief Information Security Officer David Rusting; Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson; Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca; Associate Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources Debbie Obley; Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions Stephen Handel; Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions Monica Lin; and Executive Director for HR Retirement Programs & Services Gary Schlimgen. We also wish to thank former Senate Director Martha Winnacker who provided invaluable support to the Joint Committee of the Administration and Senate.

J. Daniel Hare, Chair
James Chalfant, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Robert Powell, Berkeley
Benjamin Hermalin, Berkeley
Andre Knoesen, Davis
Alan Terricciano, Irvine
Leobardo Estrada, Los Angeles
Cristian Ricci, Merced
Jose Wudka, Riverside
Robert Continetti, San Diego
Ruth Greenblatt, San Francisco
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Santa Barbara
Donald Brenneis, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:

Ralph Aldredge, BOARS
Valerie Leppert, CCGA
Colleen Clancy, UCAADE
Michael Stenstrom, UCAP
Tracee Larrabee, UCEP
Calvin Moore, UCFW
Judith Habicht Mauche, UCORP
Shane White, UCPB

Council Staff:

Hilary Baxter, Executive Director
Jocelyn Banaria, Assistant Director
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst

ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LAB ISSUES ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL:

The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) was established by the Academic Council to provide broad-based Senate oversight of UC's relationship with the National Laboratories – Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL), and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). ACSCOLI advises the President and Regents on general policies relating to the National Laboratories, which includes the dispersal of UC's share of net fee monies, policies that affect the lab science management, and the quality of science being performed at the labs. ACSCOLI is also concerned with evaluating the benefits of UC's continued participation in the management of the labs, and has been charged by the Academic Council with stimulating closer connections between the labs, faculty, and students.

ACSCOLI held three in-person meetings and one teleconference in 2015-16.

National Labs Overview

DOE Annual Performance Evaluations for the National Laboratories

Each year, the US Department of Energy conducts an evaluation of the scientific, technological, managerial, and operational performance of the contractors who manage and operate its national laboratories. These evaluations provide the basis for determining annual performance fees and the possibility of winning additional years on the contract through an "Award Term" extension.

Lawrence Berkeley National Lab (LBNL) was well-reviewed and Director Paul Alivisatos was commended for a superb job. The lab was seen to be high quality and effective in its work. There was a new site manager last year, and the DOE is pleased with the operations. The result is that 94% of the available fee will be provided, and the lab is eligible for Award Term extension to the contract.

Lawrence Livermore National Lab (LLNL) was also well-reviewed. Leadership and work in key mission areas received excellent grades. 93% of the fee will be provided, as well as an extension of the Award Term to 2019.

Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) had another difficult year with additional safety issues. The full annual performance fee was again not earned. ACSCOLI learned in May that the current contract for the management and operation of the Los Alamos National Laboratory will end in Sept. 2018. After that date it is likely that the LANL management contract will be opened up for bid.

Los Alamos National Laboratory Contract

Looking ahead to a time when UC might need to reconsider its involvement in Los Alamos National Lab, committee members discussed methods for informing the faculty about the LANL contract and a potential bid process. Ideas for communicating with faculty included using the

Senate Source newsletter, sending ACSCOLI updates to Academic Council, inviting the Vice President of UC's Office of the National Laboratories to Academic Council meeting, and providing news and information at the divisional level. Many faculty members will be interested in the lab's involvement in building and maintaining nuclear weapons, and it will be important to provide accurate and factual information.

The Regents are involved in the management of the labs at high levels. ACSCOLI will invite Regent Norm Pattiz, who chairs the Board of Governors of the Los Alamos National Security LLC (the partnership that manages LANL) to a meeting in 2016-17.

Change in Administration

Michael Witherell replaced Paul Alivisatos as Director of Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. Director Witherell, who was previously the Vice Chancellor of Research at UCSB, attended the May ACSCOLI meeting to introduce himself to committee members and update the committee on the work of the Berkeley Lab.

UC Lab Fees Research Program

Funding for the UC Lab Fees Research Program (LFRP) comes from the net fee income that UC receives for managing the Livermore and Los Alamos National Labs. The 2017 LFRP call for proposals was sent out in the spring, with letters of intent due June 2, 2016. The program has a carry-forward from prior years, which, along with an adjusted amount for this year, brings the total award funds to \$13.5 million. This year there are two award categories: "Targeted UC Multicampus-National Lab Collaborative Research and Training Awards" and "In-Residence UC-National Lab Graduate Fellowships."

The collaborative awards were offered in 2008 and 2012. The 2017 "targeted" opportunity is a result of a proposal from last year to integrate the LFRP goals of maximizing UC campus faculty collaboration and linking key lab strategic initiatives to campus interests. Targeted grant proposals must focus on collaborative research and training activities in one of three key areas identified for high-impact research:

1. Biological applications of advanced computing
2. High energy density science
3. Mesoscale materials science

Grantees must include a minimum of four campuses and either LLNL or LANL. Although committee members expressed concern about the four campus requirement, systemwide workshops held on the targeted subject area last year drew participants from all campuses.

The in-residence fellowship grants will be given to graduate students who have advanced to candidacy who will be on-site at either LLNL or LANL doing their own dissertation research at 80% time. The grants are for two years, with a possible third year extension option, and while not tied to any particular subject area, each proposal needs to have identified a scientist at the lab to serve as mentor and supervisor and be approved by the student's UC faculty advisor. The goal of the grant is to provide experience, training, and mentoring. It is expected that the graduate fellowships will take about \$800,000 of the \$13.5 million total.

UC Office of the National Laboratories Vice President Kimberly Budil, who briefed ACSCOLI regularly on the UC-DOE relationship, noted that she has widely promoted to DOE the fact that UC re-invests their lab fees in academic endeavors. The Office of the National Labs would like to see more larger-scale collaborations, and welcomes suggestions for broader outreach.

Joint Appointments

Establishing joint appointments between UC campuses and the National Laboratories has been a long-standing area of interest for ACSCOLI. Committee members again discussed the interpretation of “adjunct professor” as defined in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). Concerns about adjuncts and joint appointments have included costs and whether or not the positions sufficiently benefit the local campus community. LANL and LLNL employees are not UC employees, so arrangements are more complex than at LBNL. ACSCOLI members noted that a communications strategy to describe the case for adjunct professors would be simpler than changing policy or the APM. It was agreed that a straightforward path to pursue an adjunct appointment would be helpful.

Strengthening the Relationships between UC Campuses and the National Laboratories

The labs and campuses continue to work together to develop larger-scale strategic collaborations, with a goal of developing research engagements between the labs and all of the UC campuses. The Lab Fee Research Program’s Multicampus-National Lab Collaborative Research and Training Awards is one example.

In December, ACSCOLI learned about four joint campus-lab project areas that have received discretionary and external funding:

1. Clean energy and water (“CERC-WET” – LBNL, Berkeley, Davis, Irvine and Merced)
2. Predictive medicine (Biological Applications of Advanced Scientific Computing or “BAASiC” – led by LLNL and UCSF)
3. Mesoscale Materials Science (led by LANL and Irvine)
4. High Energy Density Science (led by LLNL and San Diego)

In addition, Discovery Science projects at the NIF (National Ignition Facility) have increased, with eight completed and nine new projects starting.

In May, the Executive Director of the National Laboratory Program, June Yu, demonstrated a new data visualization tool that illustrates the extent and nature of current UC-lab collaborations using Web of Science peer-reviewed publication data. ACSCOLI members were impressed with Director Yu’s interactive graphical presentations of lab-campus connections, although noted that Web of Science does not cover all subject areas (most notably absent is computer science).

Other Updates from the Office of National Laboratories

The federal government has four major initiatives related to “applications of high performance computing to biology” in the areas of microbiomes, cancer moonshot, precision medicine, and a brain initiative. Work that is already going on within UC can be applied to these efforts. President Napolitano and others have reached out to relevant departments in Washington, DC, about energy innovation, biosciences, and about potential regional collaborations within California that would include the private sector.

Representation

As Chair of ACSCOLI, Jim Chalfant served as a member of the LBNL Advisory Board and the LBNL Contract Assurance Council.

Acknowledgements

ACSCOLI wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its principal consultants: Kimberly Budil Vice President of the Office of the National Laboratories; Mary Croughan, Executive Director of the Research Grants Programs Office; and Kathleen Erwin, Director of the UC Research Initiatives. UC Davis Professor Robert Powell was appointed by the Regents as Executive Committee Governor to the Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC (LLNS) and Los Alamos National Security LLC, (LANS) Boards of Governors and is a recurring guest of the committee. Powell also chairs the LLCs' Science and Technology Committee.

Respectfully submitted, 2015-16ACSCOLI:

Jim Chalfant, Chair (Academic Council Vice Chair)

J. Daniel Hare, Vice Chair (Academic Council Chair)

Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Past Chair, 2014-15

Bernard Sadoulet, UCPB Vice Chair

Judith Habicht Mauche, UCORP Chair

Steven Glaser, UCB

Darrell D.E. Long, UCSC

Harold Monbouquette, UCLA

Thomas H. Morton, UCR

Ivan Schuller, UCSD

Ram Seshadri, UCSB

Joanne Miller, Academic Senate Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) is charged in Senate Bylaw 155 to represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology and advise the President concerning the acquisition, usage and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues. UCACC held three in-person meetings during the 2015-2016 academic year. Highlights of the committee's actions are outlined below.

Cybersecurity

The biggest issue facing UCACC in the 2015-16 academic year was cybersecurity. In February, UC's Vice President and Chief Information Officer, Tom Andriola, and Chief Information Security Officer, David Rusting, joined the UCACC meeting to inform members about UC's response to the June 2015 security breach at UCLA. The response, which began immediately after the breach, included the hiring of a third-party vendor with expertise in dealing with large-scale attacks to assist with consistent and coordinated detection to prevent further attacks. It also included the formation of a systemwide Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC) with representation from the administration of each division and one Senate member (the UCACC chair). Led by VP Andriola, the CRGC is responsible for monitoring the University's risk profile, overseeing its security strategies, and coordinating cybersecurity efforts across the system. UCACC Chair David Kay and/or Vice Chair Christine Borgman attended the quarterly CRGC meetings in 2015-2016.

In May, in response to a need for more faculty involvement at the highest systemwide level, UCACC sent a plan to Academic Council for additional Senate faculty representation on both the CRGC and its technical Advisory Board. The UCACC plan suggested that three Academic Senate representatives be appointed to CRGC: the chair and vice chair of UCACC (or their designees) and a representative from UCAF or UCFW. The Academic Senate, via the UCOC, will make the appointments in consultation with the chairs of the committees. Three representatives from the Academic Senate will also be appointed to the CRGC Advisory Board, which advises CRGC on technical issues. The plan was endorsed by VP Andriola and subsequently approved by Council on May 25, 2016.

UCACC and the faculty more broadly were primarily concerned that UC's response to the cybersecurity attack was implemented with neither advance consultation nor timely subsequent notice to the Senate of the actions taken. The nature and extent of the monitoring itself were also serious concerns. After receiving detailed explanations from UC's IT leadership about the monitoring activity, UCACC concluded that the actions taken at the time were reasonable under the circumstances, but the lack of consultation with the Senate was a serious failure of shared governance. During the February 1st meeting, the committee drafted a statement of its findings to send to Academic Senate leadership. The statement was included on the UCOP Information Security website at <http://security.ucop.edu/>. Going forward, the committee feels that it is imperative for UC's leadership, both IT and in general, to institute protocols that inform faculty in a timely way of any significant security breaches and the actions taken in response.

Privacy and Information Security

During the 2015-16 academic year, UCACC began work to promote the full implementation of the 2013 Privacy and Information Security Report, a result of the Privacy and Information Security Initiative (PISI) convened by former UC President Mark Yudof (<http://ucop.edu/privacy-initiative/>). The PISI process was long, thorough, and deliberative, involving senior members of university administration and of the Academic Senate. PISI membership overlaps with current membership of UCACC and the Cyber Risk Governance Committee. UCACC proposes to build upon the University's investment in that report. All recommendations of the PISI report, save one, were approved by the UC Office of the President under President Yudof, and reaffirmed under the leadership of President Napolitano. UC's Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Sheryl Vacca led the implementation of the report, which includes the creation of Chief Privacy Officers (CPOs) and Privacy and Data Protection Boards at the campuses where these positions and boards did not yet exist. The one recommendation that was not initially approved by President Yudof was to form a UC-wide board. However, that recommendation has been implemented, de facto, by convening the ten CPOs under SVP Vacca's office, and by the activities of UCACC. Some other formal steps are required to implement the PISI recommendations by the UC Board of Regents, which UCACC is now pursuing. Rather than revisiting the thorough work of the PISI process, UCACC recommends fuller implementation and fuller engagement of the Academic Senate in current campus boards responsible for privacy matters.

In February, UCACC reviewed an early draft revision of the Electronic Information Security Policy ([Business and Finance Bulletin IS-3](#)). The purpose of the policy is to establish guidelines for the appropriate protection of the university's electronic information resources. The draft was deemed not yet ready for UCACC to review; members suggested that be revised by a technical writer before input was sought from legal, risk, ethics and compliance, human resources, and academic domains. Along with a revised draft, the committee requested a one-page explanation of the policy, with a summary and rationale. Committee members cautioned against issuing yet another set of requirements for faculty without resources for compliance or implementation.

UC Online Education and Cross-Campus Enrollment System

At its first meeting in November, the committee received an update on the [Innovative Learning Technology Initiative \(ILTI\)](#). ILTI was designed to help students access high-demand courses and support learning across the system. Currently, at the end of its third year, ILTI has 85 students enrolled cross-campus in undergraduate courses. Student experience data is being collected from students, faculty, and teaching assistants. Faculty have expressed appreciation for feedback about how students learn, but engagement can be a challenge. Campus policies and other factors keep enrollment low.

The Cross Campus Enrollment Website was rolled out on November 4th to provide information to students who want to find out about and enroll in a course at another UC campus. UCACC would like to explore ways to increase significantly the number of students who take advantage of cross-campus enrollment. UCACC can help by advising on learning management systems and encouraging standardization, fostering best practices, emphasizing the educational component, and urging involvement by campus academic senates that might be interested in issues such as time to graduation rate and security. UCACC members asked about data or metrics for assessing online education, whether there are standard variables, and who evaluates the success or failure. The committee will continue to engage the administration on these questions.

Educational Technology Leadership Group and Learning Analytics

In April, UCACC reviewed and discussed a “Learning Data Privacy and Principles” document from the Educational Technology Leadership Group (ETLG). The draft principles, which are based on those in the Privacy and Information Security Initiative, address concerns about learning tools and platforms, particularly from third-party vendors. UCACC members appreciated the intention behind the principles and also expressed interest in advising on learning management systems. After obtaining feedback from UCACC and circulating to other groups for review, ETLG will finalize the document and seek endorsement from UCACC.

During the discussion with the ETLG chair and vice chair, it became clear that UCACC would benefit from stronger relationship with ETLG. It was decided that an ETLG representative will be added as an ex-officio member/consultant of UCACC.

Open Educational Resources

At its April meeting, UCACC member Chikako Takeshita (UCR), who is one of three UC faculty participants on the California Open Educational Resources Council, gave an update on the issue of textbook affordability, which had been discussed in previous years by UCACC’s precursor committee. The OER Council was formed after the passage of two textbook affordability bills, in 2012, and tasked with facilitating the review of textbooks for inclusion in the new California Open Source Digital Library. The California State Legislature directed the public higher education systems in the state to create an online library with open educational resources and textbooks in order to increase faculty adoption of high quality, affordable or free materials to save students money. Takeshita presented slides on the work and accomplishments of the California Open Educational Resources Council in identifying courses, evaluating e-textbooks, and promoting the adoption of free and open textbooks in California higher education. The California State University uses an open access repository called MERLOT for course resources, and has developed the “[cool4ed](#)” website as the public face of the California Open Online Library for Education for all higher education sectors. Faculty can use the website to find free and open textbooks. Many of these are developed by [OpenStax](#) and include texts for foundational courses. Since the signing of the [College Textbook Affordability Act](#) (AB 798), the California OER Council has shifted its focus to support CCC and CSU proposals for funding.

California Digital Library Data Sharing and Management Services

UCACC members were briefed about the data management services offered by the UC Curation Center (UC3) at the California Digital Library. CDL’s intention is to complement local solutions in supporting research data management at UC and help UC maintain control over its research outputs. Tools include the [DMPTool](#) and the [Dash](#) user interface for depositing data into the Merritt repository. UCACC’s concerns were primarily about the total cost of data storage and the inability of UC3 to offer a one-time, up-front fixed price for a specified term primarily due to UC bureaucracy. The committee offered to try to influence the university to consider a fixed price or to provide a minimal amount of coverage for each faculty member.

UCPath Roll-Out Update

UC Deputy Chief Information Officer and UCPath Program Director Mark Cianca attended the February meeting to talk about the rationale behind the UCPath project and its progress. The long-term goal is to standardize the full suite of human resources functions (“from hire to retire”) and to reduce risk and enhance compliance. UCACC learned that cost savings are not being

realized, but the system should help accommodate the overhead growth as campuses increase their populations. There was a successful roll-out late last year for UCOP employees. The first campuses to move to UCPATH will be UCLA, Riverside, and Merced. Each campus has a UCPATH sponsor, generally the Vice Chancellor for Administration or CFO.

Senate Regulation 542

Chair Kay introduced a problem on some campuses created by [Senate Regulation 542](#), which is interpreted by registrars as prohibiting access by waitlisted students to course email messages and other electronic resources. This puts students at a disadvantage when they are finally enrolled in the course. A change to the SR542 was approved by the committee on February 1, 2016, but Academic Council requested additional justification before starting the intensive review process that a change in regulation involves. Meanwhile, UCACC issued its own statement to express its formal opinion that Senate Regulation 542 does not preclude providing, at the instructor's discretion, access to electronic resources for students with an intent to complete the course.

Additional Business

UCACC devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports on issues on individual campuses.

Reports and Recommendations

- UCLA cyberattack response (February 2016)
(See: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucacc/reports.html>)
- Recommendation to the Academic Council for the addition of Senate faculty to the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC) and its technical Advisory Board (May 2016)
(http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/documents/DH_TA_CRGC.pdf)
- Statement on the interpretation of Senate Regulation 542 (June 2016)
(See: <http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucacc/reports.html>)

Looking Ahead

Two key areas were identified by the chair and vice chair for focus in 2015-16 that will continue to occupy the committee's attention in 2016-17:

1. *Involving stakeholders in the design of systems that are widely used by faculty and that affect faculty and students.*
2. *Data management and governance.*

Representation

The UCACC Chair, David Kay, served as a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council and as an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications. Chair Kay and Vice Chair Christine Borgman also served as Senate representatives on the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC).

Acknowledgements

UCACC is grateful for the contributions made by the consultants and guests who attended meetings in 2015-16:

- Tom Andriola, CIO (Consultant to UCACC)
- Mary-Ellen Kreher, Director of Course Design and Development, ILTI (Consultant to UCACC)

- Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator
- Roslyn Martorano, Systemwide Privacy Manager
- Stephen Abrams, Manager – Digital Preservation Technology, CDL
- Mark Cianca, Deputy Chief Information Officer
- Rachel Nosowsky, Deputy General Counsel, UC Office of General Counsel
- Israel Fletes, ETLG Chair, Director of Educational Technology and Computing, UC Riverside
- Jenn Stringer, ETLG Vice Chair, Associate CIO, Academic Engagement, Educational Technology Services, UC Berkeley

Respectfully submitted, UCACC 2015-16:

David G. Kay, Chair (I)
 Christine Borgman, Vice Chair (LA)
 Kenneth Goldberg (B)
 Matt Bishop (D)
 Alfred Kobsa (I)
 Timothy Tangherlini (LA)
 Florin Rusu (M)
 Chikako Takeshita (R)
 Maryann Martone (SD)
 Miguel Pampaloni (SF)
 Keith Clarke (SB)
 Jose Renau (SC)
 Michael Sanfilippo (Graduate Student Representative, Merced)
 J. Daniel Hare, Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
 James Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (*Ex Officio*)
 Valerie Leppert, CCGA Chair (*Ex Officio*)
 Tracy Larrabee, UCEP Chair (*Ex Officio*)
 Eric Bakovic, UCOLASC Chair (*Ex Officio*)
 Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)

2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) met three times in Academic Year 2015-2016 (twice by teleconference) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 130. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Regents Statement on Principles Intolerance

In October, the committee conducted a teleconference in Executive Session to discuss the Regents' [draft Statement on Intolerance](#) which had been proposed and rejected by the Board in September. Subsequently, a Regents' Work Group was formed to develop a new Statement on Intolerance, to which Academic Senate Chair Hare was appointed. The Work Group's process included a day of public comment at which a statement prepared by UCAF was read. The [Final Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles against Intolerance](#) was released just days before UCAF's scheduled meeting on March 17th and the Board's March 23rd meeting.

Although another opportunity was not provided for public comment and the Senate was not asked to formally review the revised statement, Chair Hare submitted a [memo to Work Group members](#) on March 21st outlining faculty concerns about the Final Report of the Regents Working Group on Principles against Intolerance. The memo included concerns raised by the Academic Council and Divisional Senate leaders as well as a report from UCAF to Chair Hare that offered specific suggestions for the Regents' last-minute consideration. On March 23rd, the Regents accepted the amended language suggested by the University Committee on Academic Freedom. At the March 30th [Academic Council meeting](#), President Napolitano acknowledged the significant Senate contribution to the process and outcome.

UC Network Monitoring Initiative

UCAF received briefings from the Senate leadership about the UC Network Monitoring Initiative this year. As a result of an internet security breach at UCLA, UC campuses began to monitor web traffic to determine the use of problematic websites and to watch for transfers of large data files. UCOP has a policy that permits it to direct staff at the campuses to put network monitoring in place without notifying faculty. The committee was concerned that network monitoring may have a chilling effect on the sites that faculty opt to visit. While UCAF members agree that there is an academic freedom issue, it is secondary to privacy concerns.

UCOP is open to more Senate involvement, but whether monitoring will be done at all is not open to debate. UCAF was informed that the University's Electronic Communications Policy will be updated in the near future and the Senate will have the opportunity to review the revised policy. OGC has provided feedback that will, with some revised language, make the monitoring more consistent with UC's policy on privacy. A new structure for involving the Academic Senate is being established and it will include the Committee on Academic Computing and Communications, and UCAF will continue to monitor the issue.

Other Issues and Additional Business

Openness in Research is an ongoing information item that UCOP's Office of Graduate Studies and Research has discussed with UCAF over the past several years. It is expected that the policy will be sent to the Senate for review in the future. Additionally, UCAF devoted part of each regular meeting to reports on issues facing local committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Montgomery, Chair (R)
Jody Kreiman (LA)
Eric Widera (SF)
David Wagner (B)
Thorne Lay (SC)
Jeffrey Haydu (SD)

Hugh Roberts, Vice Chair (I)
Christopher Elmendorf (D)
Hugh Roberts (I)
Rudy Ortiz (M)
Ward Beyermann (R)
Erika Rappaport (SB)

Dan Hare ((R); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Jim Chalfant ((D); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Principal Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had three meetings during the Academic Year 2015-2016 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135, which are to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Salaries for Lecturers with Security of Employment Work Group

At the beginning of the year, Vice Provost of Academic Personnel Susan Carlson convened a Work Group to review policy for the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series, given current and increasing campus use of the titles. Chair Stenstrom was one of the Senate members who volunteered to serve on the Work Group which also included academic administrators. The LSOE Work Group looked at the entire series in this title including lecturers with potential security of employment and senior lecturers. The general questions include what voting rights and privileges the LSOEs should have and whether UC should hire them or not.

Currently campuses have very different approaches to the LSOE title and there is a fairly small group of individuals in the LSOE series. UCLA has fewer than ten and UCI has over a hundred, and there is also variation by discipline. There is concern that there might be two cultures at UC if the trend toward increasing this pool of LSOE faculty continues. Given the pressures to educate students, some may be thinking that it is more efficient for LSOEs to teach. During discussions about the LSOE series, UCAP members expressed concern about the decreasing number of tenure track positions available for graduate students. Another concern is related to the differential effect on Humanities as opposed to the Sciences. The increase in LSOEs is having unanticipated effects that are threatening the regular promotion of tenure-track faculty.

UCAP will have the opportunity to participate in the management review the Work Group drafts of APM 285, the LSOE series and APM 210.3 the instructions to review committees that advise on this series. The formal consultation will likely begin in the fall.

Faculty Exit Survey

UCOP partnered with the Harvard-based Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) to develop and pilot a Faculty Exit Survey at several UC campuses for separating faculty. In addition to the Vice Provost's office, an advisory group comprised of faculty from different UC campuses helped provide information about UC's culture. A literature review and study of practices at other research institutions were also conducted.

Currently the six campuses participating in the pilot are UCLA, UCSD, UCB, UCI, UCR, and UCSB with the administration of the survey starting in February. The survey was for the academic year 2014-2015 and all ladder rank faculty who left the University were surveyed as were faculty identified by the campuses as retention cases which serves as a comparison group. The return rate was over 65% and the research team at Harvard is in the process of analyzing the results. A June 28th roundtable seminar at UCI will include a discussion about the partial results and about the general idea of conducting the surveys and

how they can help with faculty retention and recruitment. Academic Personnel will join UCAP's fall meeting to review the results of the survey.

Negotiated Salary Trial Plan

UCAP discussed the second year of the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP). A summary of the year two report on the Negotiated Salary Plan was provided by Academic Personnel to the campuses and to the Senate Leadership and UCAP will have an opportunity to comment next year. Faculty are allowed to supplement their salary in certain circumstances and under the supervision of faculty groups at the campus. Academic Personnel is preparing to administer a survey to faculty in participating units to solicit their feedback on the program. A more comprehensive review of the first three years of the program will be conducted and good Senate representation for a task force is desired. A task force will be needed to recommend to the provost whether the NSTP should be continued, extended to other campuses, continued on a temporary basis, or ended.

2015-2016 Campus Discretionary Salary Program

UCAP reviewed the outcome of the 2015-2016 Discretionary Salary Program. Each campus designed something different from what the president set out for the program. It worked fairly well for non-Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP) ladder rank faculty and discretionary funds were primarily used to address equity issues. The plan was less robust for HSCP faculty because the elements did not fit well for how salary and reviews occur for these personnel. The committee learned that the president sent a memo to the Chancellors in April regarding the 2016-2017 salary program. The two key parts are an adjustment to the scales and a discretionary program and there is a broader conception of how campuses may want to implement the program.

Other Issues and Additional Business

University Professor: The committee handled two University Professor nominations this year. In October, in accordance with APM 260, UCAP nominated an ad hoc faculty review committee to review an appointment to the University Professor title proposed by UCLA. In January, UCAP members reviewed the ad hoc committee's recommendation and all case materials and Chair Stenstrom notified Vice Provost Carlson by email that UCAP unanimously supports this recommendation for the University Professor appointment.

In July 2016, UCAP received another request to approve an ad hoc review committee for a University Professor title nomination from UCR, and in accordance with APM 260, UCAP nominated an ad hoc faculty review committee to review an appointment to the University Professor title proposed by a campus. UCAP members reviewed the ad hoc committee's recommendation and all case materials and Chair Stenstrom notified Vice Provost Carlson by email that UCAP unanimously supports the recommendation for the University Professor appointment at UCR.

Next year, UCAP will participate in the review of the Health Sciences Clinical Professors series. In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed Guidelines for the Use of Waivers in Academic Hiring at UC
- Proposed Revisions to APM 360 and APM 210-4
- Proposed Revisions to APM 278, 210-6, 279, 112 and New APM –350
- Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate on Faculty Discipline

Campus Reports

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to discussion of issues facing local committees and

comparison of individual campus practices

UCAP Representation

UCAP Chair Michael Stenstrom represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate. He also served on the Provost's Academic Planning Council and the Lecturers with Security of Employment Working Group.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel and Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel. UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate Chair Dan Hare and Vice Chair Jim Chalfant about issues facing the Senate and UC.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Stenstrom, Chair (LA)

Barbara Spackman (B)

Stuart Brown (LA)

Carolyn Dean (SC)

Virginia Richards (I)

David Lloyd (R)

Christina Ravelo, Vice Chair (SC)

Seana Coulson (SD)

Andrew Ishida (D)

Peter Sturman (SB)

Fanis Tsoulouhas (M)

Jacqueline Leung (SF)

Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (R))

Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

**University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity
(UCAADE)
Annual Report 2015-16**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In November, 2015, the Academic Council approved a proposal from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to add the word “Equity” to the name of the committee. The change reflects the broader scope of issues that UCAADE has addressed in the past several years.

The University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) met three times in person and once via teleconference during the 2015-16 academic year. In accordance with its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 140, UCAADE consulted on policies bearing on affirmative action, diversity, and equity for academic personnel, students, and academic programs. Highlights of the committee’s discussions and actions are described below.

President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

In October, the new director of the President’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, Dr. Mark Lawson, joined the committee to discuss the PPF and the Campus Chancellor’s Fellowship Programs. Dr. Lawson listened to the concerns of the committee and will continue to consult and work with UCAADE.

At the fall and winter meetings, Vice Provost Susan Carlson updated the committee on a presidential initiative associated with the PPF that offered support for start-up costs, hiring incentives, and an interactive training program for deans and department chairs. The training included an innovative interactive theater portion that provided deeper engagement on issues of diversity and equity for those who attended. VP Carlson’s office is following up with participants, but the immediate feedback was very positive. The theater presentation was videotaped, and there is a small group working on how to continue the training via video. The impression is that, while video is good, a live person is needed to facilitate discussion. Some of the most successful aspects of these sessions were the discussions after the presentation.

Relatedly, UCAADE prepared a memorandum with recommendations for standardizing the appointment process for faculty hires via the UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellows and Campus Chancellor’s Fellows Programs. The memo was sent to the Academic Council in January. The recommendations were unanimously approved by Council and forwarded to Provost Aimée Dorr for distribution to campuses. On July 12, 2016, Provost Dorr sent the report to campuses along with an accompanying memo conveying her own support and encouragement for reviewing the effectiveness of current hiring practices and adopting new practices to increase the hiring of underrepresented minority faculty members at UC per UCAADEs recommendations.

Search Waivers

The committee discussed search waivers in the context of the PPF and in general as a tool for diversifying the faculty. In the spring, UCAADE, along with other Senate committees, reviewed “Guiding Principles: Search Waivers for Academic Appointees at the University of

California.” The guidelines were prepared by the Academic Personnel Directors to bring consistency to the provision of search waivers on campuses; rules for exceptions to open searches are not always clear, and vary from campus to campus. The document called out PFPF as an appropriate use of the waivers.

UCAADE is concerned that the UC faculty is becoming less diverse. Despite the existence of campus administrative positions and programs that focus on diversity, it can still be very difficult to hire underrepresented minorities and women within the existing hiring structures. The traditional hiring processes are not generating the critical mass of underrepresented minorities in faculty positions needed to address campus climate issues and create a more inclusive environment. Search waivers are one tool that can be used. UCAADE members noted that local committees on diversity can work with their EVCs or other campus officials on promoting search waivers when appropriate.

Salary Equity Studies

UCAADE reviewed the final Faculty Salary Equity Studies Report from Academic Personnel and Programs that summarizes the campuses’ studies. UCAADE found variations in the findings from the campuses due to the different ways the studies were implemented. UCAADE is interested in whether information can be provided consistently for all the campuses going forward, as well as the plans for equity adjustment based on the findings. In the spring, the committee drafted a memo with suggestions for future faculty salary equity analyses. The memo will be circulated for further review and additional perspectives before it is finalized and sent to Academic Council in the fall.

Anti-discrimination policies

In the spring, a UCAADE subcommittee looked into UC’s anti-discrimination policies. The group started with the compilation of discrimination-related policies related to sexual harassment that was prepared in support of the Joint Committee of the Administration and the Senate on Faculty Discipline. Subcommittee members reviewed the policies and jointly came up with a few potential areas to pursue, including time limits for reporting grievances, differences in accountability/procedures for sexual harassment and discrimination violations, follow-up on the Moreno Report recommendations (January 2014), and attention to campus climate. The subcommittee will continue to consult with experts, with the goal of having a memo ready to share with the full UCAADE and local committees on diversity in fall 2016.

Other Topics

NSF Grant on STEM faculty recruitment: UCAADE received regular briefings from the Office of Academic Personnel and Programs, including an introduction to an NSF grant on recruiting STEM faculty called “Evaluating Equity in Faculty Recruitment” that is being led by researchers from Davis and Berkeley. It is intended as a “systematic analysis of the faculty hiring process at research-intensive universities” and will use data from UC Recruit, which is the best data set that exists on faculty recruitment.

Faculty Exit Survey: UCAADE also received regular updates on the Faculty Exit Survey pilot study that includes six UC campuses and a research partnership with Harvard’s Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE). COACHE Director and Principal Investigator Kiernan Mathews joined the UCAADE videoconference in June to describe the data and preliminary findings of the survey. A report due this summer will provide aggregate data on

why faculty leave the employment of the university or choose to stay. The goal is to understand causes and patterns of faculty mobility, including faculty who were retained.

Diversity and Engagement: In April, Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt attended the UCAADE meeting to talk about her role as the Chief Outreach Officer for UC who is responsible for providing education, training, and working on issues related to the K-12 and community college pipeline. VP Gullatt noted that some of President Napolitano’s initiatives focus on diversity issues, which helps to bring attention and funding to the area. The Vice Provost clarified that accountability and responsibility for diversity on the campuses resides with the chancellors, deans, and department chairs. Everyone has to work within existing structures that may impact faculty diversity. Programs like PFPF and UC-HBCU are seen to work well, but they are relatively small. UCAADE agreed that clarity about existing programs and more incentives are needed; deans and chairs need to know what they can do and what is expected. Departments that make an effort are generally successful at diversifying, but sometimes more pressure at the department level is needed.

At the January UCAADE meeting, members learned about the Office of General Counsel’s Proposition 209 Guidelines (“Guidelines For Addressing Race and Gender Equity In Academic Programs in Compliance with Proposition 209”) that was published in July, 2015. UCAADE recommended wide distribution of the guidelines, including sending them to every search committee chair and Faculty Equity Advisor, as well as a one-page summary for all search committee members. Vice Provost Gullatt’s office may be able to facilitate disseminating the guidelines to local offices for Equity and Inclusion.

Systemwide issues and campus reports

UCAADE devoted part of each meeting to reports on topics from individual campuses and discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership.

Reports and Recommendations

On January 6, 2016, UCAADE sent the letter and report, “Diversifying the faculty at the University of California: Standardization of the appointment process for faculty hires via the UC President’s Postdoctoral Fellows and Campus Chancellor’s Fellows Programs,” to Academic Council for transmittal to the Provost. Academic Council approved the report and sent it to Provost Dorr, who sent it to campuses on July 12, 2016.

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAADE also opined on the following:

- Proposed Revised Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (October 26, 2016)
- Retirement Options Task Force Report (February 2, 2016)
- Proposed Revisions to APM Sections 278, 210-6, 279, 112 and New APM – 350 (June 15, 2016)

Acknowledgements

UCAADE is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with the following UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Provost Aimée Dorr, Vice Provost Susan Carlson, Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt, Diversity, Labor, & Employee Relations Director Amy K. Lee, PFPF Director Mark Lawson, Graduate Studies Director Pamela Jennings, Chief Deputy

General Counsel Karen Petrulakis, Senior Counsel Elisabeth Yap, Director of UC Berkeley's Office for Faculty Equity and Welfare Karie Frasch, and Harvard's COACHE Director Kiernan Mathews. The committee also thanks the faculty members who served as alternates during the year.

Respectfully submitted,
UCAADE 2015-16:

Colleen Clancy, Chair (D)

Amani Nuru-Jeter, Vice Chair (B)

Lok Siu (B)

Sean Owens (D)

Belinda Robnett-Olsen (I)

Russell Thornton (LA)

Tanya Golash-Boza (M)

Manuela Martins-Green (R)

Daniel Widener (SD)

Audrey Lyndon (SF)

Beth Schneider (SB)

Miriam Greenberg (SC)

Violet Barton, Graduate Student Representative (M)

Chloe Pan, Undergraduate Student Representative (LA)

J. Daniel Hare, Chair, Academic Senate (Ex Officio)

James Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate (Ex Officio)

Joanne Miller, Academic Senate Committee Analyst

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2015–16 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 145](#), to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The major activities of BOARS and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE REGENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

BOARS’ [Annual Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review](#) discusses application, admission, and yield outcomes under comprehensive review for the years 2012–2015; the ongoing implementation of the new freshman admissions policy and the Regents’ Resolution on Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation; efforts by BOARS to enhance the transfer path and to ensure that admitted nonresidents compare favorably to California residents; diversity outcomes; and challenges associated with the future of the referral guarantee.

COMPUTER SCIENCE LETTER

In December, the Lieutenant Governor and other policy-makers and business leaders sent a letter to BOARS asking the committee to change admissions standards to recognize “academically rigorous” high school computer science (CS) courses for the core math (“c”) subject area requirement for freshman admission. BOARS sent a [letter](#) in response, noting that a CS course may qualify for area “c” if it includes sufficient math content, and that approved CS courses may also count toward the college-preparatory elective (“g”) requirement. BOARS also described barriers to the development of more computer science courses in high schools, including the lack of approved California K–12 content standards for computer science and too few instructors with the appropriate credentials to teach math-based computer science courses. BOARS also warned that implementing a specific computer science requirement could disadvantage students from less-resourced schools that do not offer CS courses. The Lieutenant Governor sent a follow-up letter to BOARS inviting further dialogue about the issues.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

BOARS helped lead the Senate’s response to a range of issues and concerns about community college transfer.

- ***UC Transfer Pathways***

BOARS supported a Senate-led effort to develop UC Transfer Pathways—lower division courses recommended to California Community College (CCC) students as preparation for transfer admission into a given major at all nine of UC’s undergraduate campuses. In October, the Senate chair and UC Provost convened three meetings of campus faculty delegates to identify Pathways for 11 additional majors, in addition to the 10 Pathways completed in spring 2015. The BOARS chair participated in some of the meetings. BOARS also received regular briefings from Senate

and UCOP leaders on the campus review of the Pathways and efforts to identify articulation gaps between specific CCCs and the nine undergraduate campuses for specific Pathway course expectations. The 21 Pathways are detailed on a [systemwide website](#).

- ***UC Transfer Pathways and Comprehensive Review***

In June, BOARS approved revisions to the [Comprehensive Review Guidelines](#) for the selection of advanced standing (transfer) applicants. The revisions incorporate into existing selection criteria language highlighting completion of a UC Transfer Pathway as one way for applicants to demonstrate transfer readiness.

- ***Course Identification Numbering System(C-ID)***

BOARS led the Senate’s response to a state request to consider the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) as a supplemental numbering system for lower division UC courses identified as comparable with CCC and CSU courses. At several meetings, BOARS discussed the use of C-ID at CSU and the CCC, the benefits of C-ID for CCC students navigating the transfer path and for colleges and universities wanting to streamline course articulation, and the possibility of endorsing the use of C-ID at UC. In February, BOARS endorsed a plan to maintain the existing systemwide articulation review process to determine the initial UC transferability of CCC courses, and to pilot the use of C-IDs at the second level of review for the course-to-course articulation of a select number of UC Transfer Pathways. The Academic Council supported BOARS’ consideration of this pilot approach to C-ID.

NONRESIDENT ADMISSION

- ***Compare Favorably Report***

In June, BOARS issued its annual [“Compare Favorably” report](#) on 2015 nonresident admissions. The report summarizes systemwide and campus outcomes for BOARS’ [policy](#) requiring campuses to admit nonresidents who compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus. It compares high school GPA, SAT score, and first-year UC GPA and persistence for residents, domestic nonresidents, and international nonresidents, and highlights statistically significant differences in group averages for each campus. The report notes that based on those limited measures, the University is meeting the standard on a systemwide basis, although outcomes vary on specific campuses. The report emphasizes that GPA and test scores are narrow, imperfect measures for the assessment, given campuses’ use of 14 comprehensive review factors, and suggests that future BOARS analyses might include an assessment of outcomes by admitting unit and a comparison of Holistic Review scores. Finally, the report states that a given campus enrollment target for residents and nonresidents should not influence the quality or outcome of the compare favorably assessment.

- ***UC Audit***

BOARS discussed a state audit that criticized UC’s nonresident admission and enrollment practices, responses to the audit from [the President](#) and the [University](#), and other UC efforts to counter assertions made in the audit that UC gives priority in admission to nonresidents and admits many nonresidents who are less qualified than residents. Consultants from the Office of Admissions, Office of State Governmental Relations, Budget Office, and President’s Immediate Office updated BOARS on a regular basis about the audit and legislative efforts to address the

audit's recommendation that UC adopt a different nonresident admissions policy. In July, the President asked the Senate to review its compare favorably policy in the fall, to clarify the policy's compliance with the Master Plan and its consistency with UC's comprehensive review policy and holistic review processes.

ADVANCING DIVERSITY

BOARS discussed efforts to expand diversity on campuses, including strategies to increase applications from underrepresented minority (URM) students and the yield of those students after they are admitted.

- ***African American Yield Study***

In March, BOARS member and UCR Professor Comeaux presented findings from a study of African American student yield, commissioned by UCOP in 2015 to help understand why some African American students admitted to UC choose to enroll at other schools. The study—*Investing in California's African American Students: College Choice, Diversity, and Exclusion*—discussed choice factors based on a survey and interviews with student respondents from across California, and made recommendations for several changes to policy and practice.

- ***ELC-Only Admissions Pilot***

BOARS discussed a pilot program proposed by UCOP as a way to increase diversity. The program targets UC applicants eligible for an admissions guarantee through the ELC-only pathway and who graduated from a high school designated as “Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+).” UC flagged applicants meeting those criteria and encouraged campuses to give them an additional review to achieve a 4% target as a proportion of overall admits. BOARS initially raised concerns about a lack of shared-governance consultation in the decision to launch the pilot and about the extent to which it may be perceived as a mandate to campuses. In June, BOARS reviewed data showing that a higher proportion and more diverse group of ELC-only applicants had been admitted to at least one UC campus for fall 2016, compared to fall 2015, and indicating that UC met the 4% target on a systemwide basis. BOARS also noted that other variables might be influencing the outcomes and that some individual campuses did not achieve the 4% target over concern about the ability of some ELC-only applicants to succeed at UC. BOARS also discussed plans on some campuses to augment academic advising services to support the success of students admitted under the pilot.

- ***Other Discussions About Diversity***

At the joint meeting with the campus Admissions Directors and Associate Vice Chancellors for Enrollment Management in June, BOARS discussed URM recruitment and yield efforts on campuses and the role of outreach and financial aid in a student's decision to enroll at a UC campus. At other points during the year, BOARS considered the extent to which alternative structures for the “9-by-9” policy could help expand access to the University and result in admitted classes that better reflect the state's population. One possibility discussed was an expansion of the 9% Eligibility in the Local Context guarantee to a larger proportion of high school graduates.

REQUESTING PARENTAL ALUMNI STATUS ON THE UC APPLICATION

In April, UCOP consultants discussed a proposal to add a field on the UC application for applicants to designate their parents' UC alumni status. Following the meeting, BOARS sent a letter to President Napolitano expressing concern that collecting the information at the time of application could foster misperceptions about "legacy" admissions and could discourage some students from applying to UC. The President decided to delay implementation of the proposal to allow UCOP time to consider and address the concerns. Senior UCOP leaders returned in June to update BOARS on the status of the proposal. They discussed its benefits for alumni communications and student yield activities in more depth, and assured BOARS that UC can collect the information in a way that avoids pitfalls and enhances alumni engagement. BOARS expects to discuss the proposal again in the fall.

MATHEMATICS PREPARATION

- ***Letter on Geometry Requirement***

BOARS sent a [letter to campus admissions directors](#) clarifying UC's geometry requirement for the mathematics ("c") subject area requirement, the rationale for the requirement, and guidance on validation options. The letter notes that effective for fall 2015 admissions, UC freshman applicants are required to take geometry, or an integrated math sequence that includes sufficient geometry, to meet the area "c" requirement. Students may not validate the omission of geometry with a subsequent higher-level math course or a standardized test score, but may validate a deficient grade in geometry by completing at least the first semester of an advanced-level math course or a "challenge" exam administered at the student's high school. Campuses may also admit students without geometry through "Admissions by Exception." The changes to area "c" demonstrate the faculty's commitment to aligning UC's math preparation expectations with the goals and expectations of the state's K–12 Common Core State Standards.

- ***Statement on the Impact of Calculus on Admission to UC***

In April, BOARS released a [Statement](#) on the Impact of Calculus on Admission to UC. It addresses concerns from some parents of middle and high school students that California's Common Core math curriculum, in which calculus may no longer be the highest level of advanced mathematics that students complete in high school, will disadvantage their child in UC admissions. The Statement notes that UC does not require calculus and, in general, does not give it extra weight in admissions, although high school calculus can help students majoring in disciplines with highly sequential coursework such as engineering. It notes that UC looks favorably on a rigorous course load that may include calculus but that taking calculus too soon and performing poorly may hurt a student's admission prospects. It encourages interested students to consider other advanced math options such as statistics.

HONORS "A-G" POLICY REVISIONS

BOARS approved five revisions to the [guidelines](#) for UC-approved high school-created "a-g" honors courses eligible to receive a one-point GPA "bump." Four revisions relate to specific subject areas, and one relates to the general requirements for school-created honors courses. BOARS also approved revisions to the college-preparatory elective ("g") subject area guidelines to allow rigorous courses explicitly designed for the 9th and/or 10th grade level to be approved for area "g."

IMPLEMENTATION OF REDESIGNED SAT

BOARS approved implementation procedures for the redesigned SAT exam that was administered for the first time in March 2016 and is effective for fall 2017 admissions. The implementation areas include a transition plan requiring UC applicants from the high school class of 2020 onward to submit scores from the new SAT only; plans for converting new SAT scores into the UC Score used in the statewide index and the Admission by Examination pathway; and plans for using scores from the new SAT Writing & Language test to verify satisfaction of the area “b” requirement and the English proficiency of students who have enrolled in fewer than three years of high school in which the primary language of instruction was English.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE 2017–18 UC APPLICATION

BOARS endorsed modifications to the UC Application in two areas: (1) a redesign of the application interface to improve its usability and accessibility, and (2) changes to improve the quality of the information gathered in the application focused around personal statement prompts and other areas that provide students opportunities to define themselves.

CLEP AND ALTERNATIVE CREDITS

BOARS discussed a state request to review policies for granting credit for College Level Examination Program (CLEP) tests taken outside of UC prior to matriculation, with the goal of providing credit that will help students graduate from UC sooner. BOARS recommended that faculty content experts review a subset of the 33 CLEP exams to determine whether they meet expectations for a particular course across the UC system. Council later endorsed a plan for the evaluation of seven CLEP exams for possible UC credit by systemwide UC faculty committees. The Senate ended its consideration of CLEP after learning that the College Board was willing to provide faculty review teams full exams only in proctored, in-person sessions.

AP COMPUTER SCIENCE

BOARS approved the recommendations of UC faculty content experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for scores of “3” or higher on the new AP Computer Science Principles exam.

AREA “C” REQUIREMENTS AND COMPONENTS

BOARS discussed the CSU Senate’s resolution *in Support of Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to CSU* and potential changes to UC’s mathematics (“c”) subject area requirement for freshman admission that would better support student preparation in math and alignment with the Common Core. BOARS reviewed admissions and demographic data on the UC applicants who do not take advanced math in high school indicating that while more than 95% of UC applicants took at least one advanced math course in high school, applicants with none or only one advanced math course were more likely to be Chicano/Latino or female. BOARS will monitor the progress of the CSU resolution next year.

AREA “D” AND THE NEXT GENERATION SCIENCE STANDARDS

UCOP identified representatives for a systemwide faculty advisory group, chaired by Vice Chair Sanchez, to review and propose revisions to BOARS, as needed, to UC’s laboratory science (“d”) subject area requirement to align with the state’s K–12 Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). The revision will help signal UC’s expectations for how the NGSS will be implemented within the K–12 curriculum. The advisory group will begin meeting in summer 2016 via teleconference.

BERKELEY LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION PILOT PROGRAM

BOARS discussed UC Berkeley’s Letters of Recommendation Pilot Program and the role of the Pilot in admissions outcomes. BOARS met by conference call in July to review an analysis of the Pilot from the Berkeley Office of Admissions, an independent analysis by a UCB professor, and a UCOP analysis of individual Berkeley and UCLA applicants who went through the admissions process at both campuses. BOARS was concerned about a finding that students from underrepresented backgrounds were less likely to request letters and submit letters to Berkeley, that applicants who submitted letters were admitted at a higher rate than students who did not, and that the diversity of Berkeley admits declined in 2016. BOARS asked to review additional data to help clarify the extent to which the Pilot may or may not have contributed to the decline in diversity. BOARS passed a recommendation that Berkeley continue the Pilot in its current form for a second year, and continue to limit the group of applicants from whom letters of recommendation are solicited and considered to those ranked as ‘Possible’ admits. Chair Aldredge asked Council to endorse the recommendation. However, Council voted to oppose both the continuation of the pilot project and the expansion of the pilot project to all applicants.

ADMISSION BY EXAMINATION

BOARS discussed the continued role and relevance of the Admission by Examination option for undergraduate admission described in [Senate Regulation 440](#) and on the [UC Admissions website](#). BOARS noted that the 2012 eligibility reform policy changed the Admission by Exam from a guaranteed admission pathway to an “entitled to review” pathway, guaranteeing a comprehensive review to applicants with a minimum qualifying UC Score. BOARS decided that although most campuses already give a comprehensive review to every application, and students eligible for the Examination pathway may ultimately be tagged Admission by Exception, the pathway has value to certain populations and should not be eliminated.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

BOARS hosted its annual half-day joint meeting with the campus Admissions Directors on June 24. BOARS and the directors discussed outcomes from the 2016–17 admissions cycle and the ELC-Only Pilot, the Compare Favorably policy, Admission by Examination, the geometry requirement for area “c,” strategies for expanding student diversity, and ways to increase communication between the Senate and Admissions.

BOARS SUBCOMMITTEES

The BOARS Chair charged two subcommittees with reporting to the parent committee about specific topics. The subcommittees met separately during a portion of several meetings in the fall and winter. One subcommittee, chaired by BOARS Vice Chair Sanchez, focused on the state’s

request to review policies for granting credit for courses and exams taken outside of UC prior to matriculation, including CLEP exams, and other Credit by Examination vehicles. Another subcommittee led by BOARS Chair Aldredge, considered BOARS' endorsement of the use of the Course Identification Numbering System at UC, as well as online courses that could potentially have C-ID numbers, as well as general standards for college-level online courses.

OTHER BUSINESS AND BRIEFINGS

Campus Reports: BOARS set aside a portion of each meeting for updates from faculty representatives on issues being discussed on their admissions committees and campuses. These briefings touched on a wide range of topics, including strategies for addressing the mandate to enroll 5,000 new resident undergraduates; how admissions policies can make finer distinctions between highly qualified applicants and increase diversity in a competitive admission environment; how to better identify and prevent fraud in international applications; local holistic review processes; and best practices for increasing diversity, including strategies for enhancing outreach to African American, American Indian, and undocumented students.

Admissions Cycle Outcomes: The Office of Admissions provided regular briefings on application, admissions, and SIR outcomes for freshman and transfer students from different demographic groups and residency categories.

Senate Leadership Briefings: The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair attended a portion of each BOARS meeting to brief the committee on business from the Council and Board of Regents, the status of budget negotiations, proposed legislation affecting UC, and systemwide issues of particular interest to BOARS and of general interest to the faculty.

ICAS Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences: BOARS approved a *Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen*, drafted by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) to update a 1988 ICAS statement to reflect the state's adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards for K–12.

Statement on Consultation: BOARS approved a statement affirming the value of systemwide discussions and consultations about changes being considered for admissions practices and policies at the individual campuses.

Student Policy Proposal: BOARS discussed a proposal from a UCD student arguing for a reduced focus by admissions committees on AP courses, tests, and scores to help address a lack of student diversity.

Budget and Enrollment Briefing: UCOP's Associate Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources briefed BOARS about the development of UC's 2015–16 budget and long-range enrollment plan, and its possible impacts on nonresident enrollment and tuition.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Ralph Aldredge represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. Vice Chair Henry Sanchez represented BOARS on the Systemwide Strategic Admissions

Taskforce (SSAT), on a Task Force to review CSU’s mathematics/quantitative reasoning (Area B4) requirement, and at an all-campus meeting hosted by the UC Provost on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. Chair Aldredge and Vice Chair Sanchez represented BOARS at meetings of the transfer streamlining discipline groups for the UC Transfer Pathways initiative, and both attended the UC Articulation Conference focused on math education on March 2 at UC Davis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS collaborated closely with UCOP and benefited from regular consultations with Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions Stephen Handel, Director of Undergraduate Admissions Michael Treviño, and Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions Monica Lin, who updated BOARS about application, admissions, and SIR outcomes; transfer policies, initiatives, and legislation; community outreach; admissions messaging; feedback from counselor conferences; campus-based concerns; high school and “a-g” course certification issues; the UC Articulation Conferences; the Next Generation Science Standards; and other topics. Associate President Nina Robinson discussed the ELC pilot, budget audit, and legislative issues with BOARS. Senior Vice President for Public Affairs Julie Henderson and Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement Geoff O’Neill briefed BOARS on the UC application proposal. UC Deputy to the Chief Financial Officer for State Budget Relations Kiernan Flaherty and Associate Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources Debora Obley briefed BOARS on budget issues. BOARS also received valuable support and advice from Institutional Research Coordinator Tongshan Chang, who provided the committee with critical analyses and data related to the Report to the Regents, and the compare favorably analysis. BOARS also thanks Special Assistant for Systemwide Admissions Initiatives Lisa Garcia, Admissions Evaluation Coordinator Evera Spears, and Associate Director Han Mi Yoon-Wu for their contributions. Finally, BOARS appreciates the contributions of the faculty who attended meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Adrienne Lavine (LA), Richard Rhodes (B), Jingsong Zhang (R), and Ann Sakai (I).

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph Aldredge, Chair (D)	Maribel Buena Cachadina (SB)
Henry Sanchez, Vice Chair (SF)	Melissa Famulari (SD)
Frank Worrell (B)	Christopher Viney (M)
Rena Zieve (D)	Khajidmaa Soyoltulga, Undergraduate (SD)
Gilbert Gonzalez (I)	Kevin Heller, Graduate (D)
Eddie Comeaux (R)	J. Daniel Hare, <i>ex officio</i>
Minghui Hu (SC)	Jim Chalfant, <i>ex officio</i>
Kelly Lytle-Hernandez (LA)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

**Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
Annual Report 2015-16**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Per Senate bylaw 180, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) advises the University President and all agencies of the Senate on all matters regarding research and learning related to graduate education. One of CCGA's chief responsibilities, as delegated by the Regents, is the authority to review and evaluate all campus proposals for new graduate programs and schools that require approval of the President. In addition, CCGA establishes basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various graduate councils and divisions, recommends to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students, reviews standards and policies applied by graduate councils, reviews policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies, and approves UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in divisional catalogs.

Review of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

During the 2015-16 Academic year, the campuses submitted 29 proposals to CCGA for review; of these, 24 were approved, and 5 were left to carry over into the next academic year. This included 27 proposals for new graduate degree programs, of which 15 were SSGPDPs.

Proposals Under Review as of August 10, 2016

Campus	Program	Degree	Request	SSGPDP
Irvine	Finance	Master	Establishment	Yes
Los Angeles	Conservation of Material Culture	M.S./Ph.D.	Establishment	No
Los Angeles	Environment & Sustainability	M.S./Ph.D.	Establishment	No
Santa Barbara	Technology Management	Ph.D.	Establishment	No
San Francisco	Nursing Practice	DNP	Establishment	Yes

Programs Approved During the 2015-16 Year

Campus	Program	Degree	Request	SSGPDP
Berkeley	Public Affairs	Master	Establishment	Yes

Berkeley	Earthquake Engineering	Master	Establishment	Yes
Davis	Interdisciplinary Energy Studies	MS/PhD	Establishment	No
Davis	Nursing (Entry Program)*	Master	Establishment	Yes
Davis	Public Health Sciences*	PhD	Establishment	No
Davis	Business Analytics	MS	Establishment	Yes
Davis	Environmental Policy and Mgmt.	MS	Establishment	No
Irvine	Computer Science	Master	Establishment	Yes
Irvine	Human Computer Interaction & Design	Master	Establishment	Yes
Irvine	American Law*	Master of Laws	Establishment	Yes
Irvine	Art History*	B.A./M.A.	Establishment	No
Irvine	Asian American Studies	B.A./M.A.	Establishment	No
Irvine	Embedded Cyber-Physical Systems	Master	Establishment	Yes
Irvine	Pharmacology	M.S.	Establishment	Yes
Irvine	Legal and Forensic Psychology	Master	Establishment	Yes
Los Angeles	Social Sciences*	Master	Establishment	Yes
Los Angeles	Applied Statistics	Master	Establishment	Yes

Los Angeles	Teaching Asian Languages*	MA	Establishment	No
Los Angeles	School of Music		Establishment of School	No
Los Angeles	School of Arts and Architecture		Reconstitution	No
Merced	Mechanical Engineering	MS/PhD	Establishment	No
Merced	Economics	MA/PhD	Establishment	No
Santa Cruz	Computational Media	MS/PhD	Establishment	No
San Diego	Chinese Economic and Political Affairs	Master	Establishment	Yes

* Indicates a proposal carried over from 2014-15

Topics of Note During the 2015-16 Year

Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs)

The ongoing reductions in state support have resulted in campuses increasingly looking to self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) as one means of funding new degrees and growing departments, as well as backfilling declining state support for existing programs. SSGPDPs also have the potential to allow the University to meet the state's needs for professional training that are not currently addressed through UC's existing academic graduate programs. Accordingly, the University has seen a rapid year-to-year increase in SSGPDPs, most notably from UC Irvine, which had 7 self-supporting program proposals under review in AY15-16.

While CCGA recognizes the potential benefits of such programs, their recent influx has raised a number of concerns for the committee. First and foremost is the concern about how best to apply CCGA's standard review criteria of academic quality and financial soundness for UC caliber graduate programs, given their increasing variety and the absence of many constraints in the Presidential policy authorizing them. For example, applicant selectivity is often used as a metric of academic excellence. If a program targets working adults, and it has been determined that metrics such as GPA and standardized test scores are not useful for applicant selection, what metrics should properly be used in their place to ensure that the highest quality applicants are admitted? Similarly, what are the pressures to downgrade selectivity, for programs that are highly scalable due to enabling technologies such as on-line delivery? In setting fees for self-supporting programs, what kind of data are essential for ensuring that fees are set appropriately so that admissions criteria do not end up being relaxed in order to generate sufficient income for the program to remain solvent? A second major concern is the impact of proposed self-supporting programs on state-funded programs. This is a particular concern given that ladder rank faculty are required to be involved in program oversight and delivery in order to ensure UC quality, but their involvement is often on an overload or buy-out basis, implying that they will have less time to devote to regular state programs since a faculty's available bandwidth is typically limited. What policies should guide the amount

of faculty time impacted and the number of faculty in a unit impacted by involvement in self-supporting programs?

The lack of a detailed policy/set of procedures for reviewing SSGPDP proposals resulted in recurring questions related to the role of SSGPDPs and return-to-aid and program evaluation, in addition to those listed above. The committee, in consultation with UCPB, discussed a number of these key questions at length for a variety of SSGPDP proposals. In the face of these questions, the committee worked diligently to provide consistent, fair, and informed guidance and decision-making in this new and complicated arena. Toward the end of the academic year, CCGA took it upon itself to form a subcommittee to help examine these questions and how to best resolve them. As part of this, the subcommittee worked with UCPB to revise some sections of the CCGA Handbook related to self-supporting programs (Appendix K) and suggested guidelines for SSGPDP assessment during periodic program review. The major changes to Appendix K were a new requirement to provide the SSGPDP cost analysis data that is submitted to OP with CCGA proposals and to list some specific issues that proposals should address. CCGA also developed a new process for review of SSGPDPs in the 2016-2017 Academic Year, which was not discussed in Appendix K revisions, where the lead CCGA reviewer will be paired with a member of UCPB to carry out the review. The CCGA Handbook revisions and new review process are expected to expedite co-review of SSGPDP proposals by the two committees in the future.

In July 2016, the new University Policy on SSGPDPs was finalized by the President's Office. As of this writing, it has not yet been put into use on new proposals (due to the timing of its release). However, the committee is enthusiastic about having it as a reference for campus composition and CCGA review of proposals in the 2016-17 year.

Sexual Harassment/Sexual Violence (formerly VAWA) Policy

In response to federal legislation and system concern, the President worked to develop a sexual harassment/sexual violence policy for the University. CCGA was asked to closely review the new draft policy in terms of its implications for graduate students – both as potential victims and as designated reporters for undergraduate students. A policy had been initially drafted without faculty input; however the President put it in place as an interim policy to allow time for Senate faculty to contribute to the development of a new policy. The new draft policy stated that all faculty and all student employees would be reporters for undergraduates. GSIs would report to the campus Title IX officers, not to the faculty members for whom they work. Under the policy, each campus designates some employees as “confidential resources.” An employee designated as a confidential resource is exempted from reporting to the Title IX office. Faculty will have to be responsible for making sure that graduate students are aware of their responsibility for undergraduates. CCGA discussion highlighted the need for details to be refined on the campus level; members were urged to talk to their administration and ensure that graduate student training is adequate.

Graduate Student Mental Health

UC Medical Director Gina Fleming visited CCGA to make a presentation and answer questions related to graduate student mental health. This visit arose out of concerns voiced by the 2014-15 CCGA Student Representative.

Data collected from graduate students systemwide show the following as the top diagnoses for students who report mental health issues:

- Anxiety Disorders
- Depressive Disorders
- Relational Problems
- Academic Problems
- Phase of Life Issues

In response, the University has developed targeted mental health services such as:

- Wellness outreach activities
- Therapy groups
- Satellite offices at several grad/professional schools

- Interactive Suicide Prevention screening program (ISP)
- Training for graduate student TA's and Instructors on how to identify and respond to students in distress
- Liaisons for various graduate programs
- Participation on relevant committees
- Presence at graduate student orientations
- Inclusion of graduate students on mental health advisory board
- Targeted advertisement material.

The importance of mentoring of graduate students was also discussed at several points in the year. It was noted that UC Davis is in the process of developing "best practices" for graduate student mentoring. This will likely be on the agenda for the 2016-2017 academic year.

UC MEXUS

UCORP was the lead committee for the UC Mexus review; however CCGA was heavily involved throughout the process. Members agreed that the Mexus report was very clear and direct about both strengths and weaknesses of the program. CCGA commended the strengths of the program, noted that it would be beneficial to expand the diversity in its financial sources, and that efforts should be undertaken to increase the competitiveness of its grant programs. CCGA also discussed whether funding should be by topic and whether Latino studies should be part of the program's mission. Members felt that the program could have proposed more innovations for its renewal, especially in light of current efforts from other border universities to establish their own binational centers. As a result, CCGA found it difficult to support *expanded* UCOP funding for UC Mexus, particularly during the current fiscal environment, although it was supportive of renewal of the program without contingencies. The committee asked if UC Mexus' extensive experience in research with Mexico could be leveraged in some way to the benefit of the UC system as a whole.

Items of Interest from Academic Affairs

Graduate Research Advocacy Day took place in March. Students from all ten campuses went to Sacramento to talk with legislators about the importance of graduate research. The students were joined by President Napolitano in advocating for graduate research and highlighting its contributions to the California economy. Academic Affairs worked to develop a Graduate Student Fact Sheet to help explain the role of graduate students within UC.

The systemwide Grad Slam tournament was held on April 22 in San Francisco; LinkedIn hosted. The event – in its third year - is an important way for graduate students to share their research information in front of the public.

The Provost visited the committee to discuss the financial analysis for PDST proposals. She explained that items would be coming before the Regents related to PDSTs, and asked for CCGA's input on a briefing paper about them. Some PDSTs are out of compliance with policy, and the chair of the Board of Regents has stipulated that the University must obey the policy or change it. There is a hope to put something in place that allows for reasonable changes in PDSTs and only requires Regental approval for significant changes.

The Provost informed CCGA that she deliberately did not search for a new Research and Graduate Studies Vice President last year because the President was in the midst of making decisions about how she would organize the role in conjunction with the new Senior Vice-President for Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship. The President wants a SVP who will be very outwardly focused on research innovation and entrepreneurship – someone who appreciates research and can move in the corporate and government worlds. Arthur Ellis joined UC as the new RGS Vice President on August 10, 2016.

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from and exchange with these UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Provost Aimée Dorr, Director of Graduate Studies Pamela Jennings, Director of Academic Planning Todd Greenspan; Academic Planning Manager Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning and

Research Analyst Chris Procello, and Council of Graduate Deans representative Tyrus Miller (UCSC). Special thanks to Council Chair Dan Hare, Council Vice Chair Jim Chalfant, Senate Associate Director Jocelyn Banaria and Senate Executive Director Hilary Baxter. CCGA is particularly appreciative of Analyst Fredye Harms' support of the committee during a year that saw an accelerated expansion of Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program proposals.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Leppert, Chair (UCM)
Kwai Ng, Vice Chair (UCSD)
Jan DeVries (UCB)
Laurel Beckett (UCD)
Susan Charles (UCI)
Ioanna Kakoulli (UCLA)
Michael Dawson (UCM)

Michael Coffey (UCR)
David Salmon (UCSD)
Jason Rock (UDSF)
Dar Roberts (UCSB)
Donald Smith (UCSD)
Zhixun (Jason) He, Student Representative (UCM)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties

Pursuant to [Senate Bylaw 150](#), the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) oversaw the appointment of chairs and vice chairs for each of the standing committees of the Assembly; oversaw the nomination of Senate members to serve on ad hoc or ongoing joint Senate-Administration committees and task forces. UCOC met three times in person and six times by phone. Major issues and accomplishments are reported below.

Appointment of Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Senate's Standing Committees

At the November 2015 meeting, members chose their positions to serve as standing committee liaisons. The liaisons gathered information from the committee chairs, vice chairs, members, and analysts on the committee's effectiveness and possible vice chair candidates. In addition, the liaisons recommended individuals for 2016-17 chairs and vice chairs of their designated committees. UCOC reviewed and approved these recommendations from April to June 2016. Special attention was paid to make sure incoming chairs and vice chairs are in compliance with the recently revised Vice Chair bylaw, 128.D.1.

Appointment of members of Senate committees, subcommittees, or task forces that report to the Assembly

The ten divisional Committees on Committees nominated divisional representatives to the standing committees and to the Assembly. Subsequently, UCOC issued the appointment letters, which specified the term of appointment and the committee's charge. This year's UCOC selected two new ACSCOLI members in fall, with terms beginning 2015-16, selected another member to start in 2016-17, and reappointed a current member for a second two-year term. UCOC appointed four UCR&J members (two for the 2015-16 year and two for 2016-17), four new members to the Editorial Committee, one HCTF member, and four TFIR members. Additionally, UCOC started the process for selecting a chair and at-large members for the new instantiation of ACSCANR (Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources) as a task force with UCPB as the parent committee.

Appointment of Senate Representatives to Special Committees & Task Forces, Search Committees, & Joint Senate/Administrative Task Forces and Committees

UCOC is responsible for appointing Senate representatives to various groups that are proposed by the President, Provost, and/or other senior administrators, including search committees for senior executives and chancellors. UCOC nominated and appointed representatives to serve on a number of joint Administration-Senate task forces and other groups. These included the UC Santa Barbara and UC Merced Chancellor Ad Hoc Review Committees, the UC Davis and UC Berkeley Chancellor Search Committees, a BOARS Lab Science ("d") work group, STEM faculty project, Cyber-Risk Governance Committee, Cyber-Risk Governance Committee Advisory Board, the Committee on the UC Code of Conduct for Trademark Licensees, and the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) fourth year review Task Force.

Oliver Johnson Award

UCOC nominated Robert M. Anderson (UCB) and Katja Lindenberg (UCSD) for the Oliver Johnson award. Both have distinguished academic careers with a long history of substantial

Senate service. Academic Council subsequently selected both nominations for the Oliver Johnson award.

Other UCOC activities

- The UCOC Chair completed summaries (“Templates”) of the committee chairs’ responsibilities. This information included a brief description of committee duties, meeting frequencies, involvement with other committee(s), and stipend amounts, and is now available on the UCOC SharePoint site.
- UCOC invited UC Press Director Alison Mudditt, Editorial Director Kimberly Robinson, and Editorial Committee (also known as EDIT) Vice Chair Greg Clark to its February meeting in Oakland. The discussion involved the responsibilities of the EDIT members and brief descriptions of the areas of scholarship.
- Discussion about Bylaw 150.B.2, which states that UCOC “appoints all the general membership of all other Senate committees.” What happens in reality is that the appointed divisional representatives’ names are submitted to the Executive Director of the Systemwide Academic Senate. Then, the UCOC analyst drafts the appointment letters, which has the salutation of the UCOC Chair. UCOC proposed more direct involvement in this process, and closely monitored divisional rosters during the summer to encourage more complete committee population.
- UCOC distributed a workload survey to the outgoing Senate committee chairs and vice chairs which it will use for a future review of stipend compensation for committee chairs and certain vice chairs.

Respectfully submitted:

Eleanor Kaufman, Chair (UCLA)	William Griswold (UCSD)
Robert Clare, Vice Chair (UCR)	Vineeta Singh (UCSF)
William Drummond (UCB)	Kevin Plaxco (UCSB)
Andrea Fascetti (UCD)	Patricia Gallagher (UCSC)
Robin Buck (UCI)	Dan Hare(Council Chair, ex-officio)
Joseph Nagy (UCLA)	Jim Chalfant (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
Anna Song (UCM)	Jocelyn Banaria (Committee Analyst)
Jeffrey Sacks (UCR)	

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times in Academic Year 2015-2016 (including twice by videoconference) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 170](#) and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the “[Compendium](#)”). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

State Budget Framework Initiatives

UCEP was notified in June 2015 about the [budget framework initiatives](#) announced by Governor Brown as part of his May Revision to the 2016-2017 budget for the University. Over the course of this past year, the committee considered the issue of alternative credit, primarily through the use of Credit by Examination, the awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) credit, and the potential use of the College Board’s College Level Examination Program (CLEP).

Credit by Examination

UCEP began discussing credit by examination at the October 2015 meeting and determined the first steps in the committee’s investigation. UCEP representatives gathered information from home campuses about current policies and discussed the similarities and differences between campuses. UCEP representatives also were asked to consult with their local campus CEPs and other relevant administrators to get a sense of how frequently the credit by examination process is used and what barriers that may exist to students using this option. Information about campus policies was summarized and discussed in the spring of 2016. Issues addressed included reasons why the credit-by-examination option is used so infrequently, workload issues for faculty, and the advantages and disadvantages in terms of student learning outcomes of possibly promoting this option more.

Members received a list of specific policy inconsistencies by campus and were asked to opine on whether UCEP should remove these inconsistencies and come up with a general policy. Members were also asked if they felt any of the restrictions on credit by examination should be removed, or justify why not, and to give an opinion on whether students should be encouraged to take this option. Further discussions on the campuses about these questions are under way with the expectation that UCEP will prepare a report and submit a report to the Academic Council in the fall of 2016.

Advanced Placement Credit

Following the June briefing, in October UCEP began a more in-depth discussion about the awarding of AP credit at UC. Representatives gathered information from home campuses about current policies and discussed with academic advising staff. This information was organized in terms of application to university requirements, departmental (major) requirements, and General Education (GE) requirements. There was a great degree of consistency across campuses in terms of the use of AP exams for university and departmental requirements, with less consistency across campuses (and indeed across schools within campuses) for awarding GE credit. Some exceptions to the use of AP credit occur because at some campuses lower division course sequences are organized in a way that no single course corresponds to the relevant AP course. For most departmental requirements, a score of 4 is needed for credit.

Two main issues regarding reexamining AP credit will be on the agenda for the fall of 2016. UCEP will discuss whether the general policy of requiring a 4 or above on AP exams for major credit is justified, particularly in foundational courses. UCEP also will examine the differences in awarding AP credit for GE courses among campuses and how awarding AP credit, or not, aligns with the pedagogical goals and philosophies of the GE programs at the difference campuses. Following these discussions, UCEP will prepare a report for the Academic Council. In addition to the report to Council, committee members expressed an interest in developing white papers on how students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are disadvantaged by a lack of access to AP courses.

College Level Examination Program

In October, UCEP members were asked to consider the use of CLEP, which had not been evaluated by UC since the 1980s. UCEP studied the use of CLEP examinations by other universities and learned that they are rarely used by any of UC's comparators. Nevertheless, UCEP examined the list of examinations offered and developed a plan to establish subject-area working groups, comprised of faculty from each of the nine general campuses to review a subset of examinations in the areas of: Financial Accounting, College Composition, Spanish Language, American Government, Principles of Microeconomics, Calculus, and Chemistry. After these working groups were established, we learned that the Education Testing Service (ETS) would not allow UC faculty to review the examinations without a representative from the ETS or the College Board being present when the exams were reviewed. This was to ensure that the exams would not leave the room. Because that precluded the UC faculty members from comparing the CLEP exams with examinations with specific courses for which CLEP scores might be used for credit, or to consult with colleagues, UC declined to review the examinations under such restrictive conditions.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

ILTI's Project Coordinator Ellen Osmundson, Coordinator joined several UCEP meetings this year to report on the status of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative and to ask UCEP assorted policy questions. The committee was informed that by the end of 2016, 150 courses will be funded by ILTI including STEM, Social Sciences, and Arts & Humanities. Approximately 13,500 students completed online courses at their home campuses from winter/spring 2014 to fall 2015. ILTI created a new website in November for enrollment in online courses across the UC campuses and thirty courses are being offered for cross campus enrollment this winter. With the new launch of this website, a goal was to provide a more interactive experience to allow students a better understanding of what the course will be like.

Input was sought from UCEP on simultaneous enrollment policies, course credit, SB 477 and the question of whether online courses should count for General Education preparation or for the major. Another issue is related to the twelve unit minimum and the requirement that students taking online courses must be full time. The committee was also asked to consider extending the add/drop period. The members were asked to bring these questions to their campus committees for discussion.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:

- Systemwide Review of Proposed Modifications to SR 417 and SR 621
- The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Statement on Natural Science Competencies
- Draft New Presidential Policy on International Activities
- University Committee on International Education's Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182
- Proposed Guidelines for the Use of Waivers in Academic Hiring at UC
- Report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, ICAS, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils.

UCEP Representation

UCEP Chair Tracy Larrabee represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. Chair Larrabee also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing teleconferences and the Academic Planning Council. Vice Chair, Barbara Knowlton regularly attended ICAS meetings. Finally, UCEP was represented by John Tamkun (UCSC) and Jeffrey Stopple (UCSB) on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, UCOP; Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning, (IRAP); Todd Greenspan, Director, Academic Planning, IRAP; Kimberly Peterson, Manager, Academic Planning, IRAP; Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator, UCOP; and Steve Handel, Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions.

In addition, UCEP consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracy Larrabee, Chair (SC)

Simon Penny (I)

Michael Burawoy (B)

Leslie Zimmerman (SF)

Edward Caswell-Chen (D)

Jeffrey Stopple (SB)

Elioth Gomez (Undergraduate Student-B)

Barbara Knowlton, Vice Chair (LA)

Anne Zanzucchi (M)

John Tamkun (SC)

Tara Javidi (SD)

James Gober (LA)

Thomas Stahovich (R)

Dan Hare ((R), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Jim Chalfant ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
2015-16 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under [Senate Bylaw 175](#), the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) considers and reports on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty, including salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. UCFW held eight in-person meetings and two teleconferences during the 2015-16 academic year, and the major actions and discussions of ongoing issues are highlighted in this report.

UCFW has two key task forces with memberships independent of UCFW and with particular expertise in: (1) the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) including its policies and its investments (the Task Force on Investment and Retirement, TFIR); and (2) the University's health plans for employees and retirees (the Health Care Task Force, HCTF). These task forces monitor developments and carry out detailed analyses of questions and issues in their respective areas and report back to UCFW for further action. UCFW is indebted to the extraordinary commitment and skills of our task force leadership, Avanihar Subrahmanyam (TFIR) and Robert May (HCTF). These two task forces spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). Many of these consultants, along with others from Academic Personnel and the Office of the Budget also regularly attend UCFW meetings and lend their expertise to our discussions. We are indebted to these consultants, and they are individually acknowledged at the end of this Report.

CASH COMPENSATION ISSUES:

Salary Administration: The ladder-rank faculty received a 3% increase in cash compensation, but President Napolitano decreed that it would not be administered across-the-board. Instead, she directed that 1.5% could be allocated equally to all, but that the second 1.5% was to be targeted to addressing one of four areas: equity, inversion, compression, and exceptional merit. The campuses were given discretion on determining the needs in the second group. UCFW has noted that even if the full 3% had been made available to all ladder-rank faculty, the compensation gap would still continue to grow. The success of the targeted redress efforts in reducing identified shortfalls is unclear, despite the reporting required. It is expected that a similar program with less reporting will be implemented next year. It seems unlikely, given internal and external political pressures, that UC will be able to solve its cash compensation problem with traditional means.

The Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP), in which some general campus faculty are eligible to solicit external salary support similar to that in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP), is entering its final year. Data so far show that no differences in teaching load have resulted from the pilot. If the program is to end, exit strategies must be developed and deployed in the fall. If the program is to continue, similar planning is needed.

Total Remuneration: In response, UCFW began investigation into other means of increasing remuneration, such as through tax advantaged child care, housing assistance, identity theft protection, etc. Arguing that recruitment and retention of junior and mid-career faculty need the most attention, alternative forms of compensation that would most benefit these groups were discussed. While many of the options would impact only a limited number of faculty, each is considered quite valuable – if not monetarily, then psychologically. UCFW discussed in detail with Academic Personnel the status of child care facilities at UC and at its competitors. While the need is universal, the ability to meet that need is dependent on local factors like physical capacity and community services that render systemwide guidance of questionable use, especially regarding facilities. Improved housing assistance could also benefit these populations, but funds are stretched and changes to policy are cumbersome in this area particularly since the programs are Regents-authorized. UCFW endorsed a proposal to improve support for adoption services, and considered ways to improve the coverage of infertility treatments. Tuition remission was again posited as an effective means of encouraging young and mid-career faculty to join and remain at UC.

POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS:

As part of the budget negotiations conducted last year, President Napolitano and the Regents agreed to the governor’s terms, including creation and launch of a new pension “option” by July 1, 2016. The new option would cap benefits at the PEPRA cap, but some employee groups may also have access to a supplemental defined contribution (DC) plan. The design of the new pension option was the product of a Retirement Options Task Force that was charged to deliver a plan design by January 1, 2016. The Senate had four participants on the task force, some with experience in the 2010 Post-Employment Benefits investigation and all with UCFW backgrounds. The new pension tier offers to qualifying employees the option to supplement the defined benefit (DB) plan with a DC plan, and faculty can begin deposits to the supplemental plan starting with the “first day and first dollar” where other employees can only begin deposits once their compensation level passes the PEPRA threshold. Employees can also change their election at the 5-year (or tenure review) mark, should they choose to do so. UCFW noted that the new tier is mostly competitive with the 2013 Tier for most faculty groups. UCFW also worked closely with Human Resources and External Relations/Communications to develop educational materials regarding the new tier and its impacts. How the new tier will impact recruitment and retention will be closely monitored moving forward.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS:

UCFW continued to monitor the operations of UC Care. While from the consumer perspective, many basic care and basic business operations were improved, previously identified strategic issues, such as long-term adverse selection, remain a concern. UC Care re-bid its third-party administrator (TPA) this year, and again, HCTF representatives were invited to join the process. UC decided to change the UC Care TPA for 2017, and expects improved service and billing. Disruption from the TPA change is expected to be small, but careful communications are being prepared and reviewed.

HCTF lobbied UC Care Executive Vice President Stobo to investigate more options for improving mental and behavioral health delivery and outcomes. Having previously made significant changes to the student mental health services on the campuses, Dr. Stobo was receptive. A work group with stakeholders from industry and providers, including HCTF representation, was convened. UCFW and HCTF will continue to monitor the work of this group closely.

Last year, Human Resources began a review of UC's disability insurance and plan design. UC's benefits were found to be significantly out of line with similar benefits from the state, and in this case, UC is the laggard. A working group investigated how UC's benefit can become more competitive while remaining cost effective. A simplified plan was unveiled this spring for implementation on January 1, 2017. The new program has a "one-size fits all" approach for short-term disability, and a simplified approach for long-term disability. The new design should encourage return-to-work when possible, and encourage participation as it is both easier to understand and cheaper to the employee.

UCFW learned this year that the benefit afforded to unmarried domestic partners, especially in instances of survivorship, were unclear and subject to abuse. HCTF worked closely with HR to identify the problems and the number of individuals impacted; how to fix the problem remains under discussion. Improved communications are one step, but educating current employees that they may need to audit their coverage and take additional steps to ensure family members are adequately covered is a second struggle. It is hoped that a streamlined process can eliminate inconsistencies and unfair documentary requirements.

HCTF and UCFW were both concerned over the long-term strategic direction of UC Health. The Senate gratefully accepted an advisory seat on the newly restructured Regent's Committee on Health, but many worry that shared governance in this area is not as strong as it should be.

Finally, UCFW continued to lobby HR and others to increase support for the Health Care Facilitator program. Facilitators report being overworked, understaffed, and given non-facilitator duties; despite these obstacles, the facilitators continue to receive excellent reviews.

INVESTMENT

In addition to helping craft the 2016 pension tier, UCFW and TFIR received updates on asset allocation changes to better meet UC's needs in the ever-changing market. TFIR encouraged the Office of the Chief Investment Officer to explore annuity options, and UCFW and TFIR will continue work in this area.

FACULTY WELFARE

The Vice Provost for Academic Personnel entered an agreement with the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE), a Harvard think tank to develop faculty exit surveys. This year, the survey was piloted, and in June, a debriefing session was held in Irvine. Although the data are still slim, indications are that faculty who leave do not do so for large cash compensation increases. Administration of subsequent surveys will require identification of a permanent fund source, but the benefits and knowledge learned should easily justify such costs. In addition to the

survey, the new UC Recruit tool can be used to triangulate further the reasons for faculty departures.

This year, faculty discipline was also under scrutiny, following several high-profile cases of malfeasance and apparent mishandling. At the president's request, a joint administration-Senate working group was appointed to assess how the processes involved could be better aligned, streamlined, and expedited. Different procedures, standards, and charges for different groups (faculty versus students, for example) complicate the handling of cases that cross groups. Different goals at resolution (punish a perpetrator versus support a victim) also hampered progress. Nevertheless, improved guidance for investigating claims and supporting those implicated were generated, and clarifications on the different, but parallel and sometimes intersecting, processes were issued.

Also in response to high-profile data hacks, cybersecurity became an increasingly pressing topic at UCFW. Hacks from external parties highlighted the need for greater firewalls with patient health records and student and staff employment records. An RFP was issued, and a new cybersecurity vendor was hired. Internally, too, cybersecurity protocols were revisited to clarify under what circumstances UC is allowed to request records from employees.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS:

Academic Personnel Manual Revisions: Several sections of the APM were up for review, and some new sections were proposed. UCFW opined on or discussed each of the following:

- 278, 210.6, 279, 112 and new APM 350 (Clinicians)
- 360 and 210.4 (Librarians and Review Committees, respectively)
- 133, 715, 760, etc (“Active Service-Modified Duty)

Additional Items:

UCFW was pleased to receive updates on the following items, and will continue to monitor developments in these areas:

- Changes to Mortgage Origination Program
- Innovation Council
- UC Ventures
- UCPath Center and Operations

CORRESPONDENCE:

Beyond submitting opinions and recommendations on the topics above, UCFW opined on the following matters of systemwide import:

- Search Waivers
- President's Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Senior Management Group Policy on Outside Professional Activities
- UC Health governance at the Regents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

UCFW is indebted to its consultants and guests, without whom the committee's work could not be done:

Academic Affairs: Provost Aimée Dorr;

Academic Personnel: Vice Provost Susan Carlson and Director Janet Lockwood;
Finance: Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom;
State Governmental Relations: Senior Vice President Nelson Peacock;
UC Health: Senior Vice President Jack Stobo;
Human Resources: Vice President Dwaine Duckett, Executive Director of Retirement Programs and Services Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director of Benefits Programs and Strategy Michael Baptista, Director of Benefits Programs Mark Esteban, and Executive Director for Compensation Programs and Strategy Dennis Larsen;
Office of the Chief Investment Officer: CIO Jagdeep Bachher, Associate CIO Arthur Guimaraes;

External consultants from Mercer, Deloitte, and Segal.

We are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Dan Hare and Vice Chair Jim Chalfant, as well as the advice and perspective provided by Senate Executive Director Hillary Baxter. Finally, the committee is indebted to Kenneth Feer who has provided superb staff support.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2015-16

Calvin Moore, Chair

Lori Lubin, Vice Chair

Mark Gergen, UCB

Charles Hess, UCD

Bill Parker, UCI

Megan Sweeney, UCLA

Sean Malloy, UCM

Victor Lippit, UCR

Sheila Gahagan, UCSD

Roberta Rehm, UCSF

Stan Awramik, UCSB

Jim Zachos, UCSC

Avanidhar Subrahmanyam, TFIR Chair

Robert May, HCTF Chair

Roger Anderson, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)

Henning Bohn, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representative (ex officio)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION**

2015-2016 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) met in person two times and once by teleconference in the 2015-2016 academic year to conduct business in accordance with its charge, outlined in [Senate Bylaw 185](#), to advise the President about the administration of University libraries and issues related to innovations in forms of scholarly communication. Highlights of the committee's major activities are outlined briefly below.

Challenges Facing Scholarly Communications in the Humanities

In the 2014-2015 academic year, the committee discussed various issues related to scholarly communication and in October UCOLASC considered a proposal from several members to establish a special systemwide committee to consider issues related to the dissemination of Humanities research. Publishing a book is the key way of getting promotion and tenure in the Humanities and it has become increasingly difficult to do so in large part because publishers lose money on books. In the Humanities, Social Sciences, and small fields with limited readership, both senior and junior faculty are impacted by this crisis and the cost is often prohibitive for younger faculty.

It was suggested that a UCOLASC subcommittee on publication in the Humanities could be effective and UCOLASC began to identify some of the specific issues and potential solutions over the course of this year. UCOLASC hopes that campus library committees have discussions about the issues related to publishing in specific disciplines. It is noteworthy that the Senate and Presidential Open Access policies are not necessarily a solution for Humanities publishing, however development of Open Access textbooks should be a part of this discussion. Funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities has decreased by 70% from 1979 to 2014. While some campuses have discussed providing funding to young scholars, it is unclear whether subventions are readily available to Humanities faculty and this is a need to be addressed, especially for junior faculty. Young scholars would also benefit from education regarding what they are trying to publish and the likely costs in order, for example, to eventually make the case when negotiating start-up packages with administrators at UC campuses.

There are separate questions related to the evaluation of the careers and contributions of faculty in fields such as the Humanities and Social Sciences, and UCOLASC may suggest establishing a short term ad hoc task force to investigate different forms of assessment. Ultimately, a larger, more comprehensive initiative on matters unrelated to UCOP's entrepreneurial ventures and that do not require much funding is called for. In October, a motion was made and seconded for the formation of a subcommittee to look at issues related to book publishing in the Humanities. In February, the UCSB representative provided members with a report on publishing issues under discussion and a follow-up report is anticipated for UCOLASC's Fall 2016 meeting.

Journal Licensing Negotiations

In February and May UCOLASC received reports on journal licensing negotiations from CDL's Director of Collections, Ivy Anderson. This year there have not been major changes with the licensing and some negotiations have just wrapped up. Director Anderson negotiated eight large multi-year agreements this year. Current renewals are with American Chemical Society, Wiley, Springer, the Royal Society of Chemistry, Karger, and Web of Science. American Chemical Society and the Royal Society of Chemistry have both attempted to increase the cost of UC's license over the past few years. UC has done well with Wiley over the past several years. Director Anderson discussed the merger of Springer with the Nature

Publishing Group, which added some complications to UC's negotiations.

The cancellation of the Taylor & Francis contract in 2013 resulted in a new, reinstated contract in 2016. Taylor & Francis acquired a huge number of journals in recent years and the new contract includes access to archives dating back to the first issues of their journals. Open Access article processing charges for UC authors will also be significantly discounted. The CDL is examining the impact of open access offset agreements in Europe and is considering a similar model for UC, with a goal of cost neutrality. eBooks have been challenging to license for a number of reasons. It is still not clear when our libraries' users want print versus electronic versions, but the available data suggests they want both. Many eBooks are being sold in packages similar to journal packages, and the libraries are very concerned about being locked into a package when UC's needs might be more selective. In some of the license agreements the CDL was able to include author's rights provisions as well as text and data mining provisions. There will be an effort to make this information more public and visible. The CDL continues to be very successful in cost control with UC's very large agreements.

Implementation of Open Access Policies at UC

CDL's Director of Publishing, Catherine Mitchell, provided UCOLASC with a 12-month report on the status of implementation of the Academic Senate Open Access policy at UC in October and brief updates in February and May. Records of publications by individuals recognized as UC faculty are now harvested by the publication management system, Symplectic Elements, and faculty then receive email alerts through the system to verify their publications and to deposit the author's final version ('post-print') thereof. The rate of deposit has spiked since the automated system was implemented. Medicine, Health Sciences and Physical Sciences faculty have the highest deposit rates, likely due to the fact that many faculty in these disciplines already deposit their post-prints in PubMed Central and other repositories in compliance with granting agency requirements. Full compliance with the policy is effectively voluntary given that there are no repercussions for faculty who do not participate. The data being collected helps the CDL identify where more outreach is needed.

The CDL surveyed faculty about their experience with the system and 45% indicated that the deposit process was not burdensome. At the same time, feedback from faculty suggests that they simply do not want to deal with this process. The education effort needs to be ongoing so that more faculty become engaged. CDL is now considering how to integrate the publication management system into other existing services to make it more compelling for faculty to utilize and a future question for the CDL is how to harvest publications with little to no faculty involvement. The publication management system will be refined based on what is being learned, especially with respect to those disciplines that are not yet well-represented in terms of who is depositing their publications. CDL's campus partners have assisted with the process of connecting with human resource feeds and other campus data sources. UCOLASC members recommended that the Office of General Counsel make a statement that UC will indemnify faculty against publishers in the event that a mistake is made when attempting to comply with the Open Access policy (e.g. by depositing the final published version of an article rather than the post-print, or by not requesting an embargo or waiver when one is required by the publisher).

In May, the committee considered questions related to the Academic Senate Open Access policy and working with publishers. The questions include whether publishers who currently require waivers understand that an embargo is an option that may satisfy both their requirements and the policies, how short an embargo publishers would be willing to entertain, and what authors are willing to compromise in exchange for automatic delivery of post-prints from publishers if they are able to offer this service. UCOLASC also considered and discussed strategies for increasing faculty compliance with the Senate's policy and this matter will be discussed further in the year ahead.

The committee briefly discussed the Presidential Open Access policy this year. New human resources

feeds are informing the Symplectic Elements system so that it will look for publications from all UC employees covered by this policy who publish academic scholarly articles. The committee will continue to discuss implementation issues such as how to include non-Senate authors who do not own copyright to their work and how a 'scholarly article' is defined.

Regional Library Facility Planning

UCOLASC received updates at each meeting from the chair of the Council of University Librarians, Lorelei Tanji (UCI), on a variety of topics including Regional Library Facility (RLF) planning. UC has the second-largest number of volumes held in the U.S., second only to the Library of Congress. The RLFs play an important role in storing physical research collections off campus, which can be retrieved via interlibrary loan. While the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) was able to free up some storage space after the relocation of the UCLA Film and Television Archive, the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) in Richmond still has severe space constraints. Based on recent deposit allocations, the facilities will both reach their fill date by 2018. To address these issues, the Shared Libraries Facilities Board (SLFB) has been reconvened. This includes CoUL members plus RLF Directors, a Librarians Association of UC (LAUC) representative, the California Digital Library Shared Print Manager, and other staff.

CoUL met with President Napolitano on February 12 to discuss the UC Libraries' collections, the UC Regional Library Facilities, and open access and open data. The group received a positive response from the President, who understands the value of libraries and how important they are. The President instructed the ULs to submit a written proposal for funding storage facilities expansion. Chair Tanji thanked UCOLASC for its support, which was a key to getting the President's approval. The ULs are preparing a proposal for a feasibility and engineering planning study and will look to next year's budget cycle to obtain funding. The proposed expansion of the NRLF is intended to provide storage for all ten UC campuses for the next ten to fifteen years. The proposal also recommends that a new library collection storage evaluation is funded after the NRLF's Phase 4 in an effort to plan ahead. This will continue to be of import for the whole UC system.

California Open Educational Resources Council

UCOLASC received a presentation in February about the status of the [California Open Educational Resources Council](#) (COERC) from Council member Professor Peter Krapp from UCI. COERC is an intersegmental council with representatives from the California Community Colleges, the California State University system and the UC system. The first piece of legislation (AB 798) created the Council and other legislation called for the creation of the repository. The Council was created to coordinate the work of all three segments on the goal of creating at least fifty viable textbooks that can be sustained into perpetuity. In year one, the Council worked quickly to identify the available resources and to set up test cases to determine if the books created by others could meet the needs of California students. Fifty classes were identified across the three segments and in different disciplines and COERC identified open educational resources that are already available.

The timeline for AB 798 activities ends this summer. After May, the Council's work will be completed and over the summer there will be a review process of the resources. In order to maintain all of the open educational resources vetted and approved already, there will have to be some process for updating them. There are no more specific UC deliverables but on a volunteer basis UC faculty are still part of the process of vetting and finalizing the reports. A white paper has to be delivered to the State Senate as a final report. Case studies of campuses and their use of OER, the creation of information packets for new hires, and issuing invitations to faculty to participate as experts are some of the final activities for the Council. COERC has not reached the point where it is ready to scale beyond the fifty courses. As an institution, UC has not put a structure in place that encourages faculty to make materials available in OER. Funding should be available for the small number of faculty who are experts in developing

textbooks. The available resources can be found on the Cool4Ed website and the ICAS website has a COERC section.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians

UCOLASC met with the University Librarians in February to discuss common topics of interest including open access and the Mellon grant-funded Pay It Forward Project conducted by the CDL and UC Davis.

Campus Reports

UCOLASC devoted part of each regular meeting to member reports about issues facing divisional Senate library committees. In these discussions, faculty members touched on library budget and space issues on their respective campuses.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCOLASC acknowledges the contributions of its administrative consultants and guests. The committee benefited from consultation and reports from University Librarians Convener Lorelei Tanji (UCI), CDL Director of Collections Ivy Anderson, CDL Director of Publishing Catherine Mitchell, and Librarians Association of the University of California President Diane Mizrachi (UCLA). UCOLASC also consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice chair about issues facing the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Eric Bakovic, Chair (SD)
Dennis Ventry (D)
Karl Ryavec (M)
Cynthia Darling (SF)
Thomas Shannon (B)
David Sabean (LA)

Luca De Alfaro, Vice Chair (SC)
Sean Walsh (I)
Leonard Nunney (R)
Eileen Zurbruggen (SC)
Candace Waid (SB)
Oumelbanine Nina Zhiri (SD)

Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (R))
Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))
Brenda Abrams, Principal Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) held eight in-person meetings and two teleconferences in Academic Year 2015-16 to conduct business pursuant to its duties to advise the President and other University agencies on policy regarding planning, budget, and resource allocation as outlined in Senate Bylaw 190 and in the *University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units* (the “Compendium”). The major activities of UCPB and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

BUDGET AND ENROLLMENT

Senior leaders from the UCOP Offices of the Chief Financial Officer and Government Relations joined UCPB to inform the committee about the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, budget contingency planning, capital projects, tuition policy, proposed performance outcome measures, and other UC-specific budget matters.

Last year’s budget negotiations between President Napolitano and Governor Brown led to a budget framework that included several programmatic details as well as funding dicta. Of most concern to UCPB was the requirement to enroll an additional 5000 California undergraduates for the 16-17 academic year; UCPB was concerned that these students would not have adequate housing available, adequate classroom space available, and adequate instruction time made available. UCPB heard monthly from UCOP about enrollment planning contingencies occurring at the campuses, as well as how the enrollment increase was to be allocated by campus. UCPB again called for meaningful enrollment planning that would recapture the education narrative which the state is currently driving by focusing exclusively on California undergraduate admissions, rather than overall educational environment and academic quality after enrollment.

A comprehensive long-term enrollment plan would address graduate and professional school enrollment, too. These students perform essential functions as aides, tutors, and researchers, and they fill the pipeline from which future faculty are chosen. Being able to recruit and retain quality and diverse graduate students requires strategic planning and financial support.

This year the state conducted an audit of UC, and its findings were unkind to the University; the University has issued counterstatements that dispute the methodology employed by the auditor, the assumptions used, and the short-term focus of the state report. UCPB offered to help draft and edit statements and to help prepare data for evaluation.

UCPB hopes that with the budget predictability offered by the budget deals crafted under President Napolitano, out-year planning can occur in earnest beginning in 16-17. After all, it is unclear how many additional “efficiencies” can be found following years of serial budget cuts; new sources of funding will be necessary to ensure no further degradation of UC academic quality.

UCPB received regular reports on the Berkeley campus structural budget shortfall. Plans to consolidate academic programs, find administrative “efficiencies” including the layoff of up to 500 staff members, and restructure campus operations are still emerging. The local CPB and Senate leadership are involved, but high turnover among senior leadership has undermined confidence in many quarters. The likelihood that other campuses will face similar situations demands that this first instance must be handled carefully and transparently.

FINANCE

UCPB met with the Chief Financial Officer division regarding capital project planning and funding. Of particular focus was the Merced 2020 plan: the road envisioned to bring UC Merced into full flight as a mature campus. External economic pressures and local considerations have forced the reconceptualization of the Merced campus growth plan into a design, build, finance, operate, and maintain (DBFOM) model that has a strong pedigree in Europe, but is new to the United States and to higher education projects. The Regents approved this process in spring 2016, and UCPB will continue to monitor its progress.

UCPB learned more about UC's captive insurance program, Fiat Lux. The program is designed to save UC money by providing services in-house that were previously purchased from external vendors, in this case, in the area of insurance and re-insurance, or to avail of better commercial rates. UC is now able to manage its own debt in some instances, such as cash-on-hand for legal payouts and operating costs, which allows UC flexibility in how to leverage those funds while in abeyance. UC can also insure others' premium funds, and leverage those moneys, too. By not using external markets, UC can save administrator fees and other costs; considering the size of UC insurance bills, these savings are expected to total in the millions over time.

GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH SUPPORT

University support for graduate programs also received much discussion by UCPB this year. The administration continues to develop guidelines to govern self-supporting graduate and professional degree programs (SSGPDPs) and to determine when increases in professional degree supplemental tuition (PDST) are appropriate. This year, UCPB continued routine review of SSGPDP proposals. UCPB developed an evaluation template based on the Academic Planning Council's SSGPDP proposal guidelines, and assigned each proposal a lead reviewer. UCPB noted on many proposals that faculty are expected to teach or supervise capstone type projects on an overload basis, and that long-term physical plant costs are often not considered in a realistic way. As SSGPDP proposals increase, the need for increased budget exactitude becomes clear. A budget template used at the campus level will be included in materials submitted for systemwide evaluation starting in 16-17.

UCPB also met with Provost Dorr to discuss doctoral student support and the institution's role in protecting and promoting graduate education and research. A new vice president for research and graduate studies was appointed after UCPB's final meeting of the year; the new committee will work closely with the new VP next year to strengthen support for graduate education and research.

INVESTMENT POLICY

This year, UC received the first of three "one-time" payments from the state for UCRP in recognition of achieving its enrollment target and launching a new pension tier as agreed to in last year's budget deal. The new tier emerged from a joint Senate-administration working group's recommendations to President Napolitano, who then made her slightly adjusted recommendation to the Regents. The new tier offers new hires a choice between a DB and a DC plan, with the option to switch election at the 5-year or tenure review. Hires who elect the DB plan can enroll in a supplemental DC plan for income that exceeds the PEPR limit; the supplemental plan is open to eligible faculty starting on the first day of hire, and to other employee groups once they pass the PEPR threshold. One UCPB critique of the new tier was to the paradoxical instruction to create a competitive plan that would save money. UCPB focused efforts on encouraging clear communications and education of new hires, and those who hired them. The long-term funding stability of UCRP requires additional influxes of cash, despite the lower normal cost of the new tier; legacy costs have not been addressed, and market volatility leads many to question the minimum funding ratio the plan must have.

CASH COMPENSATION AND HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS

Following promulgation of the 2014 Total Remuneration Study for ladder-rank faculty, UCPB was alarmed at the deterioration in UC's remunerative competitiveness, especially in terms of cash compensation and the disproportionate impact on mid-career faculty still bound by UC's once "golden hand-cuffs". In response, a joint Senate-administration work group was formed to advise the President on (1) how best to allocate the current year's 3% salary increase, and (2) how best to close the 12% cash compensation gap over the next few years. UCPB was disappointed that the workgroup's advice on (1) did not receive traction, and that it was disbanded before it opined on (2). Instead, President Napolitano decreed that 1.5% would be allocated across the board, and that the other 1.5% would be allocated at local discretion to address equity, compression, inversion, and exceptional merit. The required reporting on the salary administration does not indicate that significant achievement was made in any of the four target areas, and overall, the UC faculty salary lag is greater than it was last year. Future salary increases might be expected to be administered under the same presidential guidelines, so the Senate must think creatively to find steps to close the compensation gap. As with other budget issues, selling academic quality to Sacramento or voters or philanthropists remains an uphill battle.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

- Agriculture and Natural Resources: UCPB kept abreast of developments in ANR through its representative to the Academic Council Special Committee on ANR, Riverside Representative Barish. UCPB also met with senior officials from ANR to understand and appreciate the unique financial situation of ANR and to begin to brainstorm paths forward. At the end of the year, it was determined to disband ACSCANR and empanel a new standing subcommittee on ANR that will report directly to UCPB. Populating the new group and finding leadership will occur over the fall.
- Education Abroad Program: UCPB participates in the EAP governing committee. UCPB remains concerned that structural budget issues remain unresolved, and communicated these concerns to Provost Dorr. EAP received a new Associate Vice Provost/Executive Director this year, and UCPB looks forward to working closely with her.
- DOE National Labs: UCPB was represented on the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues by Vice Chair Sadoulet, and received regular updates on issues of interest from the labs. Management fees from the LLC in which UC partners are diminishing, and governance and operating concerns with LLC partners have arisen.

CORRESPONDENCE

In addition to memoranda addressing the above, UCPB submitted opinions and analyses on the following:

- Proposed Revisions to SBL 140 (UCAAD)
- Proposed Changes to the Search Waiver Policy
- Proposed Amendments to SR 417 and 621
- Proposed Changes to the President's Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- UC Mexus 15-year Academic Review
- 10 Proposed SSGPDPs

UCPB REPRESENTATION

Chair Shane White represented UCPB at the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, the Academic Planning Council, the Provost's Budget Advisory Group, and the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC). He also served on the UC Education Abroad Program Governing

Committee and was Chair of Finance Committee for UCEAP. UCPB Riverside Representative Kenneth Barish represented UCPB on the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture & Natural Resources (ACSCANR), and Vice Chair Sadoulet was also a member of the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee and the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCPB is most grateful to the following committee consultants and guests for their valuable contributions: Provost Aimée Dorr; Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning Debora Obley; Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning; Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson; Executive Vice President and CFO Nathan Brostrom; Controller Peggy Arrivas, and Chief Risk Officer Cheryl Lloyd.

Respectfully submitted:

Shane White, <i>Chair</i> (UCLA)	Sonia Ramamoorthy, San Diego
Bernard Sadoulet, <i>Vice Chair</i> (UCB)	Russ Pieper, San Francisco
Jenna Johnson-Hanks, Berkeley	Josh Schimel, Santa Barbara
Mitchell Sutter, Davis	Abel Rodriguez, Santa Cruz
Jim Steintrager, Irvine	
Francesco Chiappelli and Monica Smith, Los Angeles	
Mukesh Singhal, Merced	Gerard Ochoa, Undergraduate Student
Ken Barish, Riverside	Paul Monge, Graduate Student

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2015-16 Academic Year, the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) met twice and the UCOPE English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group met once. Both groups considered matters in accordance with their duties as set forth in Senate Bylaw 192, which states that UCOPE shall advise the President on matters relating to preparatory and remedial education (including the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds); monitor and conduct periodic reviews and evaluations of preparatory and remedial education; supervise the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement; monitor the development and use of placement examinations in mathematics; and work with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools to communicate these standards to all high schools and colleges in California.

A summary of the committee's activities and accomplishments follows below:

Review and Selection of Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Essay Prompts

Under the leadership of consultant George Gadda, UCOPE members approved selected writing prompts to be used in the 2016 UC-AWPE administration, in accord with Senate Regulation 636B.1. This annual event involved UCOPE members evaluating excerpts from a variety of publications for which the AWPE Committee has secured copyright permission. This process ensures that norming procedures used in evaluation of the exam would be consistent with SR 636A and SR 636B.1.

Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions, reported that the program continues to be financially stable. The exam revenue will continue to slowly drop as the number of test takers with fee waivers slowly rises. UC tested over 16k students at the May 14th administration. The number of students paying the full fee is 45.6%, 36% pay no fee, and 18% pay the reduced fee of \$20. This is the second year in a row where the number of students paying the full fee did not change. The five year contract with the vendor has been finalized for October 2016 to September 30, 2020. The program is trying to maintain a small financial cushion for expenses that are not anticipated.

At the April meeting, under the guidance of AWPE Committee Chair Gadda samples of student exams were read and calibrated in advance of the May administration. Committee members ranked student essays according to a scale established by the AWPE Committee. This process determines the threshold for a passing essay.

AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader

As described in the [2014-15 Annual Report](#), UCOPE was prepared to take the lead in the search for a new Chair of the AWPE Committee and Chief Reader and a transition plan was endorsed by the Academic Council on July 29, 2015. However, as a result of additional discussion at UCOPE's meetings this year, it became apparent that the committee did not possess the resources needed to carry out the search for a replacement. Subsequently, the Senate leadership consulted with the Administration in the spring and the decision was made for UCOP's Undergraduate Admissions unit to be responsible for hiring the new AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader. In the fall, Undergraduate Admissions will consult with UCOPE about the requirements of the position and the Chief Reader's role and responsibilities.

The Redesigned SAT Exam and the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR)

The committee discussed the newly redesigned SAT Exam and how it will satisfy the ELWR. The first administration of the new exam was in May 2016 and it will be several years before there is data to help

UCOPE determine how to treat the exam. It is expected that UCOPE will make a final decision about the new SAT in January 2017.

EMS Advisory Group

The campuses continue to actively manage issues related to the increased enrollment of students who are multilingual including international students as well as native students whose primary language is not English. During its meeting this year, the EMS Advisory Group outlined a number of action items the members will work on in the future including activities focused upon professional development and specific services/supports for this particular student population.

UCOPE Representation

UCOPE Chair Caroline Streeter represented the committee at meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

Acknowledgements

UCOPE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: UCLA Writing Program Director and Chair of the Analytical Writing Placement Examination Committee George Gadda; EMS Advisory Group Chair Dana Ferris and all members of the EMS Advisory Group; Director of Undergraduate Admissions Michael Treviño; AWPE Coordinator Julie Lind; and, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu. The committee also thanks the numerous faculty members who, as alternates, kindly represented their respective campuses at UCOPE meetings this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline Streeter, Chair (LA)

Robert Newcomb (D)

John William Gary (R)

Carrie Wastal (SD)

Darlene Francis (B)

Michelle Fregoso (Undergraduate Student Representative)

Bradley Queen, Vice Chair (I)

Sholeh Quinn (M)

Benjamin Brecher (SB)

Carol Miller (SF)

Gabriel Elkaim (SC)

Dan Hare (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (R))

Jim Chalfant (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (D))

Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

University Committee on Research Policy

Annual Report 2015-16

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research; for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures; and for advising the President on research. During the 2015-16 academic year, UCORP met eight times, seven in person and once via teleconference. This report briefly outlines the committee's activities during the year.

RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

1. UC MEXUS Review

UCORP spent much of the 2015-16 year working on a “sunset” or 15-year review of the University of California Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC MEXUS). UCORP led the Senate review, with participation from UCPB and CCGA. UCORP members reviewed extensive written materials prepared by UC MEXUS and the UC Research Grants Program Office for the review. The Chairs and Vice Chairs of the three participating Senate committees met via teleconference to plan the details of the review process, including developing interview questions for the UC MEXUS Executive Director, Program Directors and Advisory Board. The informal joint subcommittee conducted phone interviews with the two UC MEXUS Program Directors and with the Institute's Advisory Board. The UC MEXUS Review report was submitted to Academic Council for transmittal to Provost Aimée Dorr on May 13, 2016.

2. Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) Opportunities and President's Catalyst Award

The [Multicampus Research Program Initiative \(MRPI\)](#) program supports innovative multicampus research collaborations, with competitive grant funding from campus assessment. The planning/pilot awards, intended to stimulate new collaborations, provide up to two years of funding, while the program awards provide up to four years of funding to support new or established research collaborations. The President's Research Catalyst award, which was first offered two years ago with funding from the President's Endowment Fund, will this year be folded into the MRPI process and will be awarded to selected highly regarded applicants to be chosen by the President. UCORP members provided feedback on the draft MRPI RFP, which was finalized and sent out to campuses in the spring.

3. UC Laboratory Fees Research Program

The UC Lab Fees Research Program is funded by a portion of the fees the University receives for its management of the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Labs. A new request for proposals (RFP) was released in April, 2016. This year there are two funding opportunities: a “UC Multicampus-National Lab Collaborative Research and Training (UC-NL CRT) Award” and a “UC-National Lab In-Residence Graduate Fellowship” for doctoral graduate students. Three targeted areas of focus were identified for the multi-campus awards that align with the research interests of UC-lab

collaborations: biological applications of advanced computing, high energy density science, and mesoscale materials science. Although the multi-campus collaborative opportunity requires participation by a minimum of four campuses and either LANL or LLNL, the program received 33 viable letters of intent. After extensive review by multidisciplinary panels, 3-5 proposals will be funded. The graduate fellows opportunity received 22 letters of intent, of which approximately 4 will be funded.

4. Portfolio Review Group

UCORP was asked for comment on the Portfolio Review Group (PRG) follow up compilation of strategic plans from five UC programs: California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology 2 (calit2), Center for Information Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS), California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI), UC Natural Reserve System (NRS), and the UCSD Supercomputer Center. UCORP sent a letter with its review of the plans to Interim Vice President Bill Tucker on December 15, 2015.

In June, UCORP heard an update from Natural Reserve System Director Peggy Fiedler on the organization's strategic planning efforts and 50th anniversary capital campaign. NRS is the largest field station operator in the world, with 39 reserves and over 756,000 acres.

5. Multicampus Research Unit Reviews

In June, after the completion of the UC MEXUS Review, committee members met with Provost Aimée Dorr and the Research Grants Program Office staff to discuss future Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) reviews. In recent years, oversight of MRUs decreased significantly as UCOP staff were cut in the 2000s. Communication between MRUs and UCOP decreased in the intervening years, and the review schedule languished. However, with a new Vice President starting this summer and a more stable budget, there is now an opportunity to strengthen relationships and focus attention on the structures in place for evaluating MRUs. While the Portfolio Review Group addressed some concerns, there is still uncertainty around which multicampus units need to go through a systemwide review. UCORP and Provost Dorr agreed that, under UC's system of joint governance, research entities that receive systemwide funding should be periodically reviewed by the Academic Senate, with UCORP as lead committee.

6. Status of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies

UCORP learned that the Innovation Alliances and Services portion of the Office of Research and Graduate Studies will be spun off into a new Office of Research Innovation and Entrepreneurship, led by a new Senior Vice President reporting directly to President Napolitano. On May 12 the Regents approved Christine Gulbranson as senior vice president for research innovation and entrepreneurship at UCOP.

In the fall, UCORP consulted with Provost Dorr on the expectations and job description for the open position of Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. UCORP Chair Judith Habicht Mauche served on the search committee for the new Vice President of RGS and provided updates to UCORP on the progress of the search.

7. Additional updates and items

UCORP heard updates from ORGS consultants about state and federal legislation, the impact of a Congressional investigation into fetal tissue research, proposed changes to the Common Rule, indirect cost recovery delegations of authority, the need for a new UC policy on conflict of interest disclosures, and a recently established “center of excellence” for drone use at UC Merced. UCORP consulted for the second time on a proposed Openness in Research Policy brought by Research Policy Analysis and Coordination. The policy drafters will continue to seek input and will revise the policy in preparation for review next year.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES

UC Vice President for the National Laboratories Kim Budil attended UCORP meetings to provide updates on the National Labs and the status of the Los Alamos contract. The Office of National Laboratories is interested in building and strengthening relationships between campuses and the labs, and welcomed suggestions for bringing lab opportunities to the attention of the campuses. Suggestions offered by UCORP members included on-campus colloquia and presentations, hands-on instruction in how to collaborate with the national labs, and how to prepare a proposal for the UC Laboratory Fees Research Program. In April, 2016, discussion was wide-ranging and delved into the extent of UC’s involvement in the labs, the mission-driven projects and work priorities of the labs, research output, national security, intellectual property rights, and more.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Research Infrastructure: UCORP heard from UCOP CIO Tom Andriola about a proposed cyberinfrastructure initiative to support UC’s research enterprise. Still in the planning stages, the proposed campus-led “alliance” is seeking seed funding. The infrastructure is anticipated to include access to collaboration tools, an expertise service, support of data as research assets (to be managed, curated, published and preserved), and connected and interoperable platforms. UCORP will keep abreast of actions in this area so that campus faculty are informed.

Cybersecurity: In June, 2016, CIO Tom Andriola provided an update on the status of network security measures that are being considered and undertaken by UC. UC will sign a systemwide contract with a security vendor and will mandate a minimum level of network security. However, each campus and health center will be locally responsible for working out the details, including any additional security measures.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (ANR)

The Vice President of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Glenda Humiston gave an overview and provided background on the work of ANR and its relation to the campuses and the university as a whole. UCORP will continue to foster the consultative relationship with ANR on topics such as program priorities, grant decisions, and academic issues.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

New Federal Rules for Overtime Pay: In June, 2016, UCORP received an update from Vice President of Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson and Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Director Amy Lee about new federal rules for overtime pay that

go into effect on December 1, 2016. These rules will impact researchers because research assistant salaries are generally below the threshold for overtime pay and will now have to be categorized as “non-exempt” positions eligible for overtime pay (over 40 hours per week) or increased to meet the threshold. Estimates indicate that it will cost \$36 million to raise all post-docs up to the minimum salary of \$47,476. Final decisions on UC’s course of action will rest with Provost Dorr.

Systemwide issues and campus reports: UCORP devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports on issues on individual campuses.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW PARTICIPATION AND CORRESPONDENCE REPORT

In addition to the above, UCORP responded to requests for systemwide review of policies and items of systemwide import:

- Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Sections on Clinical Series Titles (Revised 278, 210-6, 279, 112, and new Section 350)
- Management Review of Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 417 and 621
- Proposed Revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment
- Regents Item J2 – Proposed Revisions to the Governance of UC Health

UCORP REPRESENTATION

UCORP Chair Judith Habicht Mauche participated on the following systemwide bodies during the year: Academic Assembly, Academic Council, Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues, Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the Academic Planning Council. Chair Habicht Mauche also served on the search committee for a new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies. Throughout the year, the Chair provided updates on the activities of these groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCORP members would like to acknowledge their UCSF colleague Dieter Gruenert, who passed away in April.

UCORP is most grateful to its consultants, who have provided invaluable information and perspective to the committee: William Tucker, Interim Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS); Mary Croughan, Executive Director for Research Grants and Program Office (RGPO), ORGS; Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Research Initiatives, RGPO; Wendy Streitz, Executive Director for Research Policy Analysis and Coordination (RPAC), ORGS; Jeff Hall, Director of Research Policy Development (ORGS); and Kimberly Budil, Vice President for the National Laboratories. Christopher Spitzer from UC Research Initiatives was enormously helpful in tracking, compiling, and organizing the materials for the UC MEXUS review.

UCORP also wishes to thank its invited guests and campus alternates for their participation and support, as well as colleagues across the system who brought to the attention of the committee research-related issues of concern.

Respectfully submitted, UCORP 2015-16:

Judith Habicht Mauche, Chair (UCSC)
Srikantan Nagarajan, Vice Chair (UCSF)
Ramona Naddaff, UCB
David Pleasure, UCD
Edward Dimendberg, UCI
Mark Cohen, UCLA
Deborah Wiebe (fall) / Ajay Gopinathan (spring), UCM
Richard Arnott, UCR
Isaac Martin, UCSD
Dieter Gruenert, UCSF
Jeffrey Richman, UCSB
Steve Whittaker, UCSC
Alexander Dodge, Undergraduate Student Representative (UCSD)
Rachel Hatano, Graduate Student Representative (UCR)
J. Daniel Hare, Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio* (UCR)
James Chalfant, Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*, (UCD)
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst (UCOP)

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. Amendment to Academic Senate Bylaw 125.B [ACTION]

The Academic Council recommended at its October 26, 2016 meeting that Senate Bylaw 125.B, which defines the authority and duties of the Academic Council, be amended as described below to give Council the authority to select a Senate nominee to the Health Services Committee of the Board of Regents. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has certified that the legislation is consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Amendment to Senate Bylaw 125.

Justification for Revisions to Senate Bylaw 125.B

In November 2015, the Academic Senate was asked to nominate a UC faculty representative from a School of Medicine to the new Health Services Committee of the Board of Regents. The new Committee was approved by the Regents on November 19 and is described in [Regents Bylaw 12.7](#). The amendment to Senate Bylaw 125.B codifies the authority of the Council to select a Senate nominee to the Health Services Committee. The authority is described in new Section 14 of 125.B. It is expected that when a vacancy appears on the Committee, Council will request nominations of candidates from the campuses and select the final nominee. Candidates must be Senate members who hold a clinical appointment at a UC School of Medicine. The successful candidate also will serve as an ex-officio member of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare Task Force on the Future of UC Health Care Plans.

Title III. Academic Council

125. Academic Council

- A. Membership. The Academic Council shall consist of the following members:
1. The Chair of the Assembly, who is the Chair of the Academic Council;
 2. The Vice Chair of the Assembly, who is the Vice Chair of the Academic Council;
 3. The Chairs of the Divisions; (Am 4 May 89)
 4. The Chairs of the following University Standing Committees:
 - Academic Personnel
 - Affirmative Action and Diversity (Am 09 May 2007)
 - Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
 - Educational Policy
 - Faculty Welfare
 - Graduate Affairs
 - Planning and Budget
 - Research Policy (Am 28 May 2003)

In the absence or disability of the Chair of a Division or Standing Committee the Vice Chair of that Division or Standing Committee shall serve on the Council with full privileges. In the absence or disability of both the Chair and Vice Chair of a Division or Standing Committee, the appropriate Committee on Committees shall appoint a replacement, who shall have full privileges, for the specified meeting(s) of the Council. (Am 2 Dec 81; Am 4 May 89)

- B. Authority and Duties [See [Legislative Ruling 2.86](#)]
1. The Academic Council shall serve as the Executive Committee of the Assembly (Am 12 May 2004)

2. The Academic Council normally shall advise the President of the University on behalf of the Assembly. [See [Bylaw 115.E](#)]
3. The Academic Council shall have the continuing responsibility to request committees of the Senate to investigate and report to the Council or to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.
4. The Academic Council shall appoint two Senate members to serve on the Advisory Board of the University of California Retirement System. (En 4 May 89; CC 28 May 2003)
5. The Academic Council shall have the authority to consider proposals for Divisional status, and to recommend to the Assembly that Divisional status be conferred. (En 9 March 05)
6. If a proposed Divisional Regulation, which has been submitted to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for approval, is at variance with Universitywide Regulations and cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Divisional action, the Academic Council, with the advice of the appropriate University Senate committees, is authorized to approve provisionally such proposed Regulations. Such approval is effective until the end of the next following term in which a regular Assembly meeting is held. Such approval must be reported to the Assembly. [See [Bylaw 115.F](#) and [Bylaw 206.D](#)] (CC 9 March 05)
7. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs shall submit to the Academic Council for final action on behalf of the Assembly proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees submitted in accordance with [Bylaw 180.B.5](#) when such proposals cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within thirty calendar days after Committee action. (Am 10 Dec 2014; Am 7 Jun 72)
8. In accordance with [Bylaw 65](#) the Academic Council shall act upon appeals of curricular decisions by Universitywide Senate committees.
9. In accordance with [Bylaws 110.A.3.b and 110.A.3.e](#) the Academic Council shall be consulted by the Chair of the Assembly concerning the schedule of, the setting of agendas for, and the cancellation of regular meetings of the Assembly.
10. With the concurrence of a majority of the Academic Council an emergency meeting of the Assembly may be called by the Chair of the Assembly or, in the Chair's absence or disability, by the Vice Chair, as specified in [Bylaw 110.A.3.d](#) .
11. Special meetings may be called as specified in [Bylaw 110.A.3.c](#) .
12. Any action item, other than a Bylaw amendment, noticed for a meeting of the Assembly that does not achieve quorum, may be acted upon by the Academic Council. Such action must be reported to the Assembly in the Call of the next regular or special meeting of the Assembly. (En 12 May 2004)
13. The Academic Council is empowered to establish Special Committees. (En 12 May 2004; CC 9 March 2005)
14. The Academic Council shall nominate to the President an Academic Senate member who holds a clinical appointment at a UC School of Medicine to serve on the Health Services Committee of the Board of Regents. The member serving in this role shall also be an ex-officio member of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare Task Force on the Future of UC Health Care Plans.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

2. Amendments to Academic Personnel Manual Sections 015 and 016 [ACTION]

At its January 18, 2017 meeting, the Academic Council voted unanimously to recommend to the Assembly the approval of proposed revisions to APM sections 015 (the Faculty Code of Conduct) and 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline). The revisions implement policy revisions recommended by the Administration-Senate Joint Committee on investigation and adjudication processes for sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) cases involving faculty. The office of Academic Personnel proposed the language and distributed it for [systemwide review](#) in September 2016, and made subsequent revisions based on [Senate comments](#) during that review. The Assembly will consider conforming amendments to Senate Bylaw 335 and 336 at a future meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Amendments to APM Sections 015 and 016.



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

January 17, 2017

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR JIM CHALFANT

Re: Revisions to Academic Personnel Policy Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual, The Faculty Code of Conduct (APM - 015), and Section 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline (APM - 016)

Dear Jim:

As you well know, the University has been vigorously engaged in meeting President Napolitano's goal that UC be the national leader in prevention and response to sexual violence, sexual assault, and sexual harassment. A portion of that work involves changes to Academic Personnel Policy. The next section of this letter provides extensive background on this work, followed by sections that provide an analysis of comments received on the proposed policy changes and explication of decisions I needed to make to complete the work. I am copying all those who were informed about the systemwide review, so that they too may know the current status of the work.

I am conveying to you, as Chair of the Academic Council, proposed revisions to Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM - 015), The Faculty Code of Conduct, and Section 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline (APM - 016) (attached). It is my understanding that the Academic Council will consider these revisions and, if endorsed, place them on the agenda for the Academic Assembly to consider at their February 8, 2017 meeting. Those revisions that involve The Faculty Code of Conduct will need to be approved by the UC Board of Regents. The President will review and transmit the proposed revisions to The Regents.

Background

In October 2015, President Napolitano convened the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate "to examine how the University of California manages disciplinary proceedings for faculty respondents in cases alleging sexual violence, sexual assault or sexual harassment (SVSH)." To fulfill the President's charge, the Joint Committee examined the systemwide Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy (SVSH) and the systemwide policies governing faculty conduct and the discipline process, among them APM - 015, APM - 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 (Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees – Disciplinary Cases). The Joint Committee found that "...in general, the policies are reasonable and adequately describe the key steps involved in the investigation and discipline process...They allow discretion to deal with complexities of individual cases in which a faculty member is subject to possible discipline based on allegations involving any of the full spectrum of offenses that violate The Faculty Code of Conduct. The policies give the Administration the authority and responsibility to investigate any allegations of misconduct, including SVSH, and to impose discipline while providing that the accused faculty member has the right to a hearing prior to the imposition of a

disciplinary sanction. The policies also specify the forms of sanction that may be imposed through the formal discipline process, leaving broad discretion to implement other administrative measures to remediate or mitigate a situation without implicating the faculty disciplinary process” (p. 14).

Nonetheless, among the recommendations provided to President Napolitano both in the Joint Committee’s initial Report (April 4, 2016) and also in its Supplemental Report (August 1, 2016), there were several proposed changes to APM - 015 and APM - 016. The President accepted all of the Joint Committee’s recommendations, including the proposed changes to the APM. Representatives from the Office of the President and the systemwide Academic Senate drafted the proposed policy revisions to the APM, and the systemwide Academic Senate drafted conforming revisions to Senate Bylaws 335 and 336. The remainder of this letter addresses only the proposed APM revisions.

Response to Systemwide Review – September 21, 2016 to December 21, 2016

During Systemwide Review (September 21 to December 21, 2016), we received comments from administrators on nine campuses as well as significant Academic Senate input from all 10 divisional Senates as well as five systemwide committees. My staff and I have analyzed the comments and, based on this input, I am now proposing some new draft revisions intended to be responsive to the Joint Committee’s recommendations as well as the substantive feedback submitted during the consultation period. The several concerns that surfaced during the systemwide review and involve policy revisions other than those directly related to the recommendations of the Joint Committee are being collected, and they will be considered at a future time.

An analysis of the major themes expressed in comments and my decisions follow below, according to the corresponding section of policy.

Revisions to APM - 015, The Faculty Code of Conduct

Section II.A, C, and D, Types of Unacceptable Conduct. The Joint Committee recommended that explicit language be added to APM - 015 to clarify that incidents of SVSH are violations of The Faculty Code of Conduct. Given the organization of APM - 015, this entails the addition of such language in three different places.

Reviewers were generally supportive of this addition to language; thus, I have accepted the Joint Committee’s recommendation and these proposed policy revisions. Some reviewers proposed that the added statement on sexual violence and sexual harassment would more appropriately be incorporated into non-discrimination language. This proposal will be archived for review at a future date, since current long-standing non-discrimination language in APM - 015 is intended to mirror the federal non-discrimination language.

Please note that Section C has been revised, as proposed in another parallel Systemwide Review (November 1, 2016) of the Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Regarding Academic and Staff Employment, to reflect recent amendments to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs’ (OFCCP) pay transparency rule. Proposed changes to APM - 015 add the California FEHA-related protections to existing language regarding non-discrimination and anti-harassment under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

Section III.A and B, Enforcement and Sanctions. The Joint Committee report also addressed issues surrounding what many refer to as the “three-year rule.” As stated in the April 4, 2016 Joint Committee Report, “...an often repeated critique of the Senate discipline process is that it includes a ‘statute of

limitations' that prevents discipline for any offense that occurred more than three years in the past" (p. 24). The Joint Committee went on to add that it found this critique "completely untrue" (p. 24). To address these misunderstandings, the Joint Committee recommended draft language to clarify what the "three year rule" is and is not. As stated in the August 1, 2016 Joint Committee Supplemental Report, "...Following consultation with the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, Joint Committee Co-chair Hare and Joint Committee members Blumenthal, Dorr, Pantelia, and Simon crafted language to meet multiple goals so that the provision clarifies: 1) when the Chancellor is deemed to know about an SVSH allegation; 2) when the Chancellor must initiate any related disciplinary action; 3) how the related disciplinary action is communicated to the respondent; and 4) that there is no time limit for reporting an alleged violation" (p. 20). The proposed draft also includes a technical correction to update "informal disposition" to "early resolution," language that is contained within Section III.B.

The proposed revisions solicited substantial comments. Some reviewers believe that three years is excessively long. Others asked for clarification whether the "three-year rule" applies to sexual misconduct only or to any violation of The Faculty Code of Conduct; whether the rule represents a firm statute of limitations or a guideline; and whether the rule relates to California state law prohibiting a statute of limitations in SVSH cases. As proposed in the revised policy language, the "three-year rule" remains a firm deadline by which a Chancellor may file disciplinary charges based on an allegation of any violation of The Faculty Code of Conduct, including allegations of misconduct related to sexual violence and sexual harassment. It is a long-standing rule adopted by the University in 2002; it is consistent with California state law related to allegations of SVSH but not prompted by enactment of a new 2016 California law.

Reviewers offered several comments about the statement that "There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation." The Joint Committee recommended this statement to clarify the difference between a deadline date for pursuing discipline and any potential deadline date for filing a report of an alleged violation of The Faculty Code of Conduct. The "three-year rule" imposes a three-year deadline, from the date the Chancellor knew or should have known about the report, to pursue formal disciplinary proceedings. There is no deadline date by which a complainant may file a report. In the case of an SVSH allegation, an individual may file a report of an alleged violation at any time or date, with any Responsible Employee, the Title IX Office, or the Chancellor or designee. As is also true for any perceived violation of The Faculty Code of Conduct, an individual may file a report at any time or date with the department chair or other senior administrative officer, the whistleblower hotline or locally designated official, or the campus ethics and compliance office.

Revisions to APM - 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and The Administration of Discipline

The Joint Committee also proposed changes to APM - 016. In its April 4, 2016 Report, the Joint Committee reviewed the timeline for involuntary paid leave: "APM - 016...gives campus Administrators explicit authority to place a Senate or non-Senate faculty member...on involuntary paid leave when the Administrator determines that the faculty member's presence on campus may pose a risk to campus safety or interfere with an investigation or when the Administrator learns that the faculty member has been accused of a serious crime that is being investigated by law enforcement. In an attempt to balance the demands of campus safety, the integrity of investigatory processes, and the critical need of most faculty members to come onto their campus in order to pursue their work, APM - 016 [currently] requires that the Administration decide whether to bring formal charges and inform the respondent Senate faculty member of those charges, if any, within ten days" (p. 21). The Joint Committee found that "...this time limit has proven to be untenable, as a credible investigation cannot [usually] be completed in such a short time" (pp. 21-22).

Section II, Types of Disciplinary Actions. Proposed revisions to APM - 016 recommended by the Joint Committee institute a new timeline that is practical, that can be applied consistently, and that is fair to the respondent. “ This new timeline imposes a 5-working day deadline after the imposition of involuntary leave for the Chancellor... to inform the faculty member of the reasons for the leave, the allegations being investigated, the anticipated date when charges will be brought, a statement concerning when the leave will end, and the faculty member’s right to grieve the involuntary leave to be handled by the Privilege and Tenure Committee on an expedited basis” (p. 22). Reviewers were generally supportive of the new timeline and of the proposed communication from the Chancellor to a faculty member who has been placed on involuntary leave.

Several reviewers, however, questioned the “expedited” review called for when a faculty respondent contests an involuntary leave. The instruction to Divisional Committees on Privilege and Tenure to handle such grievances “on an expedited basis” is existing language adopted in 2002, and intended to enable, when appropriate, timely reinstatement of pay and back pay in cases where pay status has been suspended. Reviewers found the term “expedited” vague and noted that an expedited grievance proceeding may weaken due process rights. Because the Joint Committee recommended retaining the “expedited basis” language, I did not want to change it. We did, however, add language that places the decision whether to request an “expedited” grievance proceeding with the faculty respondent, rather than requiring that a proceeding be expedited.

The policy changes circulated for Systemwide Review included proposed revisions placing authority with the President, instead of the Regents, to suspend the pay of a faculty member on involuntary leave pending a disciplinary action. Several reviewers objected to the proposal vesting authority in the President rather than The Regents. They expressed concern that the change could weaken procedural protections and the rights of an accused faculty member prior to engaging the disciplinary process. Given the concern and the facts that the proposed revision did not derive from recommendations of the Joint Committee nor from the University’s leadership and that suspension of pay during involuntary leave is very infrequent, I decided to drop the proposed change and maintain current language that vests authority in The Regents.

Senate Bylaws 335 (Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees – Grievance Cases) and 336 (Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees – Disciplinary Cases)

I note that several recommendations pertaining to Senate Bylaws 335 and 336 were submitted by Academic Senate divisions and systemwide committees during Systemwide Review. I understand that these recommendations will be assessed by Academic Council under your leadership and that where needed bylaw revisions will conform to the APM revisions.

Next Steps

The next steps, as you well know, are consideration by the Academic Council of the revised language in the attached drafts of the proposed revisions to APM - 015 and APM - 016 and then consideration by the Academic Assembly. Final revisions will be submitted to the President for her review and for transmittal to The Regents for review and approval. The first opportunity for consideration by The Regents is the March 2017 meeting, which would require consideration by the Academic Assembly at its scheduled meeting of February 8, 2017. I know we are all doing our best to accommodate that schedule, as it makes implementation of the APM policy revisions by July 1, 2017 quite feasible.

From the time the Joint Committee was established to today, and I anticipate continuing into the future, the Academic Senate and the Administration have worked productively together to clarify and enhance

UC policies addressing sexual violence and sexual harassment that involve faculty members. The active engagement and general goodwill are greatly appreciated. I believe that the attached proposed policy revisions are responsive both to the recommendations of the Joint Committee and also to the feedback from systemwide review of the proposed policy revisions. Thank you in advance for putting them before the Academic Council and subsequently, the Academic Assembly.

Cordially,



Aimée Dorr, Provost
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Attachments (4)

cc: President Napolitano
Chancellors
Laboratory Director Witherell
ANR Vice President Humiston
Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts
Executive Vice President Nava
Joint Committee of the Administration and the Academic Senate
Interim Senior Vice President Lohse
Vice President and General Counsel Robinson
Vice President Duckett
Vice President Ellis
Vice Provost Gullatt
Chief of Staff Grossman
Vice Provosts/Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel/Academic Affairs
Academic Personnel Directors
Deputy General Counsel Woodall
Deputy/UCOP Compliance Officer Lane
Executive Director Baxter
Interim Executive Director Lee
Director Chester
Director Henderson
Director Lockwood
Manager Donnelly
Manager Smith
Academic HR Manager Jordan
Human Resources Analyst Bello

This policy is the Faculty Code of Conduct as approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 15, 1971, and amended by the Assembly on May 30, 1974 and with amendments approved by the Assembly on March 9, 1983, May 6, 1986, May 7, 1992, October 31, 2001, May 28, 2003, and June 12, 2013, and by The Regents on July 18, 1986, May 15, 1987, June 19, 1992, November 15, 2001, July 17, 2003 and July 18, 2003. In addition, technical changes were made September 1, 1988 and June 11, 2010.

Additional policies regarding the scope and application of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the University's policies on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline are set forth in APM - 016, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

**The Faculty Code of Conduct as Approved
by the Assembly of the Academic Senate**

(Code of Professional Rights,
Responsibilities, and Conduct of University Faculty,
and University Disciplinary Procedures)

**Part II – Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles,
And Unacceptable Faculty Conduct**

.....

A. Teaching and Students

.....

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction, including:
 - (a) arbitrary denial of access to instruction;
 - (b) significant intrusion of material unrelated to the course;
 - (c) significant failure to adhere, without legitimate reason, to the rules of the faculty in the conduct of courses, to meet class, to keep office hours, or to hold examinations as scheduled;
 - (d) evaluation of student work by criteria not directly reflective of course performance;

- (e) undue and unexcused delay in evaluating student work.

- 2. Discrimination, including harassment, against a student on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.

- 3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of a student.

- 4. Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against students on the basis of disability.

- 5. Use of the position or powers of a faculty member to coerce the judgment or conscience of a student or to cause harm to a student for arbitrary or personal reasons.

- 6. Participating in or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.

7. Entering into a romantic or sexual relationship with any student for whom a faculty member has, or should reasonably expect to have in the future,¹ academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory).

8. Exercising academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for any student with whom a faculty member has a romantic or sexual relationship.

- - - -

C. The University

- - - -

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Intentional disruption of functions or activities sponsored or authorized by the University.

2. Incitement of others to disobey University rules when such incitement constitutes a clear and present danger that violence or abuse against persons or property will occur or that the University's central functions will be significantly impaired.

¹ A faculty member should reasonably expect to have in the future academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for (1) students whose academic program will require them to enroll in a course taught by the faculty member, (2) students known to the faculty member to have an interest in an academic area within the faculty member's academic expertise, or (3) any student for whom a faculty member must have academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) in the pursuit of a degree.

3. Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes.
4. Forcible detention, threats of physical harm to, or harassment of another member of the University community, that interferes with that person's performance of University activities.
5. Discrimination, including harassment, against University employees or individuals seeking employment; providing services pursuant to a contract; or applying for or engaged in an unpaid internship, volunteer capacity, or training program leading to employment on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
6. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
7. Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against employees on the basis of disability.

8. Serious violation of University policies governing the professional conduct of faculty, including but not limited to policies applying to research, outside professional activities, conflicts of commitment, clinical practices, violence in the workplace, and whistleblower protections.

D. Colleagues

- - - -

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance.
2. Discrimination, including harassment, against faculty on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.

3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
4. Violation of University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against faculty on the basis of disability.
5. Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

Part III – Enforcement and Sanctions

- A. In the development of disciplinary procedures, each Division must adhere to the following principles:
1. No disciplinary sanction for professional misconduct shall be imposed by the administration except in accordance with specified campus procedures adopted after appropriate consultation with agencies of the Academic Senate, as prescribed in the introduction to this part of the Code. Systemwide procedures for the conduct of disciplinary hearings are set forth in Academic Senate Bylaw 336.
 2. No disciplinary sanction shall be imposed until after the faculty member has had an opportunity for a hearing before the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, subsequent to a filing of a

charge by the appropriate administrative officer, as described in Academic senate Bylaw 336.

3. The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above. Additionally, for an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer. The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation.

4. The Chancellor may not initiate notice of proposed disciplinary action unless there has been a finding of *probable cause*. The *probable cause* standard means that the facts as alleged in the complaint, if true, justify the imposition of discipline for a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that the Chancellor is satisfied that the University can produce credible evidence to support the claim. In cases where the Chancellor wants a disciplinary action to proceed, the Divisional hearing committee must hold a hearing and make findings on the evidence presented unless the accused faculty member settles the matter with the Chancellor prior to the hearing or explicitly waives his or her right to a hearing.

.....

B. In the development of disciplinary procedures, it is recommended that each Division adhere to the following principles:

4. There should be provision for early resolution of allegations of faculty misconduct before formal disciplinary proceedings are instituted. Procedures should be developed for mediation of cases where mediation is viewed as acceptable by the Chancellor and the faculty member accused of misconduct. Mediators should be trained in mediation, be regarded as neutral third parties and have experience in the University environment. In cases where a settlement resolving disciplinary charges is entered into after a matter has been referred to an Academic Senate committee, the Chancellor is encouraged to consult with the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement.

This policy is the Faculty Code of Conduct as approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 15, 1971, and amended by the Assembly on May 30, 1974 and with amendments approved by the Assembly on March 9, 1983, May 6, 1986, May 7, 1992, October 31, 2001, May 28, 2003, and June 12, 2013, and by The Regents on July 18, 1986, May 15, 1987, June 19, 1992, November 15, 2001, July 17, 2003 and July 18, 2003. In addition, technical changes were made September 1, 1988 and June 11, 2010.

Additional policies regarding the scope and application of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the University's policies on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline are set forth in APM - 016, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

**The Faculty Code of Conduct as Approved
by the Assembly of the Academic Senate**

(Code of Professional Rights,
Responsibilities, and Conduct of University Faculty,
and University Disciplinary Procedures)

**Part II – Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles,
And Unacceptable Faculty Conduct**

A. Teaching and Students

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction, including:
 - (a) arbitrary denial of access to instruction;
 - (b) significant intrusion of material unrelated to the course;
 - (c) significant failure to adhere, without legitimate reason, to the rules of the faculty in the conduct of courses, to meet class, to keep office hours, or to hold examinations as scheduled;
 - (d) evaluation of student work by criteria not directly reflective of course performance;

(e) undue and unexcused delay in evaluating student work.

2. Discrimination, including harassment, against a student on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.

3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of a student.

3.4 Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against students on the basis of disability.

4.5 Use of the position or powers of a faculty member to coerce the judgment or conscience of a student or to cause harm to a student for arbitrary or personal reasons.

5.6 Participating in or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.

6.7. Entering into a romantic or sexual relationship with any student for whom a faculty member has, or should reasonably expect to have in the future,¹ academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory).

7.8. Exercising academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for any student with whom a faculty member has a romantic or sexual relationship.

.....

C. The University

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Intentional disruption of functions or activities sponsored or authorized by the University.
2. Incitement of others to disobey University rules when such incitement constitutes a clear and present danger that violence or abuse against persons or property will occur or that the University's central functions will be significantly impaired.

¹ A faculty member should reasonably expect to have in the future academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for (1) students whose academic program will require them to enroll in a course taught by the faculty member, (2) students known to the faculty member to have an interest in an academic area within the faculty member's academic expertise, or (3) any student for whom a faculty member must have academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) in the pursuit of a degree.

3. Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes.
4. Forcible detention, threats of physical harm to, or harassment of another member of the University community, that interferes with that person's performance of University activities.
5. Discrimination, including harassment, against University employees or individuals seeking employment; providing services pursuant to a contract; or applying for or engaged in an unpaid internship, volunteer capacity, or training program leading to employment on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
6. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
- ~~6-7.~~ Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against employees on the basis of disability.

7.8 Serious violation of University policies governing the professional conduct of faculty, including but not limited to policies applying to research, outside professional activities, conflicts of commitment, clinical practices, violence in the workplace, and whistleblower protections.

D. Colleagues

.....

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance.
2. Discrimination, including harassment, against faculty on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.

3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
4. Violation of University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against faculty on the basis of disability.
5. Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

Part III – Enforcement and Sanctions

* * * *

- A. In the development of disciplinary procedures, each Division must adhere to the following principles:
 1. No disciplinary sanction for professional misconduct shall be imposed by the administration except in accordance with specified campus procedures adopted after appropriate consultation with agencies of the Academic Senate, as prescribed in the introduction to this part of the Code. Systemwide procedures for the conduct of disciplinary hearings are set forth in Academic Senate Bylaw 336.
 2. No disciplinary sanction shall be imposed until after the faculty member has had an opportunity for a hearing before the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, subsequent to a filing of a

charge by the appropriate administrative officer, as described in Academic senate Bylaw 336.

3. The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above. Additionally, for an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer. The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to know about the alleged violation. No disciplinary action may commence if more than three years have passed between the time when the Chancellor knew or should have known about the alleged violation, of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the delivery of the notice of proposed disciplinary action. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation.

4. The Chancellor may not initiate notice of proposed disciplinary action unless there has been a finding of *probable cause*. The *probable cause* standard means that the facts as alleged in the complaint, if true, justify the imposition of discipline for a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that the Chancellor is satisfied that the University can produce credible evidence to support the claim. In cases where the Chancellor wants a disciplinary action to proceed, the Divisional hearing committee must hold a hearing and make findings on the evidence presented unless the accused faculty member settles the matter with the Chancellor prior to the hearing or explicitly waives his or her right to a hearing.

.....

B. In the development of disciplinary procedures, it is recommended that each Division adhere to the following principles:

.....

4. There should be provision for early resolution~~informal disposition~~ of allegations of faculty misconduct before formal disciplinary proceedings are instituted. Procedures should be developed for mediation of cases where mediation is viewed as acceptable by the Chancellor and the faculty member accused of misconduct. Mediators should be trained in mediation, be regarded as neutral third parties and have experience in the University environment. In cases where a settlement resolving disciplinary charges is entered into after a matter has been referred to an Academic Senate committee, the Chancellor is encouraged to consult with the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement.

.....

**University Policy on Faculty Conduct and
The Administration of Discipline**

The University policy on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline is set forth in its entirety in this policy and in the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Section I – Introduction and General Policy

This policy, as recommended by the President of the University and approved by The Regents on June 14, 1974, and November 15, 2001, supersedes the President’s interim statement on the same subject, issued on January 15, 1971. The present policy is to be read in conjunction with the Faculty Code of Conduct.

The Faculty Code of Conduct is set forth in APM - 015. Part I of the Faculty Code of Conduct notes the responsibility of the administration to preserve conditions that protect and encourage the faculty in its central pursuits. Part II defines normative conditions for faculty conduct and sets forth types of unacceptable faculty conduct subject to University discipline. Part III makes recommendations and proposes guidelines to assure the development of fair procedures for enforcing the Code.

Authority for discipline derives from The Regents. The Regents have made the Chancellor of each campus responsible for discipline on the campus (Standing Order 100.6(a)), subject to certain procedures and safeguards involving the President and the Academic Senate (Standing Orders 100.4(c) and 103.9 and 103.10).

.....

Section II – Types of Disciplinary Sanctions

.....

Prior to the imposition of any disciplinary sanction(s) as described above, the Chancellor may waive or limit any or all disciplinary sanction(s) on the condition that the accused faculty member performs some specified action(s) designed to address the harm and/or to prevent future harm. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, monetary restitution, repayment of misappropriated resources, compliance with a commitment not to repeat the misconduct, or other act to make whole the injury caused by the faculty member's professional misconduct or to prevent future misconduct.

If the imposition of a disciplinary sanction is waived, the subsequent failure to perform the required act or otherwise comply with the conditions of the waiver will immediately subject the faculty member to the implementation of the underlying sanction without an additional hearing. The authority to determine whether the faculty member has complied with the conditions of the waiver rests with the Chancellor. The

Chancellor may designate a fixed time period for compliance with the terms of the waiver, after which the authority to impose discipline will lapse. If a faculty member disputes the Chancellor's determination, the faculty member may grieve under applicable faculty grievance procedures.

A Chancellor is authorized to initiate involuntary leave with pay prior to, or at any time following, the initiation of a disciplinary action if it is found that there is a strong risk that the accused faculty member's continued assignment to regular duties or presence on campus will cause immediate and serious harm to the University community or impede the investigation of his or her wrongdoing, or in situations where the faculty member's conduct represents a serious crime or felony that is the subject of investigation by a law enforcement agency. When such action is necessary, it must be possible to impose the involuntary leave swiftly, without resorting to normal disciplinary procedures. In rare and egregious cases, a Chancellor may be authorized by special action of The Regents to suspend the pay of a faculty member on involuntary leave pending a disciplinary action. This is in addition to the Chancellor's power to suspend the pay of a faculty member who is absent without authorization and fails to perform his or her duties for an extended period of time, pending the resolution of the faculty member's employment status with the University. Thereafter, the faculty member may grieve the decision to place him or her on involuntary leave pursuant to applicable faculty grievance procedures. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall handle such grievances on an expedited basis if so requested by the faculty member; the Committee may recommend reinstatement of pay and back pay in cases where pay status was suspended. Within 5 (five) working days after the imposition of involuntary leave, the Chancellor must explain to the faculty member in writing the reasons for the involuntary leave including the allegations being investigated and the anticipated date when charges will be brought, if substantiated. Every such document

must include the following statements: (1) the Chancellor has the discretion to end the leave at any time if circumstances merit; (2) the involuntary leave will end either when the allegations are resolved by investigation or when disciplinary proceedings are concluded and a decision has been made whether to impose disciplinary sanctions; and (3) the faculty member has the right to contest the involuntary leave in a grievance proceeding that will be handled on an expedited basis, if so requested by the faculty member.

• • • • •

**University Policy on Faculty Conduct and
The Administration of Discipline**

The University policy on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline is set forth in its entirety in this policy and in the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Section I – Introduction and General Policy

This policy, as recommended by the President of the University and approved by The Regents on June 14, 1974, and November 15, 2001, supersedes the President’s interim statement on the same subject, issued on January 15, 1971. The present policy is to be read in conjunction with the Faculty Code of Conduct.

The Faculty Code of Conduct is set forth in APM - 015. Part I of the Faculty Code of Conduct notes the responsibility of the administration to preserve conditions that protect and encourage the faculty in its central pursuits. Part II defines normative conditions for faculty conduct and sets forth types of unacceptable faculty conduct subject to University discipline. Part III makes recommendations and proposes guidelines to assure the development of fair procedures for enforcing the Code.

.....

Authority for discipline derives from The Regents. The Regents have made the Chancellor of each campus responsible for discipline on the campus (Standing Order 100.6(a)), subject to certain procedures and safeguards involving the President and the Academic Senate (Standing Orders 100.4(c) and 103.9 and 103.10).

: * * :

Section II – Types of Disciplinary Sanctions

* * * *

Prior to the imposition of any disciplinary sanction(s) as described above, the Chancellor may waive or limit any or all disciplinary sanction(s) on the condition that the accused faculty member performs some specified action(s) designed to address the harm and/or to prevent future harm. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, monetary restitution, repayment of misappropriated resources, compliance with a commitment not to repeat the misconduct, or other act to make whole the injury caused by the faculty member's professional misconduct or to prevent future misconduct.

If the imposition of a disciplinary sanction is waived, the subsequent failure to perform the required act or otherwise comply with the conditions of the waiver will immediately subject the faculty member to the implementation of the underlying sanction without an additional hearing. The authority to determine whether the faculty member has complied with the conditions of the waiver rests with the Chancellor. The

Chancellor may designate a fixed time period for compliance with the terms of the waiver, after which the authority to impose discipline will lapse. If a faculty member disputes the Chancellor's determination, the faculty member may grieve under applicable faculty grievance procedures.

A Chancellor is authorized to initiate involuntary leave with pay prior to, or at any time following, the initiation of a disciplinary action if it is found that there is a strong risk that the accused faculty member's continued assignment to regular duties or presence on campus will cause immediate and serious harm to the University community or impede the investigation of his or her wrongdoing, or in situations where the faculty member's conduct represents a serious crime or felony that is the subject of investigation by a law enforcement agency. When such action is necessary, it must be possible to impose the involuntary leave swiftly, without resorting to normal disciplinary procedures. In rare and egregious cases, a Chancellor may be authorized by special action of The Regents to suspend the pay of a faculty member on involuntary leave pending a disciplinary action. This is in addition to the Chancellor's power to suspend the pay of a faculty member who is absent without authorization and fails to perform his or her duties for an extended period of time, pending the resolution of the faculty member's employment status with the University. Thereafter, the faculty member may grieve the decision to place him or her on involuntary leave pursuant to applicable faculty grievance procedures. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall handle such grievances on an expedited basis if so requested by the faculty member; and the Committee may recommend reinstatement of pay and back pay in cases where pay status was suspended. ~~However, w~~Within 5 (five) 10 working days after the imposition of involuntary leave, the Chancellor must explain to the faculty member in writing the reasons for the involuntary leave including the allegations being investigated and the anticipated date when charges will be brought, if substantiated.

Every such document must include the following statements: (1) the Chancellor has the discretion to end the leave at any time if circumstances merit; (2) the involuntary leave will end either when the allegations are resolved by investigation or when disciplinary proceedings are concluded and a decision has been made whether to impose disciplinary sanctions; and (3) the faculty member has the right to contest the involuntary leave in a grievance proceeding that will be handled on an expedited basis, if so requested by the faculty member and initiate disciplinary procedures by bringing charges against the faculty member on leave. ~~Thereafter, the faculty member may grieve the decision to place him or her on involuntary leave pursuant to applicable faculty grievance procedures. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall handle such grievances on an expedited basis and may recommend reinstatement of pay and back pay in cases where pay status was suspended.~~

. . . .

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

1. CCGA Recommendation to Approve New Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree Program at UCSF [ACTION]

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) recommends approval of a new Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree title and program at UC San Francisco. The DNP degree will be a new degree program at UCSF. As required by Senate Bylaw 116.C and Standing Order of the Regents 110.1, CCGA submits its recommendation to the Assembly for consideration. According to Senate Bylaw 116.C, “The Assembly shall consider for approval proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees received from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and requiring approval by the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval. Proposals approved by the Assembly shall be submitted to the President.”

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) as a new degree program offered by UCSF; forward recommendation to Provost Dorr for approval by the President.

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)**

Kwai Ng, Chair
kwng@mail.ucsd.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

January 26, 2017

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR JIM CHALFANT

Dear Jim:

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted earlier this week to approve UCSF School of Nursing's proposal to establish a new Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree program. Before the vote, the proposal was discussed in the January meeting on the 4th. Given UCSF's urgency to schedule on-site accreditation review for the program, an email vote was taken among CCGA's members this week. Nine voted in favor; two abstained (both from UCSF); and one did not vote.

The UCSF's DNP Degree Program was proposed as a Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program (SSGPDP). As a self-supporting program, all operations will be supported by the DNP program budget. The program will initially charge an annual tuition fee of \$61,985 for each student. According to the proposers, tuition is set to allow for an adequate operational budget, while ensuring marketability of the program.

UCSF's program will be the first of its kind among the ten UC campuses. There are now a growing number of DNP degree programs across the nation. As a professional practice-focused doctorate program, the DNP aims to develop competencies for advanced clinical and leadership roles in nursing. Of the current top ten ranked U.S. nursing schools (U.S. News and World Report 2015), all but two have active DNP degree programs. UCSF, currently ranked second, is one of the two. In the state of California, there are eight DNP degree programs at private institutions. In addition, the California State University (CSU) system offers the DNP degree through one of two consortium programs.

The proposal was transmitted to CCGA in June 2016. Michael Coffey was assigned the lead reviewer in our August meeting. The program's curriculum adopts a hybrid non-traditional format. It has a substantial online component. Approximately half of the coursework, including eight core courses and components of four project courses will be delivered using web-based strategies. It will require approval from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). Additionally accreditation will also be obtained from the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE).

The anticipated enrollment for Year 1 is 18 students with an increase to stable enrollment of 30 students by Year 3. As a doctoral program, it will build on master's level competencies in clinical practice, scholarship, leadership, and advocacy. Students will be mentored in their roles through residencies with nursing leaders and/or leaders in senior healthcare management positions. On-site intersession courses will be held at the beginning, midpoint, and conclusion of the curriculum to provide students with the opportunity to interact directly with peers and faculty.

The DNP program is designed to complement the existing PhD program as well as other campus programs by providing opportunities for collaboration around the generation and translation of research. UCSF emphasized that the program would not interfere with the enrollment or resource allocation of existing programs, including the current Master's program.

CCGA received five reviews for the proposal, two external (non-UC) and three internal (UC) reviews. The reviewers were overall very positive. Reviewers agreed that UCSF has an excellent faculty in its School of Nursing to provide high quality training and education to DNP students. The reviewers did raise a few concerns. Several reviewers mentioned the challenges of providing adequate mentoring for the required capstone project. Reviewers questioned whether enough faculty members would be involved in mentoring capstone projects. The proposers responded by affirming that intensive mentoring would be provided. Each DNP student will have a three-member committee, two of which are faculty members. Student-faculty ratio will also be kept at a low 6:1 ratio in the first year. Another concern was the degree of faculty involvement beyond teaching for the program. In their response, the proposers provided additional information to explain the role of faculty in admissions, recruitment, student counseling, and supervising capstone projects.

CCGA also received the review conducted by UCPB. UCPB criticized the low level of return to aid the proposers were willing to commit. This was echoed by some CCGA members in our discussion. According to the cost analysis provided, \$1,000 per student was set aside for return to aid. This means that with a targeted 18-student first-year cohort, \$18,000 would be set aside, that in turn means that the program can only grant one student 30% tuition discount in the first year. Both CCGA and UCPB urged UCSF to raise its return to aid. In their response, the program did not commit to earmarking more money for aid. It however pledged to fundraise for student support as soon as the program was approved. It added that the School of Nursing had a strong track record of fundraising. The School of Nursing provides over \$1m in student scholarships to its state-funded programs overall annually.

CCGA understands the initial "set up" costs of the DNP program are high. Its cost analysis estimates operating losses in its first two years of operation. That said, CCGA urges UCSF School of Nursing to commit more money for student support through fundraising, and to evaluate whether the current level of aid is adequate for attracting a competitive and diverse student population, once the program has reached its steady and revenue-generating state in the third year.

As you know, CCGA's approval is usually the last stop of the Academic Senate side of the systemwide review and approval process except when the new degree title must be approved by

the President, under delegated authority from the Board of Regents. According to the Academic Senate Bylaws, the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or the Academic Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 30 days of CCGA's approval) must approve new degree titles. Given its status as a new graduate program title on the UCSF campus, CCGA submits its approval of the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree program for formal approval by the Assembly of the Academic Senate. For your information, I have included our lead reviewer's final report as an enclosure.

Respectfully submitted,



Kwai Ng
Chair, CCGA

cc: Shane White, Academic Council Vice Chair
CCGA Members
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
Jocelyn Banaria, Academic Senate Associate Director
Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst
Ruth Greenblatt, San Francisco Division Senate Chair
Todd Giedt, San Francisco Division Senate Executive Director
Ken Laslavic, San Francisco Division Senate Analyst

Enclosures: (1)



MICHAEL DAVID COFFEY, PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY AND MICROBIOLOGY
2435 BOYCE HALL
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0122

COORDINATION COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
January 4, 2017

Lead Review on the proposed UCSF Doctorate of Nursing Practice

Background

The Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) has become the 'standard', the degree that recognizes advanced clinical nursing practice DNP-prepared APRNs (Advanced Practice Registered Nurses). APRNs are in high demand and this need is projected to grow dramatically according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. From 5 programs 10 years ago the number has grown to 250 in 2016. Surprisingly, not a single DNP is offered by public universities in California. The few such programs offered in California are in private universities where the cost is beyond the reach of many qualified nurses. UCSF School of Nursing is one of the top 5 programs nationally and as such should set a high standard in clinical, research and administrative training of future APRNs.

Applicant Pool and Graduate Prospects

Based on the reviewers comments this will be one of the great strengths of this timely proposal to establish a DNP. UCSF has the quality and diversity of PhD and DNP-trained faculty to provide a high quality training to nurses to ensure an advanced education in health needs vital to the California population.

Quality and Academic Vigor of proposed DNP

The proposed program is designed to meet both UC and national guidelines set by the American Association of colleges and Nursing's (AACN) The Essentials of Doctoral education for Advanced Nursing Practice. The proposed DNP includes advanced coursework beyond master's degree training and includes organizational and systems leadership for quality improvement, information systems/technology, health care policy/advocacy, and advanced nursing practice. Accreditation of the program will be provided by the Commission on

Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNC). The Capstone or Scholarly projects are outlined and follow national guidelines to design projects utilizing evidence-based interventions to change clinical practices.

Adequacy of Faculty, Facilities and Budgets

The core faculty in the proposed DNP consist of two tenure track and four clinical track professors with international leadership in nursing education, research and advanced clinical research. One Academic Senate member, Dr. Chen, will serve as Program Director, and is well qualified as past chair of the Nursing Faculty Council as well as the Doctoral Program Council. The quality and diversity of the core faculty with strengths variously in active clinical practice programs plus productive programs of faculty practice scholarship, was considered adequate both in quality and numeracy for this proposed DNP. One reviewer suggested that a DNP-prepared nurse who best understands this type of degree program might be best placed as Program Director.

Based of the information provide where \$800,000 was available to start this program funding appeared adequate. However, more analysis and input should be provided by the University Committee on Planning & Budget.

Rike Coffey

