

## MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

February 15, 2012

## MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

**I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

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

**II. MINUTES**

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

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

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

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

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

Admissions. Chair Anderson stated that applications for admission increased by 19.1% overall, and by 9.8% from California residents, despite recent fee increases. Applications for transfer decreased by 4.2% overall and by 5.7% from the California Community Colleges, possibly due to the difficulty of getting into the classes required for transfer at the community colleges. There has been a large increase in non-resident applications (from 21,095 last year to 33,001 this year). In addition, this year there is a new admissions process. Previously, the top 12.5% of high school students were identified by a mechanistic process and guaranteed admission to a UC campus. In the new system, the top 9% statewide (measured by test scores and GPA) and the top 9% of each

high school class by class rank are guaranteed admission. The two groups should overlap to a substantial degree. A large number of additional applicants will be deemed entitled to review and will be reviewed more holistically than in the past.

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

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

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

#### **SPECIAL ORDERS**

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

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

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

#### **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

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

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

**1. Legislative Ruling 6.11.A.** addressing the definition of "residence" was presented as an information item.

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

### **Academic Council**

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

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

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

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

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

A member asked for a justification for the substitution. Chair Crawford stated that Council was

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Anderson stated that after receiving extensive comment via systemwide review, the Academic Council objected strenuously to the proposed APM 688, which would have established a negotiated salary plan for general campus faculty similar to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. Provost Pitts then issued a letter establishing a negotiated salary pilot program for the four campuses with medical centers, excluding UCSF. Chair Anderson objected to this, and the provost agreed to withdraw the pilot program and establish a task force that would address Senate concerns with the proposed negotiated salary plan. The task force will include four administrators, representatives from UCFW, UCAP and UCPB, and Vice Chair Bob Powell. It is scheduled to issue a report on June 15, which will be reviewed systemwide.

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

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

### **X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

### **XI. NEW BUSINESS**

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

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

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

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

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 pm.

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

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

**Appendix A – 2010-2011 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 15, 2012**

**President of the University:**

Mark G. Yudof

**Academic Council Members:**

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

**Berkeley (6)**

Christina Maslach (alt. for Steven Beissinger)  
Paula Fass (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)  
Philip Stark (alt. for Ralph Catalano)  
Allen Goldstein  
Jeffrey Perloff  
Patricia Zambryski

**Davis (6)**

Jeffrey Williams (alternate for Trish Berger)  
Theodore DeJong  
Richard Grotjahn  
Joseph Kiskis  
Krishnan Nambiar  
Saul Schaefer

**Irvine (4)**

Christopher Leslie  
Tahseen Mozaffar  
Carrie Noland  
Charles Zender

**Los Angeles (8)**

Noah Goldstein (alt. for Malcolm Gordon)  
Timothy Lane  
Alan Laub  
Susanne Lohmann  
Joseph Nagy  
Jennifer Krull (alt. for Jesse Rissman)  
Monica Smith  
Ninez Ponce (alt. for Richard Steinberg)

**Merced (1)**

Wolfgang Rogge

**Riverside (2)**

Jodie Holt  
Thomas Morton

**San Diego (5)**

John Hildebrand  
Douglas Magde  
Lorraine Pillus  
Peter Wagner  
Eric Watkins

**San Francisco (3)**

Farid Chehab  
Steve Morin (alt. for David Gardner)  
Wendy Max

**Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)**

John Foran  
Vicki Scott

**Santa Cruz (2)**

Joseph Konopelski  
Marilyn Walker

**Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Jean Olson