

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

December 1, 2010
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, December 1, 2010. Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons presided and called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. In accordance with Senate Bylaw 120.C.1, Chair Simmons requested approval to change the order of business in order to accommodate Henry Powell, Chair of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC. He proposed beginning with items VI.A. and continuing with VII.A before calling roll or approving the minutes. Hearing no objections, he proceeded to items VI.A. and VII.A. Following those discussions, 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. The minutes will reflect the order of business as noticed.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the June 16, 2010 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Simmons announced that the final report of the Commission on the Future will be on Regents' agenda for endorsement at their special meeting in December. He also reported that in response to AB2302, which requested that UC study major pre-requisites to reduce obstacles for transfer students, Provost Pitts is hosting meetings of faculty in five disciplines across the system. The first meetings of math and biology faculty have occurred and the faculty discovered a great deal of agreement on lower division requirements. Meetings of computer science, psychology and history faculty will occur in the next few weeks.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

State budget. Provost Pitts noted that the incoming governor is just starting to meet with advisers, but there is a real possibility of mid-year budget cuts because of a \$6 billion budget gap. He stated that the University needs a multi-year strategy to manage its finances if state funding does not increase.

Rebenching. Provost Pitts stated that the president has asked him to begin a process to "rebench" general fund allocations that will mitigate historic inequities in funding among campuses. Currently, campuses are reimbursed per student according to a baseline formula established in the early 1990s, which resulted in differentiation based on the percentage of the graduate student population at that time, among other factors. He stated that he will convene a committee beginning in January 2011 to discuss principles for allocating state general funds and then develop financial models. The committee will be composed of approximately 15 people, including 3 or 4 Senate members, several EVCs, Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget, and staff with expertise in capital projects.

Indirect Cost Recovery. Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steven Beckwith made a presentation to the Regents on the revenue the university loses on indirect cost recovery. Some of this is due to the low ICR rate the university receives from federal grants and contracts, and some is due to the fact that some large foundations pay very low or no indirect costs. UC plans to pursue a better rate with the government and join with other universities to address the issue with major foundations.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES

A. Oral Report on the Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for UC (Discussion)

Henry Powell, Chair of the Special Committee, made the following remarks. The UC Commission on the Future was established at a time of fiscal turmoil. The Senate was deeply concerned about its implications for shared governance, as many of the recommendations involved issues under Senate purview. The Senate kept its divisions and committees informed and solicited comment on recommendations as we received them. As a result, the Senate's perspective and voice helped to shape the discussion at the final Commission meetings. The Commission referred many of the recommendations to the Senate for further development. The Commission recommendations, while providing valuable food for thought, are a series of unrelated, incremental solutions to the immediate budget crisis, and do not constitute a long term vision of the University.

Subsequently, Chair Simmons asked me to convene a Special Committee on a Plan for UC to make a comprehensive assessment of the state of the University in both the long term and the short term, to anticipate the impact of the fiscal crisis and outline prospective solutions that will mitigate the crisis while maintaining the quality and eminence of the University in the long term. The Committee is comprised of Senate members of the Commission Working Groups who bring to the table their considerable expertise. The Special Committee met twice by teleconference and once in person and submitted an interim draft to the Academic Council in November. It will meet again in person in early January to finalize the draft. Council will consider it at its January meeting and hopefully will refer it to the Assembly's February meeting.

The Special Committee's report begins by setting out the principles and values that have made UC the premier public institution of higher education in the nation, and insists that any choices must be informed by these principles. It then discusses trade-offs that must be considered and makes recommendations aimed at maintaining UC's educational and research stature. The Council recommendation to the Commission and the UCLA Statement on UC Values focused on particular, temporary solutions to the immediate budget crisis, namely, downsizing the faculty and limiting capital projects. The Special Committee will take into consideration these solutions, as well as the divisional and committee responses to them in its final report.

However, the Special Committee's report is broader. It prioritizes maintaining affordable access to the University for the state's demographically diverse citizenry. It emphasizes the crucial role of graduate students in the research enterprise. And it suggests other, longer term solutions. There is an opportunity in every crisis, and the Special Committee is exploring how we can

optimize the resources that we have, including facilitating revenue generating activities and partnerships. Such ideas include coordination with UC Extension in undergraduate education, facilitating faculty entrepreneurship, and making UC Press a more profitable enterprise by embracing such trends such as e-book publishing.

It also is discussing structural changes to achieve cost savings, such as leveraging the ten campus system to facilitate cross-campus registration for graduate and undergraduate students, pursuing efficiencies in the structure of the undergraduate program by simplifying major requirements, and creating a new position for postdoctoral scholars that would allow them to gain teaching experience and contribute to the teaching mission of the University while relieving faculty workload should enrollments increase. It should be noted that none of these measures or any combination of them can replace the funding provided by the state and that it is imperative that UC effectively communicate UC's critical importance to the social and economic well-being of the state and all of its citizens.

Members of the Assembly expressed support for the principles articulated in the report, but cautioned that they must be implemented on a campus by campus basis. Campuses are at different stages of development and should not be inadvertently disadvantaged by across-the-board decisions. For example, downsizing should not occur in a reactive way, but should be done at the campus level in consultation with the Senate. A member clarified that the disestablishment of programs is determined at the campus level, but that the discontinuance of any program does not imply the termination or layoff of tenured faculty; the campus is obliged to find them other positions on campus. The report should clarify this point. CCGA's chair stated that his committee supports the idea of hiring our own graduates as post-doctoral fellows and using them to teach in lieu of Unit 18 lecturers. A member commented that the report should distinguish between graduate and undergraduate students in its discussion of non-resident tuition, and clarify the definition of "programs." He also was surprised that the report does not take a position on the increasing role of self-supporting programs. Chair Simmons responded that these issues are on the Special Committee's agenda when it meets in early January.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. Strategic Planning for the University (Discussion)

Chair Simmons stated that the report of the Special Committee, as well as the responses to the systemwide review of the Academic Council recommendation to the UC Commission on the Future and the UCLA Statement of UC Values were discussed at the November Council meeting. Council asked the Special Committee to incorporate all of the material received as part of the systemwide review into its final report; the responses will inform an ongoing process of creating a faculty-led strategic plan for the University. Council further decided to convene a small task force to evaluate the financial impact of the Special Committee's recommendations. The task force consists of Council members who participate in monthly budget calls with the provost and other administrators. It includes division chairs Ann Karagozian (UCLA), Bob Powell (UCD), Alan Barbour (UCI), Mary Gauvain (UCR); and committee chairs Jim Chalfant (UCPB), Joel Dimsdale (UCFW), and David Kay (UCEP). The task force will quantify the impact of the proposals being made and devise implementation strategies. Once its report is completed in late spring, it will be reviewed systemwide, along with the report of the Special Committee.

B. Annual Reports (Information)

Annual reports of the standing committees are required to be submitted to the first meeting of the Assembly each academic year for information. Annual reports are included in the Call to this meeting.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

1. President's Proposal on Post-Employment Benefits (Information)

Chair Simmons reported that the Regents will take action on post-employment benefits at a special meeting on December 13. He reviewed the major points of the plan and added that the degree of consultation is an example of shared governance at its best. He noted that the next challenge will be to help the campuses find the funding for the employer contribution. A funding plan will be presented at the March Regents' meeting. Each division should develop a mechanism to work with administrators to address the budgetary challenges; some campuses already have established joint committees to do so.

2. Council Resolution on Faculty Salaries (Action)

Provost Pitts stated that \$87 million was set aside in 2011-12 budget for salary increases, but that the campuses were asked to do modeling to see if the increases could take effect earlier. However, he noted that concerns about the political consequences of providing salary increases on the heels of an 8% fee increase. If funds are allocated for salary increases, the options for disbursing them include an across-the-board increase for all faculty, allocating the funds to raise the salary scales, or allowing the Chancellors and EVCs to use the funds for recruitment and retention. Provost Pitts highlighted trade-offs among these approaches and said that he looks forward to hearing the views of the Senate on this issue. Chair Simmons stated that raising the salary scales would make a statement that the University values and wants to protect the scales and the peer-reviewed salary system. The Council resolution is a hybrid of the first two options. It recommends providing 2% across-the board increase (referred to as a "range adjustment") in 2010-11, and a subsequent (2011-12) 3% range adjustment and 2% market adjustment to raise the salary scales.

Provost Pitts commented that in Year 1 of the previous faculty salary plan, the funding was used to augment the scales, and a greater portion was allocated to the lower steps. To compensate those with off-scale salaries, a number of EVCs provided raises using their own budget resources. He noted it is doubtful that campuses would have the ability to do this again. He said that providing across-the-board increases both raises the scales and funds off-scale salaries. But if no money is provided for recruitment and retention, the EVCs raid other parts of the operational budget for this purpose.

A member stated that we need to strategically bolster the scales in order to build the future of the university. She noted that mid-career faculty are the most likely to submit retention cases and that the university also must be able to successfully recruit junior faculty. A member commented that if the scales are closer to market, there will be less need for money for recruitment. Also, having viable salary scales would be better than dealing each year with outside offers and higher than market recruitments. The merit system decreases the pressure on faculty to get outside

offers because they can expect steady salary increases. Another member expressed concern about options that would further increase the gap between the newly hired and long serving faculty; it would be preferable to apply any available funds to the salary scales. An across-the-board increase means that most of the funds would go to full professors. Several members concurred. A member argued that we need to protect the merit system, which is at the core of UC culture and is the basis for UC's success as an institution. He stated that the scales are on the brink of becoming obsolete and we must rescue the scales now, or the institution will be fundamentally changed. Provost Pitts replied that the merit and promotion system will not be dismantled; the issue is how to determine salaries. He noted that 80% of faculty are off-scale. A member asked whether there is a separate budget item for merit increases. If there is, then the issue is whether we put the money toward fixing the scales or we give it to the EVCs to use at their discretion. Chair Simmons confirmed that there is a separate \$27 million budget item for merit increases. A member asked if there is data on putting funds into the scales in Year 1 of the faculty plan in terms of its effect on recruitments and retentions. Provost Pitts responded that there was a slow-down in hiring at that time, so the effect is unclear.

A member stated that given that the budget situation is in flux, it is premature to act on the Council motion, but spoke in favor of amending the scales. A member countered that regardless of the budget situation or public perception, Council's proposal was unanimously supported, and is based on principles and a lengthy analysis of a joint committee; therefore Assembly should endorse it. The administration is free not to follow the recommendation. A member countered that salary issues should be discussed by a much broader segment of the faculty. A member responded that he is in favor of continuing the discussion, since it is unlikely that the Council resolution could be implemented this year.

A member spoke in favor of using the funds for the merit pool. This would protect the peer-reviewed salary system, in which merit and compensation are tied together, and it would avoid the potential negative consequences of an across-the-board increase. Another member suggested phasing in the increases over a period of three years as faculty are reviewed for merit. Provost Pitts said that the funds would provide higher merit increases (5-6% rather than 2.5%) for three years. Other members suggested using the funds to off-set employee retirement contributions or provide a cost of living increase.

A member moved that the Assembly endorse the three Council recommendations. A substitute motion to postpone was made. It was clarified that if the motion to postpone succeeds, the resolutions will be referred back to Council for additional consideration. If the motion to postpone fails, then the original motion will be voted upon.

ACTION: The Assembly voted to postpone the original motion and refer it to the Academic Council for action in light of ongoing budgetary developments and the opinions expressed at the Assembly. (29 in favor, 9 against, 1 abstention)

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 1, 2010

Appendix A – 2010-2011 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 1, 2010

President of the University:

Mark Yudof (absent)

Academic Council Members:

Daniel Simmons, Chair
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair
Fiona Doyle, Chair, UCB
Robert Powell, Chair, UCD
Alan Barbour, Chair, UCI
Ann Karagozian, Chair, UCLA
Evan Heit, Chair UCM
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR
Frank Powell, Chair, UCSD
Bob Newcomer (alt. for Elena Fuentes-Afflick, UCSF)
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Susan Gillman, Chair, UCSC (absent)
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS
James Carmody, Chair, CCGA
Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD (absent)
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UCAP
David Kay, Chair, UCEP
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCFW
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, UCORP (absent)
Brent Haddad (alternate for James Chalfant, UCPB)

Berkeley (5)

Daniel Boyarin
Robert Jacobsen (alternate for Steven Beissinger)
Thomas Laqueur
Mary Ann Mason
Bernard Sadoulet

Davis (6)

Richard Grotjahn
Joel Haas (absent)
Joseph Kiskis
Brian Mulloney (absent)
Terence Murphy
Krishnan Nambiar

Irvine (4)

Luis Aviles (absent)
Ulysses Jenkins (absent)
Tahseen Mozaffar

Charles Zender

Los Angeles (8)

Paula Diaconescu
Malcolm Gordon
Jody Kreiman
Timothy Lane
Duncan Lindsey (absent)
Susanne Lohmann (absent)
Purnima Mankekar (absent)
Joseph Nagy

Merced (1)

Susan Amussen (alternate for Ignacio Lopez-Calvo)

Riverside (2)

Thomas Morton
Albert Wang

San Diego (5 – 1 TBA)

Timothy Bigby
Sandra Brown (absent)
Lorraine Pillus
Peter Wagner (absent)

San Francisco (4)

Farid Chehab
David Gardner
Deborah Greenspan
Wendy Max

Santa Barbara (3)

Rolf Christoffersen (alt. for Ralph Armbruster)
Gayle Binion
John Foran

Santa Cruz (2)

Joseph Konopelski
Marilyn Walker

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson