

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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



NOTICE OF MEETING ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, June 6, 2012
10:00 am – 4:30 pm

I.	ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS	1
II.	MINUTES	
	Approval of Draft Minutes of the Meeting of April 11, 2012	2
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, April 11, 2012	7
III.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR	8
	▪ Robert Anderson	
	A. Report on the Memorial to the Regents [INFORMATION]	
	B. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2012-13 Assembly [INFORMATION]	
IV.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT	8
	▪ Mark G. Yudof	
V.	SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]	8
VI.	REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]	8
VII.	REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES	
	A. UCP&T Proposed Revision to Senate Bylaw 337 [ACTION]	8
	▪ Robert Anderson, Chair, Assembly of the Academic Senate	
	B. BOARS Proposal on Transfer [ACTION]	11
	▪ Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair	

C. Academic Council	
▪ Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair	
1. Nomination and Election of 2012-13 UCOC Chair and Vice Chair [ACTION]	13
2. Dissolution of University Committee on Computing and Communications [ACTION]	13
▪ Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair	
▪ Anthony Joseph, UCCC Member and past Chair	
3. Academic Graduate Student Support [DISCUSSION]	21
▪ Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair	
▪ Rachael Goodhue, Chair, Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support	
4. Discussion with Administrators by Invitation of the Academic Council [DISCUSSION]	
a. Robinson-Edley Report on Campus Responses to Protests	22
▪ Charles Robinson, Vice President and General Counsel	
▪ Christopher Edley, Berkeley Law Dean and Special Advisor to the President	
b. Update on State Budget	22
▪ Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources	
VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]	22
IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]	22
X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]	22
XI. NEW BUSINESS	22

I. Roll Call

2011-12 Assembly Roll Call June 6, 2012

President of the University:

Mark G. Yudof

Tahseen Mozaffar

Carrie Noland

Charles Zender

Academic Council Members:

Robert Anderson, Chair

Robert Powell, Vice Chair

Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB

Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD

Craig Martens, Chair, UCI

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA

Susan Amussen, Chair, UCM

Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR

Douglas Magde (alt. for Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD)

Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC (absent)

William Jacob, Chair, BOARS

Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA

Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD (absent)

Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP

Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP

William Parker, Chair, UCFW

John Crawford, Chair, UCORP

James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (8)

Malcolm Gordon

Jennifer Krull

Timothy Lane

Alan Laub

Susanne Lohmann

Joseph Nagy

Monica Smith

Ninez Ponce

Merced (1)

Wolfgang Rogge

Riverside (2)

Jodie Holt

Thomas Morton

San Diego (5) (confirmed)

John Hildebrand

Judith Varner (alt. for Douglas Magde)

Gershon Shafir (alt. for Lorraine Pillus)

Peter Wagner

Eric Watkins

San Francisco (3)

Farid Chehab

David Gardner

Wendy Max

Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)

John Foran

Vicki Scott

Santa Cruz (2)

Marilyn Walker

Joseph Konopelski

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson

Berkeley (6) (confirmed)

Paula Fass (alt. for Steven Beissinger)

Harsha Ram (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)

Ralph Catalano (absent)

Allen Goldstein

Jeffrey Perloff

Patricia Zambryski

Davis (6)

Trish Berger

Theodore DeJong

Richard Grotjahn

Joseph Kiskis

Krishnan Nambiar

Saul Schaefer

Irvine (4)

Christopher Leslie

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 11, 2012

MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, April 11, 2012. Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 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 February 15, 2012 meeting as noticed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

Chair Anderson stated that the Reynoso report on the pepper spray incident at Davis will be posted on UC Davis web site today at noon. A press conference will be held at 3:30 at Davis, and also will be broadcast on the web.

Voting on the Memorial to the Regents is underway; please vote. The faculty voice may influence the Regents and the public. Currently, the Regents seem to be divided on whether to support the Governor's revised ballot measure.

The Senate's Blue Ribbon Panel on UCOE has been constituted and consists of an impressive team of experts on online learning.

The National Association of Scholars (NAS) just issued a report asserting that UC is corrupted by liberal political bias that is causing student achievement to decline. They assert that the cause is bias in faculty hiring. The connection between liberal bias and the decline of student achievement is not documented. An alternative view is that individuals who want to improve welfare of society are more likely to go into the lower-earning teaching profession. Yesterday, Vice Chair Powell participated in KQED's Forum radio program on this topic. Other participants included the Chair of the College Republicans, who said he had never been disadvantaged for presenting his political views and a faculty member from George Mason University, known as a politically conservative institution, who denounced the report for its methodological failings. The NAS has requested that the Regents put the report on their May meeting agenda. President Yudof has responded that University faculty and teaching are rigorously reviewed; that student achievement is not declining; that the University values many points of view; and that the Senate will respond to the report directly. He did not address the request for time on the Regents agenda.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST

Provost Pitts stated that a draft of a budget "framework" or agreement with the state is in progress. If approved, the University's base budget would be augmented in two ways. First, the state will allocate \$90M that the University can use as part of the employer contribution to UCRP, and second, the lease-revenue debt on University buildings will revert to the University and the debt service payments will be added to the University's base budget. The University would restructure the debt, paying a lower interest

rate and extending the maturity, then use the monies freed up for other purposes. Debt service on general obligation bonds also would be passed through the University and these funds would be added to its base budget, but the debt would not revert to the University. The state would commit to a 6% annual increase to the base budget going forward. In exchange, the University would commit to meeting the following accountability metrics: 1) UC will guarantee that its 5-year graduation rate will not fall below 80% and that its 3-year graduation rate for transfer students will not fall below 79% (these are the current rates). UC will also pledge that it will accept no fewer transfer students than it already does. Provost Pitts commented that the latter requirement will be easy to meet, but that some campus administrations are nervous that they will not be able to meet the first two metrics, since graduation rates are a lagging indicator, and future rates may decline as a consequence of budget reductions. He stated that the state would reduce UC's budget increase by 1% for each failure to meet the metrics. He also noted that the metrics can be renegotiated in 3 years. In addition, there is discussion of committing to no tuition increase in 2012-13 if the state agrees to "buy out" a 6% increase (\$125 M) planned for September. The buyout would be contingent on the governor's tax measure passing. If it does not pass, UC will be cut by an additional \$200 M. The president is asking the Regents to adopt a multi-year plan to raise tuition to meet any shortfall in state funding. Some Regents expressed reluctance to do this. The president will make sure that any agreement with the governor is also supported by the legislature.

Provost Pitts stated that the Reynoso report on the pepper spray incident at Davis will be released today. The Robinson/Edley draft report on procedures for and policies in relation to demonstrations will be issued soon. There will time for comment, and then policies will be sent out for review in the fall. The aim is to create a set of general expectations systemwide for campus responses to demonstrations without being too prescriptive. For example, a policy might require that each campus create a structure for planning for demonstrations, but not explicitly prescribe that structure. There may be some systemwide requirements, such as common training for police officers.

Q: Cuts to the community colleges may reduce the number of transfer students eligible for UC. Have you discussed this in regard to the framework?

A: Provost Pitts affirmed that this issue has been raised. He noted that this year, the number of applicants decreased, but the campuses felt it was a rich pool, so they do not anticipate a reduction in the number of enrollees.

Q: What does the future budget situation for the University look like?

A: Provost Pitts replied that he is not optimistic. The debt that the state owes to K-12 due to Proposition 98 is enormous and will consume a large chunk of any new revenues.

Q: What is the administration's current view of charging differential tuition?

A: Provost Pitts replied that this has not been part of current discussions. Chair Anderson added that the Senate is opposed to differential tuition by campus. Unless tuition rose to close to \$20K, it would not be effective. He noted that the Memorial to the Regents is an opportunity for faculty to be advocates for the university.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. 2012-13 Assembly Meeting Schedule [Information]

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

VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council [ACTION]

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

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 110.A.1, the Assembly elects a Vice Chair who is a Senate member from a Division other than that of the incoming Chair, to assume office the following September. The Academic Council submits a nomination. Further nominations may be made by the Assembly members from the floor, and on written petition by twenty-five Senate members. In the following year the Vice Chair becomes Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council. Chair Anderson said he was pleased to introduce Bill Jacob, Professor of Mathematics at UCSB, and the current chair of BOARS, as the Council's nominee to become Vice Chair of the Assembly on September 1, 2012. He invited additional nominations from the floor and hearing none, he invited Professor Jacob to make a statement of his candidacy.

After Chair Jacob made a brief statement, he left the room and several colleagues spoke in support of his candidacy, noting that he has showed exceptional leadership of BOARS and as a colleague on the Academic Council.

ACION: Assembly voted unanimously to elect Bill Jacob vice chair of the 2012-13 Academic Council.

2. Ratification of the 2012 Oliver Johnson awardees

Chair Anderson stated that the Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Service is offered every other year to a Senate member for distinguished lifetime service to the Senate. Each division was invited to submit nominations to the University Committee on Committees in January, and, as provided in the conditions of the award, UCOC selects two finalists for consideration by Council. Council's choice is then brought to the Assembly for ratification.

This year, both finalists presented such significant records of service and contributions to the Senate that Council decided to honor both Professor John Oakley of Davis and Professor Sandra Weiss of San Francisco. Both have held a series of important roles in their divisions; both have been Chairs of the Assembly and have served in additional systemwide leadership roles.

ACTION: Assembly ratified the selection of Professors John Oakley and Sandra Weiss as the 2012 recipients of the Oliver Johnson Award to the Academic Senate.

3. Report on Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources [INFORMATION]

▪ Linda Bisson, ACSCANR Member and Davis Division Chair

Linda Bisson reported that the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) aims to ensure that the Senate will have greater input into the academic mission of ACSCANR activities and enhance shared governance. The committee was convened by Council, and the membership comprises the divisional chair (or vice chair) of the three ANR campuses, representatives of CCGA, UCPB and UCORP, and two at-large members appointed by UCOC. ACSCANR successfully petitioned ANR Vice President Barbara Allen-Diaz to appoint two ACSCANR members to ANR's Program Council, an entity which advises VP Allen-Diaz and had input on major decisions, including reviewing grant applications for research funds allocated by ANR. A member asked whether ANR undergoes regular reviews. Professor Bisson replied that the division has been reviewed, although irregularly, and UCORP and UCPB expressed concern about the adequacy of the review. Through ACSCANR representation on the Program Council, the Senate will have more influence on how reviews are conducted.

4. Issues related to Senate Membership [DISCUSSION]

Chair Anderson reported that the San Francisco division has announced that it intends to treat Health Sciences Clinical Professors and Adjunct Professors at the rank of Associate Professor or higher as Senate members beginning on July 1, 2012. He stated that he has asked UCR&J for a Legislative Ruling on both the procedural questions raised by this unilateral action (whether the division has the authority to do this) and on the substantive questions raised by the division's reinterpretation of the Standing Orders of the Regents (SORs), including whether the SORs require, allow or prohibit Senate membership for these titles.. He has asked a subgroup of Council to write a charge to establish a working group to address the issues raised by the Division. The draft charge will be considered by UCFW this week and subsequently by Council. Chair Anderson invited UCSF division chair Robert Newcomer to address the Assembly regarding this issue.

Chair Newcomer stated that 42% of UCSF faculty are in the Health Sciences Clinical or Adjunct series and work 100% time. He argued that it is unacceptable to deny so many faculty access to the rights and privileges of Senate membership. He noted that the division's position is strongly supported by the campus administration and legal counsel. He noted that a number of inequities could be remedied by changes in Senate bylaws, but the fundamental issue is that we do not treat our colleagues with the respect that their work warrants. He stated that there is enough ambiguity in the interpretation of the SORs that it may need to be resolved by the Regents. Members commented that they are sympathetic to UCSF's concerns and would like to find a way to address them. A member pointed out that there are other series to which clinical faculty can be appointed, such as the "in residence" and "professor of clinical X" series. Would it be possible to move faculty into those titles? Chair Anderson added that the Senate Membership Task Force recommended that this be done on a case-by-case basis. He noted that the research and service expectations for those in health science titles are lower than for those in Professor of Clinical X. For this reason, many people in health sciences titles, whose duties are primarily teaching and clinical, would have significant difficulty achieving merits. A member commented that UC is a research institution and if research is not a significant part of a job description, then people in these titles should not be Senate members. Chair Anderson noted that Lecturers with Security of Employment are Senate members, and are similar to health sciences clinical professors in that research is desirable, but not required. A member stated that at UCSD, the medical center faculty want to be able to vote in their departments on personnel matters, but are not asking to be involved in the Senate at the divisional or systemwide levels. A member raised the procedural concern that the report of the Senate Membership Task Force was reviewed last year, and the divisional chairs of the campuses with medical centers agreed to further discuss how to address these issues. Instead, UCSF brought the issue to the center of the agenda by acting unilaterally; this is a bad precedent for the workings of the Senate. A member replied that he agrees that it is unfortunate that it was done this way, but it is equally unfortunate that this problem has existed for so long without being resolved; it must be addressed. A member opined that this raises similar questions about the status of Unit 18 lecturers.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [INFORMATION]

Chair Anderson said he asked UCFW Chair Bill Parker (UCI) to provide updates on the following items.

A. Negotiated Salary Plan Task Force. Chair Parker stated that APM 688, which would have allowed the establishment of a negotiated salary plan for general campus faculty similar to the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, was proposed and reviewed, and the Senate expressed strong objections and urged the administration to withdraw it. Provost Pitts then issued a letter stating that it would be established as a pilot program on four campuses. The Senate leadership objected and it was withdrawn and instead a small group of four Senate representatives and four administrators was convened to attempt to reconcile the differences between the Senate and administration. The group aims to produce recommendations by June 15. It would be inappropriate to comment on the substance of these ongoing discussions. A member asked why the administration is continuing to push this idea

when the Senate rejected it. Chair Parker replied that several EVCs strongly feel that it would be a useful tool for recruitment and retention. A member noted that comment was mixed on this issue, but those in favor of the idea felt that there could be better ways of conceptualizing and implementing it.

B. Faculty Salaries Task Force. Chair Anderson reported that the Faculty Salaries Task Force has recommended allocating a potential salary increase of 3% a year in a way that would improve the salary scales vis-a-vis UC's competitors. The proposal is currently under systemwide review and Council will discuss it later this month. Early responses indicate general sympathy with the approach, as well as anxiety that it would be an unfunded mandate and would require campuses to cut programs in order to implement it. He asked UCFW Chair Parker, who served on the Task Force, to provide further details.

Chair Parker stated that the Task Force was appointed a year ago, charged with developing a recommendation for salary increases this year, and made those recommendations last June. It was also charged with developing a multi-year plan, which is the report currently under review. The Task Force arrived at consensus on a number of principles (see section 3.0 for items of unanimous agreement). He commented that Vice Provost Carlson should be credited for chairing the Task Force effectively. The June recommendations called for this year's 3% increase to be provided to all "meritorious" faculty (defined as a positive merit review or satisfactory review at Steps V, IX and Associate Professor). Senate representatives had argued for applying it only to the on-scale salary component, but administrators thought it should be applied to off-scale, as well, and they prevailed. The report currently under review recommends that future salary increases should be determined by two methodologies. The first recommendation, or "Step I," would establish a new minimum for the systemwide scales calculated by taking the median of the nine general campus averages for each rank and step. This is an attempt to reinvigorate the integrity of the step system. The second recommendation, or "Step II," would move faculty members' salaries at the time of advancement or a satisfactory review at Steps V, IX and Associate Professor, at a minimum, to the average of their peers at the new rank and step on their campus. UC Irvine has been using this method successfully for several years. He noted that campuses may establish salaries above the minimum. A member expressed doubt that everyone can be above the median. A member asked how this would affect someone who advances to Step IX in July and is not reviewed again for four years. Chair Anderson replied that if implemented, a faculty member who receives a positive merit review as of July 1 would receive an increase effective next October. Those who were reviewed a year ago would be the last people to benefit. A member commented that fairness to cohorts must be addressed. A member asked how the plan would affect health sciences faculty. Chair Parker responded that health sciences faculty do benefit from this plan. If the scales are increased, this would raise the X and X' components in the HSCP, which are UCRP covered compensation. Those faculty whose X component is state-funded would likely have an increase in salary, as well.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 am.

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 11, 2012

Appendix A – 2011-2012 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of April 11, 2012

President of the University:

Mark G. Yudof (absent)

Craig Walsh (alt. for Tahseen Mozaffar)

Carrie Noland

Charles Zender

Academic Council Members:

Robert Anderson, Chair

Robert Powell, Vice Chair

Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB

Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD

Craig Martens, Chair, UCI

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA

Susan Amussen, Chair UCM

Ameae Walker, Vice Chair (alt. for Mary

Gauvain), UCR

Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD

Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC (absent)

William Jacob, Chair, BOARS

Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA

Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD (absent)

Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP

Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP

William Parker, Chair, UCFW

John Crawford, Chair, UCORP

James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Los Angeles (8)

Malcolm Gordon

Jennifer Krull

Timothy Lane (absent)

Alan Laub

Susanne Lohmann

Joseph Nagy

Monica Smith

Ninez Ponce (alt. for Richard Steinberg)

Merced (1)

Robin DeLugan (alt. for Wolfgang Rogge)

Riverside (2)

Jodie Holt

Thomas Morton

San Diego (5)

John Hildebrand

Douglas Magde

Lorraine Pillus

Peter Wagner

Eric Watkins

San Francisco (3)

Farid Chehab

David Gardner

Steven Morin (alternate for Wendy Max)

Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)

Rolf Christoffersen (alt. for John Foran)

Vicki Scott

Santa Cruz (2)

June Gordon (alt. for Marilyn Walker)

Joseph Konopelski

Berkeley (6)

Philip Stark (alt. for Steven Beissinger)

Christina Maslach (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)

Ralph Catalano (absent)

Allen Goldstein

Jeffrey Perloff

Patricia Zambryski

Davis (6)

Trish Berger (absent)

Theodore DeJong (absent)

Richard Grotjahn

Joseph Kiskis

Krishnan Nambiar

Saul Schaefer (absent)

Irvine (4)

Christopher Leslie

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Jean Olson

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- **Robert Anderson**

A. Report on the Memorial to the Regents [INFORMATION]

B. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2012-13 Assembly [INFORMATION]

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 105.A.4](#), the Academic Council approved at its April 25 meeting the apportionment of the 40 Divisional Representatives for 2012-13. On the basis of Divisional Academic Senate membership as of April 2012, the Webster Method of Calculation was used to determine the number of Divisional Representatives as follows:

DIVISION	NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES/DIVISION
Berkeley	5
Davis	6
Irvine	4
Los Angeles	8
Merced	1
Riverside	2
San Diego	5
San Francisco	4
Santa Barbara	3
Santa Cruz	2

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- **Mark G. Yudof**

V. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. UCP&T Proposed Revision to Senate Bylaw 337

- **Robert Anderson**

The University Committee on Privilege & Tenure proposes amending Senate Bylaw 337 by adding a sentence to Section A that makes explicit the distinction between termination as the result of a disciplinary proceeding under Bylaw 336 and termination that results from a finding of incompetent performance. The proposed change has been reviewed by the chair of UCR&J and found to be a clarifying amendment that is consistent with the Manual of the Academic Senate.

Justification: Termination as a result of a disciplinary proceeding and termination for incompetent performance are distinct processes arising from different causes, and the processes are available to different groups. Non-Senate faculty who do not have the right to a Privilege and Tenure hearing in disciplinary cases are entitled to such a hearing in early termination cases. Existing Bylaw language does not describe explicitly the distinction between the applicability of Bylaws 336 and 337. The proposed amendment will reduce the potential for confusion and misunderstanding by Senate and non-Senate faculty and administrators.

337. Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Early Termination Cases (En 23 May 01). Additions underlined.

A. Jurisdiction (Am 10 Dec 2008)

In cases of proposed termination of a Senate or non-Senate faculty member before the expiration of the faculty member's appointment, or in cases where a tenured faculty member faces termination for incompetent performance, or for other faculty members whose right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given by Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents (Appendix I) (hereafter collectively referred to as early termination), the faculty member may request a hearing before a Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee. The committee shall then conduct a hearing on the case to determine whether, in its judgment, the proposed early termination is for good cause and has been recommended in accordance with a procedure that does not violate the privileges of the faculty member. Resolution of the dispute, either through negotiation or mediation, is permissible and appropriate at any stage of these proceedings. Termination as a result of a disciplinary case pursuant to Bylaw 336 is not covered by this Bylaw.

No Senate or non-Senate faculty member may be terminated prior to the expiration of an appointment without having an opportunity for a hearing before the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee. So long as the faculty member requests a hearing before the end of his or her appointment, the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee shall appoint a Hearing Committee and proceed according to Section B below. If the faculty member fails to request a hearing before the end date of the appointment in question, the faculty member may seek a grievance hearing by grieving the non-reappointment pursuant to Senate Bylaw 335 in the case of Senate faculty or the Academic Personnel Manual in the case of non-Senate faculty.

B. Hearing and Posthearing Procedures

1. The Privilege and Tenure Committee shall appoint a Hearing Committee for each early termination case for which a hearing is requested by a faculty member. The Hearing Committee should consist of at least three Division members. At least two of the members shall be members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, one of whom shall chair the Hearing Committee. The committee may not appoint a member of the department or equivalent administrative unit of the faculty member facing early termination to the Hearing Committee. Hearing Committee members shall disclose to the Hearing Committee any circumstances that may interfere with their objective consideration of the case and recuse themselves as appropriate. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of at least half but not less than three members of the Hearing Committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

2. Prior to the formal hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall schedule a conference with both the faculty member and the Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives. This conference should attempt to:
 - a. Determine the facts about which there is no dispute. At the hearing, these facts may be established by stipulation.
 - b. Define the issues to be decided by the Hearing Committee.
 - c. Set a time for both sides to exchange a list of witnesses and copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to limit each party to those witnesses whose names were disclosed to the other party prior to the hearing and to otherwise limit evidence to that which is relevant to the issues before the Hearing Committee.
 - d. Specify whether prehearing and post-hearing briefs will be submitted by the parties as well as the deadlines for those briefs.
 - e. Attain agreement about whether any person other than the Chancellor, the Chancellor's designee, the faculty member, and their representatives may be present during all or part of the hearing. In order to preserve the confidentiality of the hearing, persons whose presence is not essential to a determination of the facts shall, as a general rule, be excluded from the hearing.
3. The Chancellor's designee and the faculty member and/or their representatives shall be entitled to be present at all sessions of the Hearing Committee when evidence is being received and to select a representative who may act as counsel. Each party shall have the right to be represented by counsel, to present its case by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.
4. The hearing need not be conducted according to the technical legal rules relating to evidence and witnesses. The Hearing Committee may, upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, request files and documents under the control of the administration. All confidential information introduced into evidence, including the identity of confidential sources of personnel evaluations, shall remain so within the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee may call witnesses or make evidentiary requests on its own volition. The Hearing Committee also has the discretion to require that all witnesses affirm the veracity of their testimony.
5. No evidence other than that presented at the hearing shall be considered by the Hearing Committee or have weight in the proceedings, except that the Hearing Committee may take notice of any judicially noticeable facts that are commonly known. Parties present at the hearing shall be informed of matters thus noticed, and each party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to object to the Hearing Committee's notice of such matters.

6. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, at its discretion, request the appointment of a qualified person or persons, designated by the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to provide legal advice and/or to assist in the organization and conduct of the hearing.
7. At the hearing, the Chancellor's designee has the burden of proving, by clear and convincing evidence, that there is good cause for early termination. In assessing the evidence for good cause, the Hearing Committee may consider evidence regarding whether correct procedures were followed in the case.
8. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Committee shall promptly make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence, and recommendation, and forward these to the parties in the case, the Chancellor, the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and record of the proceedings shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law and UC policy. The Hearing Committee may, however, with the consent of the faculty member, authorize release of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations to other individuals or entities, to the extent allowed by law.
9. The hearing shall be recorded. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to use a certified court reporter (whose cost is borne by the administration) for this purpose, and the parties and their representatives shall have the right to a copy of the recording or transcript. The cost of the copy shall be assumed by the requesting party.
10. The Hearing Committee may reconsider a case if either party presents, within a reasonable time after the decision, newly discovered facts or circumstances that might significantly affect the previous decision and that were not reasonably discoverable at the time of the hearing.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 337.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [CONT'D]

B. BOARS Proposal on Transfer [ACTION]

PROPOSED CHANGES TO SENATE REGULATION 476 PROVIDING TWO NEW PATHS TO TRANSFER ADMISSION

The UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) proposes changes to Senate Regulation 476, in General Provisions for Admission to Advanced Standing. These changes are proposed following a favorable systemwide Senate review and approval by the Academic Council. These changes formalize two additional pathways to transfer admission: (1) Completion of a UC Transfer Curriculum (in the relevant major) and (2) completion of an approved Associate Degree for Transfer (in the relevant major) from a California Community College. The existing transfer pathway specified in Senate Regulation 476 will be retained, which will ensure that campuses have the flexibility to meet their transfer

targets and can continue to select students who have strong general education preparation, but may not have completed a major-based path. A student who completes any of the three pathways with a GPA specified by the campuses to which they apply will receive a comprehensive review for admission at each campus to which they apply. They will not be guaranteed admission to any campus.

If Assembly enacts this legislation, BOARS will update the UCOP Guidelines for Implementing University Policy on Undergraduate Admission to add a reference to timely graduation in the first sentence describing transfer students, as indicated by the underlined text: “Advanced standing applicants shall be selected by each campus using the criteria listed below as well as criteria 11-14 listed above, choosing applicants with the highest likelihood of timely graduation.” There will be no change in the four existing criteria for selection of advanced standing students now contained in the Guidelines. Two of the existing criteria already refer to major preparation, so the proposed new policy would not change existing practice as much as it strengthens current policy and practice in transfer admission.

Background: Over the past two years, the California Community College (CCC) system and the California State University have been implementing Senate Bill 1440, which requires the CCCs to create Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees with a major focus and requires CSU to guarantee automatic transfer to students who complete those degrees. These changes will significantly alter the transfer landscape. They also oblige UC to adapt and clarify its own admission criteria for transfer student admissions and to ensure that UC is welcoming to the most qualified Community College students who follow the new AA/AS pathways. By developing their own Transfer Curricula, UC departments will articulate their own vision of major preparation, rather than have CSU programs become the default advice. Comprehensive review for transfer applicants will continue. The policy does not alter the practice of using a referral pool for transfer students who meet the existing minimum eligibility requirements of SR 476.

The Academic Council asks that the following background be recorded as part of the legislative history and in describing BOARS implementation of the policy:

These changes do not require transfer applicants to complete major preparation courses or mandate any specific approach to the selection of transfer applicants. Under the proposed policy, every department and every campus will retain the authority to establish the most appropriate criteria for admission and work with their admissions staff and Senate admissions committee to ensure that transfer applicants are judged by those criteria, including major preparation and/or a particular pattern of general education.

Senate Regulations, Part II: Admission
Proposed Changes to SR 476 C
Additions underlined; deletions stricken.

SR 476 C. An applicant who did not meet the requirements specified in (A) or (B) may be admitted to the University provided the applicant has completed 60 semester (90 quarter) units of transferable college course work, has maintained a grade-point average ~~of at least 2.4 set by the campus~~ in transferable college course work, ~~and has completed all of the following transferable courses~~ with a grade of C or higher, and has completed one of the following pathways:

(1) Completion of the UC Transfer Curriculum for the applicant’s chosen major along with 60 (90 quarter) transferrable units.

(2) Completion of an SB 1440 Associate Degree for Transfer in the applicant’s chosen major at a California Community College.

(3) Completion of the minimum criteria of seven courses specified below along with 60 (90 quarter) transferrable units.

1. Two transferable college courses (3 semester or 4-5 quarter units each) in English Composition. One of the English Composition courses is to be equivalent in level to the transferable course which would satisfy (on some campuses only in part) the English Composition requirement at the University. The second course can be (but is not required to be) the 'English Composition/ Critical Thinking' course used to satisfy part of the English Communication requirement of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum specified in SR 478. Courses designed exclusively for the satisfaction of remedial composition requirements as defined in SR 761 cannot be used to satisfy this requirement.
2. One transferable college course (3 semester or 4-5 quarter units) in Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning.
3. Four additional transferable college courses (3 semester or 4-5 quarter units each) chosen from at least two of the following subject areas: the Arts and Humanities; the Social and Behavioral Sciences; and the Physical and Biological Sciences.

The minimum grade point average must be at least 2.4, cannot exceed 3.0, and will be set by each Division. The UC Transfer Curricula are developed by the departments and programs in each Division and approved by the appropriate divisional committee.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 476.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [CONT'D]

C. Academic Council

1. Nomination and Election of 2012-13 UCOC Vice Chair [ACTION]

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 150.A.1. Committees](#), "...the members-at-large are to be named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. Each at-large member will serve as Vice Chair in the first year and shall normally succeed as Chair in the second year." Accordingly, UCOC Vice Chair Mitchell Sutter (UCD) is a candidate to become Chair and Professor Martha Conklin (UCM) is a candidate to serve as Vice Chair. Professor Sutter previously served on the Committee on Committees at UCD for two years and served as a member of UCOC prior to becoming vice chair of UCOC last year. Professor Conklin previously served on UC Merced's COC from 2004-2008, chaired it in 2005-06 and is currently vice chair. She served on UCOC in 2005-06 and 2001-12, also and is past Senate Chair of the Merced division.

ACTION REQUESTED: Elect the 2012-2013 UCOC Chair and Vice Chair.

2. Dissolution of University Committee on Computing and Communications [ACTION]

- **Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair**
- **Anthony Joseph, UCCC Member and past Chair**

Following deliberation over two meetings and consultation with the University Committee on Committees, at its May 23 meeting, Council approved a proposal to repeal Bylaw 155 and amendments to Bylaws 170, 180, and 200 in order to disestablish UCCC and reassign parts of its charge. In addition, Council approved a proposal that committees on academic freedom, academic personnel, and planning and budget be formally requested to take note of computing and communications issues that fall within their respective charges as currently contained in their respective Bylaws. UCR&J's chair has opined that they are consistent with the Manual of the Academic Senate. Council recommends that Assembly enact the proposed legislation.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSAL TO REPEAL SENATE BYLAW 155 TO DISSOLVE THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS AND TO AMEND SENATE BYLAWS 170, 180, AND 200 TO REASSIGN PORTIONS OF ITS CHARGE

Overview: As computing and communications have become ubiquitous, there is no part of the Academic Senate's jurisdiction that does not include a computing and communications dimension. Accordingly, it is no longer possible to define what jurisdiction over these matters means for a single standing committee, and it is essential that standing committees charged to address such matters as educational and research policy, academic freedom, academic personnel, and planning and budget attend to the computing and communications issues that arise in their areas of oversight.

History of UCCC: On the recommendation of the Academic Council, the Assembly established the first Committee on Computer Policy at its meeting of December 3, 1974, with the charge to "represent the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of computers" and to "advise the President concerning the acquisition and use of computers at the University." (Report of the Academic Council, 12/3/1974 Assembly Call at 21-22). Minutes of the meeting indicate that Council was concerned "that the Administration's Computer Policy Board would diminish the effectiveness of divisional committees on computer policy" and that "the growing importance of computers not only in research but also in instruction" meant that "the Senate should have its own committee to submit its views to the Administration." (12/3/1974 Minutes at xiii). A decade later, the Report of the Academic Council submitted to the November 20, 1985 meeting of the Assembly, recommended dissolution of the committee, because "whereas the Divisional committees on Computer Policy . . . serve an important function at the campus level, at an institution level [it does] not[,] because "so little business" had been "directed to [this] university committee[]" that it "no longer serve[s] any clearly-defined purpose and should be abolished." (11/20/1985 Assembly Call at 48). The May 7, 1987 Assembly Call includes a Report from the Committee on Computer Policy, which indicates that Assembly did not approve Council's recommendation but instructed the committee "to prepare guidelines to ensure that it would be able to function more effectively in the future." (5/7/1987 Call at 10). The committee proposed to change its name to Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy, enlarge its membership to include the chair of the Committee on Libraries, and to revise its charge. Under the new charge, the committee would "represent the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of information technology and telecommunications and shall advise the President concerning the acquisition and use of information and telecommunications technology at the University either at its own initiative or at the President's request." (5/7/1987 Call at 58-59). The committee acquired its current name and charge at the January 30, 2008 meeting of the Assembly, which adopted a recommendation of the committee and approved by Council. As the committee explained, "Change is rapid in information technology and computing, and communications technology increasingly impacts our faculty's teaching and research as well as the student experience. While the Committee still exercises its responsibility in reviewing policy changes, more and more the Committee initiates and leads discussions on the enhanced and expanded uses of computing and communication technologies in support of the academic mission. The proposed changes will encourage future Committee leadership and membership to pursue this expanded and more activist agenda." The committee proposed to delete the

terms “information,” “technology,” and “policy” from its name to clarify that its concerns were not limited to “technology for its own sake” or to “policy” and to distinguish it from the library committee. The new charge also removed the reference to instruction and research, so that jurisdiction would extend over “all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology . . . at the University.” (January 30, 2008 Call at 84-86). Assembly adopted the proposed revisions.

The renamed committee’s amended Bylaw 155 now reads as follows:

Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128 and shall include the Chair of the Library Committee who shall serve as ex officio member. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with the Bylaw 128.D.2. and 3. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003)

Duties: The Committee shall represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology, and shall advise the President, consistent with Bylaw 40, concerning the acquisition and usage, and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues at the University either at its own initiative or at the President's request. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003; Am 30 Jan 2008)

Reasons to abolish UCCC: Given the ubiquity of computing and computing technologies, nothing in the charge to address “all matters involving the uses and impact” of these technologies in the University gives this committee a distinct task. The issues related to computing and communications technologies are embedded in the charges to committees on Educational Policy, Graduate Affairs, Academic Freedom, Research Policy, Libraries and Scholarly Communications, and Academic Personnel, among others. In addition, many of the decisions related to technology that directly affect Senate concerns take place at the campus level. Only one action item has come out of UCCC since 2009, due to the lack of actionable business referred to the committee. Reflecting this blurring of its mission, two divisions have declined to appoint divisional representatives to UCCC since 2009. At the divisional level, computing committees are folded into committees on either library or research (or both).

Annual reports: UCCC’s annual reports to the Assembly for 2008-9, 2009-10, and 2010-11 are contained in the Call to the first Assembly meeting of each of those academic years, posted at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/Feb2012Assembly_agendaFINAL_000.pdf and at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/previous.html>.

Conclusion: Given current fiscal realities, it is not a good use of Senate resources – above all, faculty time, but also including meeting costs and staff time – to maintain this separate committee at the systemwide level.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSAL TO REPEAL SENATE BYLAW 155 TO DISSOLVE THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Response to Issues Raised in Academic Council Chair Robert Anderson's Memorandum of 2/6/12 to UCCC Chair Primack

Issue: Does the charge to this committee establish distinctive jurisdiction over a meaningful array of issues not already included in the charges of other committees? Given their ubiquitousness, issues related to computing and communications technologies are embedded in the charges to committees on Educational Policy, Graduate Affairs, Academic Freedom, Research Policy, and Academic Personnel,

among others. In addition, many of the decisions related to technology that directly affect Senate concerns take place at the campus level.

UCCC Response: Computing and communications are increasingly relevant to UC teaching and research. While some computing and communications technology decisions are made at the campus level, there have been increased efforts to coordinate or centralize important areas across UC. This is discussed further below in the response of UCCC on the "**Future of UCCC**"; see also the proposed revised UCCC charge on page 3.

Issue: Does the activity of this committee indicate that its members find that it plays a significant role in shared governance?

UCCC Response: These issues were discussed by all members in attendance at the UCCC meeting on 4/18/12, representing 7 UC campuses. All expressed the view that UCCC remains very relevant to shared governance in connection with computing and communications, but with better coordination with UCOP/VCITS David Ernst. This is discussed further in "**Future of UCCC**" below.

Issue: If the committee were to be dissolved, what functions would need to be reassigned and where?

UCCC Response: The greatest overlap appears to be with UCORP, but it is not clear that UCORP members would have the relevant interest and expertise.

Future of UCCC

UC has increasingly been trying to centralize important areas of computing and communications technology, and further efforts of this sort could be beneficial to UC -- for example, UC-wide provision or coordination of an on-line environment and standard tools for web interaction and meetings and UC-wide aid in sharing computing and in massive cloud storage. Such storage could be especially beneficial in helping faculty comply with increased demands of funding agencies for archiving research data and making it widely available. In addition, better coordination between campuses in this area would be beneficial -- for example, to develop new multi-campus or UC-wide proposals for support by federal agencies. These are all areas where UCCC should continue to represent the Senate in shared governance.

The interaction of UCCC and the office of the UC VP for Information Technology Services has not been optimal. UCCC's 2009 criticism of the Shared Research Computing Services (ShaRCS) project (endorsed by UC Academic Council) led to no change in UC ITS policy. The outcome of ShaRCS would have been better if UCCC's advice had been taken into account, and there would likely have been less difficulty in developing a successor to ShaRCS. The UC Federated Cyber-infrastructure Collaborative Proposal, which is the latest effort to develop a successor to ShaRCS, was not discussed beforehand with UCCC. UCCC is nevertheless drafting a response.

The nature of the interaction between UCCC and UCOP should improve, with VPITS David Ernst or his representatives participating in *all* UCCC meetings, prepared to discuss plans in advance of implementation and to take into account the advice of UCCC. In addition, a tighter link would be desirable between UCCC, representing the faculty concerns with computing and communication on each campus, and the IT Leadership Council (ITLC), comprised of the IT administration leader (Chief Information Officer or Vice Chancellor for IT) on each campus. At present the only link is that the UCCC chair is an ex-officio member of ITLC. After not being included in the ITLC mailings and calls to meetings in 2010-11, it was good that UCCC chair Primack was included in 2011-12; this led to much relevant information being shared with UCCC. In the future, both the chair and vice chair of UCCC should be part of the ITLC, perhaps even with voting rights; including the UCCC vice chair is essential for continuity. More ambitious would be to schedule an in-person meeting of UCCC each year with one of the in-person meetings of ITLC. This would allow improved multi-campus exchanges and

coordination reflecting the perspectives of both administration and faculty. Finally, UCCC should be able to initiate relevant studies on its own authority and report to the Academic Council.

Activities of UCCC 2011-12

Mainly, UCCC has been a vehicle for intercampus discussion about the use and impact of computing and communications technology, and for discussion with UCOP through VPITS David Ernst. It should be more proactive.

Key topics at UCCC meetings 2011-12:

UC VCR/CIO Summit on IT Supporting Data and Computation-Centric Third Pillar of Research, and how to respond to an NSF official's call for UC proposals.

The need for UC to adopt and support quality Web Conferencing Software.

Campus Plans for Charging for Electricity and Cooling for Computing.

Potential UC-wide contracts for IT software and services, including with Microsoft , Adobe, and Box.net - discussion with ITLC Chair Shelton Waggener (at 11/9/11 meeting) and discussion of proposed reframing of UC Technology Acquisition Support (TAS) (at 4/18/12 meeting.)

UC Cyberinfrastructure and Research Technology plan, and Collaborative Infrastructure four-year deliverable resources (at 4/18/12 meeting).

Also discussed at UCCC meetings 2011-12 (partial list): GigU consortium; Pedagogical Issues Report; Online Instruction; How student evaluations of teaching are conducted on campuses; Consultation with UCOP/IR&C on Privacy and Security Initiative; UCCC Sharepoint website; that some campuses (e.g., UCSC) have negotiated low-cost phone service and no longer bill even for international calls.

Campuses represented at UCCC meetings 2011-12: 11/9/11: UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCSD; 2/8/12 and 4/18/12: UCB, UCD, UCM, UCR, UCSB, UCSC, UCSD. It is true that UCI and UCLA did not appoint a member to UCCC in 2011-12. The UCSF member did not attend and sent an email saying that she favors dissolving UCCC.

Current Charter of UCCC

155. Computing and Communications [formerly Bylaw 181 - Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (Am 30 Jan 2008)]

A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128 and shall include the Chair of the Library Committee who shall serve as ex officio member. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with the Bylaw 128.D.2. and 3. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003)

B. Duties: The Committee shall represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology, and shall advise the President, consistent with Bylaw 40, concerning the acquisition and usage, and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues at the University either at its own initiative or at the President's request. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003; Am 30 Jan 2008)

Martha Winnacker adds: Please note that your charge to “advise the President” should be interpreted to mean that you offer that advice through the President’s designee, the Vice President for Information Technology Services, David Ernst.

Proposed Revised Charter of UCCC

[Additions underlined]

A. No change is necessary, but note that the Chair of the Library Committee has never participated in UCCC meetings for many years, and student representatives have participated very rarely.

Revised B. Duties: The Committee shall represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology, shall initiate appropriate studies and make reports thereon to the President and the Academic Council, and shall advise the President, consistent with Bylaw 40, concerning the acquisition and usage, and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues at the University either at its own initiative or at the President's request. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003; Am 30 Jan 2008) The Chair and Vice Chair of UCCC are ex-officio members of the ITLC.

PROPOSAL BY ACADEMIC COUNCIL TO ELIMINATE THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS

REQUIRED CHANGES TO SENATE BYLAWS

Repeal Bylaw 155: [Deletion stricken]

~~155. Computing and Communications [formerly Bylaw 181—Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (Am 30 Jan 2008)]~~

- ~~A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128 and shall include the Chair of the Library Committee who shall serve as ex officio member. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with the Bylaw 128.D.2. and 3. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003)~~
- ~~B. Duties: The Committee shall represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology, and shall advise the President, consistent with Bylaw 40, concerning the acquisition and usage, and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues at the University either at its own initiative or at the President's request. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003; Am 30 Jan 2008)~~

Add new language to selected Bylaws, as indicated below to ensure that specified committee charges include oversight of relevant computing and communications matters.

170. Educational Policy [Additions underlined]

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen according with Bylaw 128.D.1. and 3. (Am 29 Nov 72, 7 Dec 76: Am 28 May 2003)

- B. Duties. Consistent with [Bylaw 40](#), the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
1. Consider and report on matters referred to it by the President of the University, the Assembly, a Division, or any Senate committee.
 2. Initiate appropriate studies and make reports thereon to the President, the Assembly, or any Division, on the establishment or disestablishment of curricula, colleges, schools, departments, institutes, bureaus, and the like; large-scale uses of technology in the curriculum; and on legislation or administrative policies of a fundamental character involving questions of educational policy. (Am 15 Jun 71)
 3. Approve UC undergraduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues. (En 10 Nov 04)

180. Graduate Affairs, Coordinating Committee on

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. Two graduate students shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D.1. and 3. (Am 6 Jun 79; Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with the [Bylaw 40](#), the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
1. Advise the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
 2. Establish basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various Graduate Councils and Divisions.
 3. Recommend to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students [see [Bylaw 311.C.1](#)].
 4. Act for the Academic Senate in the approval of new programs for established graduate degrees, including self supporting degree programs, degree programs offered primarily to off-campus students, and the joint doctoral degrees with campuses of the California State University.
 5. Review proposals from Graduate Councils for the establishment of new graduate degrees that require approval of the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval, and submit recommendations thereon to the Assembly [see [SOR 110.1](#) and [Bylaw 116.C](#)]. (Am 24 May 00)
 6. Review standards and policies applied by Graduate Councils, and policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies.
 7. Approve UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues. (En 10 Nov 04)

200. Research Policy

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D.1. and 3. (Am 26 May 82; Am 6 May 86; Am 4 May 89; Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with Bylaw 40, the Committee shall consider matters pertaining to: (Am 28 May 2003)
 - 1. Fostering research, including by advising the President on research infrastructure;
 - 2. Formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures;
 - 3. Advising the President on research. Questions of policy and their implementation may be initiated by this committee, referred to it by the President, or brought to its attention by Divisions. (Am 15 Jun 72, 25 May 82)

Bylaws listed below already contain comprehensive charges to committees that implicitly include a computing and communications component. If Assembly acts as recommended, the Chair of the Assembly should inform the Chairs of these committees that the dissolution of the University Committee on Computing & Communications requires these committees to address issues related to computing and communications falling within the committee's charge.

130. Academic Freedom

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128. D. and 3. (Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with Bylaw 40, the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)

Study and report to the Assembly upon any condition within or outside the University that, in the committee's judgment, may affect the academic freedom of the University and its academic community. (Am 15 Jun 71; Am 23 May 1996; Am 28 May 2003)

This broad charge encompasses computing and communications without need for additional language; adding new language on this issue would appear to narrow the meaning of "any condition within or outside the University." Instead of changing the Bylaw, a letter to UCAF should point out that UCCC has been abolished and that UCAF should attend to these concerns.

185. Library and Scholarly Communication (Am 9 May 2007)

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D.2. and 3. A University librarian and the

Chair of the Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy shall serve *ex officio*. Up to three at-large members, appointed for one-year renewable terms, and in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, to supplement the expertise of divisional members in areas of special relevance to the current business of the committee. (Am 7 May 87; Am 28 May 2003; Am 9 May 2007)

- B. Duties. Consistent with [Bylaw 40](#), the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
1. Advise the President concerning the administration of the libraries of the University in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents and issues related to innovations in forms of scholarly communication. (Am 9 May 2003; Am 9 May 2007)
 2. Perform such other appropriate duties as may be committed to the Academic Senate by proper authority.

UCOLASC charge already includes matters that could be addressed by UCCC.

190. Planning and Budget

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate student and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See Bylaw 128.E.] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128 D 1 and 3. (Am 28 May 2003):
- B. Duties. Consistent with [Bylaw 40](#) the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)
1. Confer with and advise the President and agencies of the University Administration on policy regarding planning and budget matters and resource allocations.
 2. Initiate studies in planning and budget matters. (Am 28 May 2003)

UCPB charge already covers matters related to computing and communications.

Representation on Information Technology Leadership Council

Although no Bylaw change is required, dissolution of UCCC will eliminate the *ex officio* representation of the Academic Senate on the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC). If UCCC is dissolved, the chair or vice chair of another standing committee should be designated as the Senate's *ex officio* representative on the ITLC or any successor body. Potential candidates include the Vice Chair of the Academic Council, the Chair or Vice Chair of UCORP, and the Chair or Vice Chair of UCPB.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve proposed amendments to the Senate Bylaws to dissolve UCCC and assign its charge to other committees.

- 3. Academic Graduate Student Support [DISCUSSION]**
- **Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair**
 - **Rachael Goodhue, Chair, Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support**

The Assembly will be briefed on two efforts to address graduate student support: the Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support, and the Joint Senate-Administration Work Group on Academic Graduate Student Issues. At the request of the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents, the groups are working to prepare a report to the Board on the topic of competitiveness in academic graduate student support.

4. Discussion with Administrators by Invitation of the Academic Council

- a. **Robinson-Edley [Report](#) on Campus Responses to Protests**
 - **Charles Robinson, Vice President and General Counsel**
 - **Christopher Edley, Berkeley Law Dean and Special Advisor to the President**

- b. **Update on State Budget**
 - **Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources**

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS