

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom convened three times during the academic year 2001-2002, and held one teleconference among members of the committee's Symposium Planning Task Force. Herein are outlined the major activities of and issues considered by the committee over the course of the year.

Revision of the UC Policy on Copyright

UCAF reviewed the three draft policy proposals prepared by the UC Standing Committee on Copyright, commending these efforts and making several recommendations to further safeguard faculty's ownership of course material. These included: defining the contextual usage of the term "syllabus"; refining language for consistency and broader effectiveness; making explicit the right to appeal a judgment of the Course Materials Policy Committee. In addition, UCAF saw the need to augment the Policy on Reservation of Rights with a recommended standard form and/or standard language for faculty use.

Student Evaluations

UCAF considered the question of whether student evaluations have an impact on careers or on teaching, and therefore on academic freedom. The committee felt that, at the least, there is a need to assess how student evaluations function on all levels, and whether they perform an important role. Also considered was the possible need to standardize and modify the use and form of student evaluations so as to provide more useful feedback to faculty, and to develop alternative teaching evaluation processes. Through the Academic Council Chair, the discussion was then opened up to UCAP, UCEP and UCP&T. UCAF looks forward to receiving wider input from the Senate for its future consideration of this issue.

Racial Privacy Initiative

Although when the committee considered this issue in May it was not yet clear whether the Racial Privacy Initiative would be on this year's state ballot, UCAF recorded its opinion that academic freedom would be negatively affected if the provisions of the Racial Privacy Initiative are interpreted in a way that would limit the ability of scholars to conduct their research.

Symposium on Academic Freedom

The committee dedicated a portion of each meeting to preliminary planning of a Symposium on Academic Freedom. A teleconference was also held among members of the planning task force. The symposium's overarching purpose is to promote greater understanding of the meaning of academic freedom, its challenges, boundaries and future within the current academic environment, to forge inter-relations with other Senate Committees and administration, and to develop potential strategies that address areas of concern. As a basis for symposium topics, the committee articulated some internal and external forces that affect academic freedom: 1) corporate-University relations;

2) impact of multiple funding sources and external granting agencies; 4) pressures to publish; 5) recent crises that have altered government priorities and the mood and perception of the country; and 6) an apparent lack of faculty awareness of the functions of both campus academic freedom committees and UCAF. Chair Wallhagen met with the Academic Council Chair, Vice Chair and Executive Director to discuss all aspects of the symposium, and in particular to determine sources of funding for and the scope of the event. The Symposium is now being seen as a Senate-wide event, and planning will continue in the fall towards a spring 2003 date.

UC Management of DOE Laboratories

The committee heard regular reports from the UCAF representative on the UCORP Subcommittee on UC-DOE Relations, and discussed their university-wide activities as well as issues such as the implications of laboratory management contracts and policy, and the status of researchers in the labs (Senate membership). Particular to academic freedom, were the issue of opportunity for researchers to work disinterestedly, and the related issue of the role of the DOE in research assignments.

Committee Membership

Bylaw Revision: In concordance with the general review of all systemwide committee bylaws, UCAF ratified the May 2001 proposed changes of Bylaw 130, which was submitted to the ad hoc Committee on Bylaws. The main structural change in the proposed bylaw is the addition of a Vice Chair.

Outside Representation: In response to a solicitation by the Academic Council Chair, UCAF nominated a representative to sit on the University Committee on Copyright. This will be an ongoing committee liaison.

Other Issues and Activities

UCAF's activities also included: considering the implications of a UCSF petition to ban research funding by the tobacco industry; monitoring the civil liberties issue in connection with federal government access to student records, and in particular UC Berkeley's student and Senate response to implementation of the PATRIOT Act; and discussion of academic freedom cases at other universities. UCAF is anticipating an active 2002-03 session that will focus on the realization of the Symposium and expanded activity within the Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Margaret Wallhagen, Chair
Michael Jubien, Davis
Ian Coulter, Los Angeles
Murray Baumgarten (fall), Santa Cruz

Robert Powell, Berkeley
Dana Aswad, Irvine
Gary Watson, Riverside
Brenda Foust, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) held seven meetings, supplemented by e-mail consultations. The following summary of the committee's work focuses on those matters that resulted in actions or generated substantive discussion. These topics appear in alphabetical order.

Ad Hoc Faculty Review Committee for University Professor

At several meetings, UCAP reviewed confidential lists of committee nominees for University Professor nominations, subsequently providing Assistant Vice President Switkes with additional nominees.

APM 270: In Residence Series

By campus request UCAP considered the following issues: Are a faculty member's rank and step automatically transferred in the transition from the In Residence to Professor Series? Should the language of APM 270 be revised in order to address this issue? UCAP concluded that, as specified in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 270), the criteria for evaluation in the In Residence title are equivalent to those for the Professor title. An individual in an In Residence appointment may be considered for an appointment in the Professor series only following documentation of a full competitive search. A Professor appointment is a new appointment, even when following on a period of In Residence appointment. As with any new appointment, the divisional CAP should evaluate the qualifications of the new appointment for rank and step. Evaluation by divisional CAPs of proposed step or rank advancement consider the cumulative level of achievement both in initial appointment and in subsequent advancement. In theory, the equivalence of the criteria between the In Residence title and the professorial title imply an equivalence of appropriate step and rank. In practice, divisional CAPs may or may not have participated fully in prior evaluations of individuals in the In Residence series. Therefore, UCAP strongly recommends that divisional CAPs strive to practice the equivalence of criteria for advancement in the In Residence and Professor series specified by APM-270.

APM 310: Professional Research Series

The Academic Council asked UCAP to look into the question of whether Professional Research Series personnel are considered faculty, and to clarify criteria that are utilized in their appointment and promotion. UCAP was specifically asked to consider the extent to which these criteria match those used in the Professor Series. The following UCAP position was sent to Council Chair Viswanathan: Research series appointments fall under the category of "other academic appointees" and are defined as non-faculty appointments. Nominally, the research components between the Professional Research Series and the Professor Series are equivalent, although in

practice research appointments may be carrying out research within the context of a project or laboratory directed by a Professor. The equivalence in the research component, even when achieved, does not necessarily reflect full equivalence with the Professor ranks, however, because there are components of performance within the Professorial ranks that are not normally a component of the Research title.

APM 311 (proposed new) – Project Series

At its June 18, 2002 meeting, UCAP conducted a preliminary review of the proposed Project (Scientist) series. Although UCAP understood the motivation for a bifurcation of the Researcher title by addition of a Project Scientist title, UCAP found the description for the Project Scientist title to be problematic, especially at the senior levels. A letter setting out UCAP comments and suggestions was sent to Assistant Vice President Switkes. The Professional Researcher is developed in parallel to the full Professor, with an equivalence of research component. It is illogical to develop the Project Scientist along the same lines, on track, because their research accomplishments are not expected to be equivalent to ladder rank faculty, as is the case with Professional Researchers. Perhaps an explicit statement could be added to the APM: that although the individual might meet the parallel, there is no presumption of lateral equivalency or transportability of rank and step. The majority of UCAP members were concerned that there might be a proliferation of series.

APM 740 (informal review of proposed revisions to): Sabbatical Leave

Formal systemwide review will begin as soon as the suggestions from UCAP, UCFW, Academic Vice Chancellors, and DANR have been received. The proposed revisions to APM 740 and SOR 103.4 will then be sent to the Academic Council and all relevant Senate committees. UCAP members recommended that APM 740-18-a-3 should apply to a five (not six) year period.

Career Progress – Request for Implementation of Systemwide Tracking.

At its May 21, 2002 meeting UCAP approved a motion that the Office of the President be requested to implement a system for tracking the career progress of faculty at the University of California.

A UC-wide career path database that tracks progress of the faculty through the ranks is currently unavailable. Lack of relevant information has consistently impeded attempts by UCAP to evaluate issues of equity and cross-campus comparability in application of standards. Although this information is implicitly contained in the archival academic personnel records, this form of information is generally inaccessible, and is not useful for the construction of system-wide aggregates. UCAP recommends that a consistently formatted database be developed that would contain sufficient information that the full career trajectory could be tracked. This database should include (at least): the dates and titles of appointment, the dates of changes of series, dates of leaves of absence, and the dates and nature of advancements of both step and rank, and of special adjustments in salary, the age of the faculty member, and the date of the highest degree. The database should also include base salary information. It should be a uniform system applied across the entire UC. Such a

database would make it possible to directly apply standard salary methodologies, such as the salary methodology of the Association of American Universities that evaluates the normative salary as a function of such factors as age and years of experience since the Ph.D. (or other highest degree). This methodology has been used or is being used on a subset of campuses. The AAU methodology would need to be extended or adapted to consider step and rank. UCAP has recently reviewed the statistical patterns of advancement in the full professor rank as a function of age and disciplinary category.

The *UCAP Statement on Tracking Progress through Ranks and Career: Statistics and Information Gathering*, along with data that suggest issues of gender inequity, was distributed to the Academic Council.

It is in context of these data that UCAP recommends that a systemwide tracking database be implemented to provide information necessary to a full understanding of faculty advancement practices.

Career Review

The University needs to ensure that all ladder-rank faculty are appointed at the appropriate rank and step consistent with their academic accomplishments as a matter of fairness and good employment practice. UCAP wrote to those Divisional CAPs not already engaged in or considering merit equity review with the recommendation that those campuses develop appropriate mechanisms for such a review. The Riverside model was offered as an example, and campuses were urged to reconsider this issue and to develop procedures, on an on-going basis, for merit equity review. Though current academic personnel policy authorizes merit reviews at normal intervals, President Atkinson believes that guidelines similar to UC Riverside's equity "career review" guidelines should be developed and implemented by all campuses.

Distinguished Professor: Proposal to Change "above-scale" Professor to Distinguished Professor

After reviewing the UC Davis administrative proposal to use the title Distinguished Professor for all above-scale faculty at UC Davis, UCAP members unanimously supported the position that the Distinguished Professor title is an honorary working title that currently is and should continue to be used only sparingly. The proposed Davis action for a blanket use of the Distinguished Professor title would create great difficulties for other UC campuses, raising issues of comparability for above-scale professors on other campuses. Its blanket use might ultimately lead to a diminished value for Distinguished Professor titles in the UC that would limit the effectiveness of this mechanism for recruitment and retention. In a letter to Davis administration, UCAP strongly encouraged that the proposal to grant the title of Distinguished Professor to all above-scale faculty be reconsidered.

Divisional CAP Procedures, Request for Review

One campus's Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure asked for a UCAP review of CAP procedures. UCAP concluded that CAP can accommodate most procedural irregularities by taking into account new information. This

accommodation may be eased because a change in the CAP constituency normally would have occurred by the time new information is considered. However, UCAP also believes that it would be possible for the CAP Chair and the Executive Vice Chancellor (or appropriate administrator) jointly to decide that a shadow CAP might be used in certain cases.

eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee

The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee asked that a UCAP member represent the Academic Senate on the eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee. UCAP was unable to designate a representative to the eScholarship Advisory Subcommittee from either current UCAP membership or from Divisional CAPs. As necessary, this request will return for consideration by the 2002-03 UCAP.

Laboratory Professorship Program

UCAP reviewed a new initiative, announced by the Provost and Senior Vice president of Academic Affairs, to establish a Laboratory Professorship program at Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Laboratories. The purpose of the program is to forge stronger ties between the laboratory and a campus in a strategic area of mutual interest. Academic Council members raised concerns that the process outlined in the proposal might fundamentally undermine the academic personnel process for hiring UC faculty. Though the overarching concept of increased lab-campus collaboration was strongly supported by UCAP, members pointed out that lab-campus collaboration currently exists. UCAP also was concerned with the principle of outside participation in the allocation of faculty FTE or the selection of faculty newly recruited to the UC. The motion to decline UCAP support for the Laboratory Professorship Program was approved by a vote of 8-2-1. UCAP concerns and recommendations about the proposed program and UC's academic personnel process were detailed in a letter to Council Chair Viswanathan.

UCAF concern: can student evaluations negatively impact the academic freedom of faculty? UCAP considered this issue, at the request of Council Chair Viswanathan, and concluded that appropriate mechanisms for the evaluation of teaching already exist in the APM. Departments are encouraged to utilize multiple alternative methods in addition to student evaluations to evaluate teaching effectiveness. If the department believes that issues academic freedom is compromised by student evaluations, they should provide this information as appropriate context as part of the faculty review file.

UCAAD Report on Recruiting a Diverse Faculty within the Context of Tidal Wave II

UCAP extensively discussed the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) *Report on Recruiting a Diverse faculty within the Context of Tidal Wave II*, sought comment from the Divisional CAPs, and consulted with representatives of the Office of the President regarding diversity policies of the University of California. UCAP members strongly support principles of excellence, equity, and diversity in faculty hiring and promotion. The specific methods and

suggestions described in the UCAAD report were extensively discussed, and, while not in agreement with a number of specific recommendations raised in the UCAAD report, UCAP members were broadly supportive of the goals of the report. In a letter to Council Chair Viswanathan, UCAP offered a series of comments and suggestions regarding the UCAAD report.

UC Merced: Initial Bylaws of the Committee on Academic Personnel; Initial UCM Academic Appointments. UCAP reviewed and commented on the UC Merced CAP initial bylaws.

UC Standing Committee on Copyright Draft Documents. UCAP considered three draft policy documents: (1) policy on ownership and use of course materials; (2) policy on recording of [academic][instructional] presentations; and (3) policy on reservations of rights. UCAP agreed that the Standing Committee on Copyright has done a judicious job of representing the rights of the individual faculty member to his or her own intellectual developments. There were, however, two minor points that UCAP would like to recommend for further consideration: (a) The “policy on reservation of rights” is vague and requires clarification. (b) Does the reference to a “course materials policy committee” mean that a new, additional committee must be established at each campus, or would extant Committees on Courses adequately be able to meet the responsibilities described? These concerns were conveyed by letter to the Academic Council Chair.

Unit 18 Lecturers Negotiations. UCAP was regularly informed by the UCOP Office of Academic Advancement about the University’s ongoing negotiations for Unit 18 Lecturers. In an executive session with AVP Switkes and Director Okada, UCAP members discussed confidential bargaining documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Doshier, Chair (I)
Michelle Yeh, Vice Chair (D)
Robert Holub (B)
Robert Rucker (D)
Richard L. Regosin (I)
Jaime R. Villablanca (LA)
Subir Ghosh (R)
Ramon Gutierrez (SD)
Sandra Weiss (SF)
Tom Gerig (SB)
Peter Kenez (SC)
Sarah Gray (UCM Rep)
Jeannene Whalen, Committee Analyst

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2000-2001**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met nine times during the 2000-2001 academic year, including a supplemental meeting in November specially convened to consider the Dual Admissions Proposal. Four intense two-day working sessions were also convened, which extended into the summer months to conduct thorough and timely deliberation of other proposed changes in admissions policy.

Overview of Admissions Statistics for 1999 & 2000

First-time Freshmen (*Information Digest 2001, Student Academic Services, UCOP*)

	Applicants	Admitted	Enrolled
Fall 1999	65,901	49,747	27,491
Fall 2000	68,209	51,804	28,560

Transfers

	Applicants	Admitted	Enrolled
Fall 1999	20,738	14,090	9,949
Fall 2000	21,071	14,949	10,599

DURING THE 2000-2001 ACADEMIC YEAR, BOARS CONSIDERED AND ACTED ON THE FOLLOWING MAJOR ISSUES:

ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT (ELC). Fall 2001 was the first admission cycle to implement the ELC program. This program, which guarantees UC admission to the top 4 percent of the graduating class in each California high school, intends to recognize academic achievement of all students while expanding the eligibility pool and increasing geographic accessibility. BOARS has monitored ELC's initial implementation and reports that the program has seen a large measure of success, with 96.8% of public schools participating and significant increases in the applicant pools. BOARS passed a motion to amend the calculation of the high school GPA used for ELC. In the future, the GPA will be computed as an average of all a-g courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades, including a maximum of eight AP courses. This recognizes successful college preparatory work that is completed by students who may not be UC eligible according to statewide criteria. BOARS will continue to oversee all aspects of ELC.

DUAL ADMISSIONS. BOARS was asked to consider the Dual Admissions proposal initiated by President Atkinson in October 2000. Dual admissions was designed to augment ELC and offer an additional pathway of admission to UC. Through this program high school students who place in the top 4 percent to 12.5 percent of their graduating class, and who are otherwise ineligible for admission, are granted admission to UC provided they first complete an agreed upon transfer program at a community college.

This option will facilitate community college transfers and has the potential to increase the diversity in UC's applicant pool. BOARS devoted a significant portion of its 2000-2001 session reviewing the proposal and soliciting input from UCEP, Senate Divisions, and UC Admissions Directors. In developing the policy, BOARS recommended that the dual admissions pathway be available only to students who are ineligible to attend UC. The intent of the program is to broaden UC's reach to high achieving students in the group of high schools where UC does not have a strong presence. BOARS formally submitted the proposal to the Academic Assembly and it was approved in May 2001. The Board of Regents approved the proposal in July 2001, but expressed concerns that the 2.4 GPA for transfers could potentially erode the quality of students admitted to UC. BOARS plans to discuss the issue and prepare a rationale for the 2.4 GPA early next year.

BOARS now looks forward to working with the administration to ensure resources for implementation infrastructure. BOARS has submitted a draft implementation plan and will continue its role as the lead Senate committee in the oversight and evaluation of the Dual Admissions Program.

[Note: Implementation of the DAP program has now been delayed until adequate funding can be secured.]

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. Because of heightened interest in comprehensive review and a desire to implement a procedure effective for fall 2002 applicants, BOARS met during the summer to expedite deliberations on this new admissions policy. In response to concerns expressed on some campuses and President Atkinson's recommendation to adopt an admissions process that evaluates applicants in a comprehensive way, BOARS recommended that the two-tiered admissions system be eliminated and a new policy be developed that allows campuses to move toward a comprehensive approach to selection for all applicants. The committee approved the following policy statement:

“BOARS endorses a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.”

BOARS drafted a set of Guiding Principles which was added to the revised *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*. The new guidelines highlights the University's commitment to maintaining standards of academic excellence while recognizing the diverse talents, backgrounds, and personal experiences of applicants, all of which may be assessed as potential sources of contribution to the university community. It is the guidelines' intent to allow campuses to consider applicants in a manner consistent with faculty priorities while encouraging use of a broad notion of merit in the evaluation of files. The committee is also developing a strong statement on the faculty's serious commitment to fairness and accountability. BOARS will continue to be in full consultation with faculty and Admissions Directors to address individual campus plans and strategies for implementation. Some campuses are ready to immediately move in the direction of comprehensive review while others will require a more gradual process.

The committee plans to submit a final proposal for approval to the Academic Assembly in October and to the Regents by November 2001.

SAT. In response to President Atkinson's February 2002 proposal to eliminate the SAT I from UC admissions requirements, BOARS has been asked to review this the complex issue and its related considerations.

BOARS members reviewed sample SAT I tests as well as government policy on high stakes testing and developed a work plan for SAT-related research. By the end of the academic year, BOARS formulated a set of guiding principles including the purposes for which admissions tests should be used and the properties that such tests should possess in order to be useful to UC. These principles were developed as a foundation for continued BOARS deliberations and a future white paper on the use of admissions tests at UC.

TESTING SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT. The subcommittee continued its review of eligibility tests – also referred to as “high stakes tests” – and their role in admissions policy and process. Prior to the president's proposal to eliminate the SAT I, the subcommittee met with the College Board to discuss concerns about the structure of the SAT, including verbal analogies, the need for more content-referenced testing questions, and the speededness of the test. The subcommittee also participated in the state's discussion of test alignment to determine if tests, such as the California Standards Test (CST) and the Golden State Exams (GSE), could be used for multiple purposes, including some testing for higher education. Data is also being collected to evaluate the GSE as a possible alternative to the SAT. The subcommittee will continue to monitor the work.

HONORS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT. The subcommittee on Honors and AP courses considered these issues: expanding the elective requirement; granting additional credit to students earning an IB diploma, and improving and standardizing descriptions of honors courses. Members reviewed the current policy on acceptable college preparatory elective courses, and drafted a recommendation and rationale in support of expanding the range of acceptable courses. This recommendation is aimed at including subject areas, such as medical and business-related courses that are increasingly a part of the curriculum in many high schools and are relevant to university majors. Credit would be given if the courses meet pre-established UC academic criteria. The committee also reviewed credit awarded to the International Baccalaureate, and recommended offering an additional 6 units of credit for this degree in view of its high academic level. BOARS unanimously accepted the recommendation. Subcommittee members also drafted preliminary detailed descriptions of honors level courses for English, Math, and Science, and will continue to develop descriptions for other honors level subjects, which will greatly aid high schools' ability to design UC acceptable courses.

ANNUAL JOINT BOARS/ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS MEETING. BOARS held their annual meeting with Admissions Directors in November 2002. Directors shared information on their respective campus admissions. Common issues concerning all the directors included their heavy workload, the need for increased resources, and the impact by multiple filing of applications. Other topics that were reported included: large

increases in freshman applications on all campuses; achieving enrollment targets; continuing challenges for diversity; trends in transfers; the effect of increased enrollment on impacted majors; and the referral pool.

ADMISSIONS CONFERENCE. BOARS representatives participated in the Freshman Admissions Policy Conference held on December 7, 2000. The meeting focused on several issues related to undergraduate admissions, with a particular concern for increasing the diversity among first-year students. The conference was co-chaired by Vice President Saragoza and Academic Senate Chair Cowan and was attended by 126 participants including President Atkinson, several Regents, students, and faculty. Recommendations and suggestions were generated on a number of topics including:

- Synchronization of Admission Selection with Outreach
- Use of high states testing
- Use and definition of Admission by Exception
- Use of Tier 1 and Tier 2
- Viability of the Eligibility Construct
- Undergraduate Student Services
- Selecting form the Full Breadth of Eligible Students
- Holistic and Quantitative Approaches to Admission Selection
- Utilization of ELC

BOARS continues to study and work with UCOP administration on these issues.

A-F/G COURSES. BOARS reviewed the instructions for a-g requirements, and modified section “g” instructions to require that introductory courses be specified. BOARS helped obtain funding and monitored the progress of the a-g Interactive Guide, a web-based tool for clarifying criteria for course approval, and was updated on the statewide informational workshops on UC course requirements that were conducted by the Student Academic Affairs office.

REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES. During the course of the year, the committee also reviewed the following proposal and policies:

- BOARS approved a revision in UC’s out-of-state freshman eligibility policy by inserting an index criterion.
- Members recommended several wording modifications to the BOARS by-laws.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Perry, Chair (UCSF)

Calvin Moore (UCB)

Linda Georgianna (UCI)

Dennis Focht (UCR)

Jean Ann Seago (UCSF)

Brenda Foust, Emily Hung, Committee Analysts

Margaret Marshall, Vice Chair (UCSD)

Patrick Farrell (UCD)

Philip Curtis (UCLA)

Barbara Sawrey (UCSD)

Michael Brown (UCSB)

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met September 2001 through August 2002 for a total of nineteen meetings days. Additional business was conducted in subcommittee meetings and by email. Most of BOARS' meetings were convened as two-day working sessions, which allowed the committee to expedite a proposal on the use of standardized tests in admissions. BOARS also continued its work on the comprehensive review policy and other admissions changes.

DURING THE 2001-2002 ACADEMIC YEAR, BOARS CONSIDERED AND ACTED ON THE FOLLOWING MAJOR ISSUES:

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. In fall 2001, BOARS submitted a proposal to institute a system of comprehensive review of applicants for undergraduate admissions, replacing the system of tiered admissions. Under the two-tiered system, campuses admitted 50 to 75 percent of their freshman classes solely on the basis of academic criteria constituting one tier. The other tier was composed of students admitted on the basis of both academic and supplemental criteria. BOARS proposed to have all students considered on the basis of a comprehensive set of criteria.

In its proposal, BOARS defined comprehensive review as "the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and process, while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated accomplishment." The comprehensive review strategy would continue to emphasize academic achievement as the most important element for consideration in admissions, but would include other achievements in the context of each applicant's opportunities. The proposal recognized that merit is demonstrated in multiple ways and supports UC's message to students to challenge themselves.

BOARS presented the proposal after a deliberative process which involved meetings and campus review during the summer months. The Academic Assembly and the Regents subsequently approved the proposal in November 2001 to be immediately initiated for the Fall 2001 admissions cycle.

Upon the proposal's approval, BOARS committed to monitoring and evaluating the comprehensive review process. The committee ensured faculty oversight by interacting with the Admissions Directors throughout the year. In September 2001, BOARS held a joint meeting with the Admissions Directors to allow each campus to present their plans for implementing comprehensive review. To address faculty accountability in the process, BOARS also adopted ten accountability principles to serve as a foundation for ongoing review and evaluation. After campuses completed the first admissions cycle using the comprehensive review process, UCOP facilitated a review of each campus' experiences based on these accountability principles. Campus outcomes and data

analyses were then presented to BOARS in July 2002 at another joint meeting with the Admissions Directors. Preliminary findings indicated that each of the selective campuses successfully implemented the comprehensive review policy in conformance to BOARS' guidelines and principles.

Also at the joint meeting, BOARS and the Admissions Directors discussed the value of the process and areas that would need further study. One of these issues was the importance of accurate and valid applicant information. BOARS believed that a verification process would serve as an important warning and deterrent against falsification on the application. During the summer, UCOP and UCSD each successfully piloted processes to verify non-academic information provided by a student on his/her application. A systemwide verification plan is under development. Other ways to make the admissions process more efficient and streamlined are being discussed by the Admissions Process Task Force, a joint faculty-administration committee.

At the end of August 2002, BOARS had begun to prepare a report on comprehensive review's first year of implementation, which will be presented to the Academic Council and the Board of Regents in fall 2002. BOARS will continue to monitor comprehensive review as the processes evolve.

ADMISSIONS TESTS. BOARS also undertook an intensive study of the use admissions tests in response to President Atkinson's February 2001 request to consider eliminating the SAT I from UC admissions requirements. BOARS reviewed the history of UC's admissions test policy and considered at length the usefulness of admissions tests, and the relative value of tests that purport to measure aptitude versus those that are achievement-based. In considering educational policy questions, BOARS concluded that there are many good reason to use achievement-type tests for admissions.

In January 2002, the committee issued a discussion paper on "The Use of Admissions Test by the University of California", in which BOARS endorsed the continued use of admissions tests but recommended that the UC faculty consider adopting a new array of tests. BOARS also proposed a set of principles that would enhance the depth, breadth, and rigor of the tests used in the UC admissions process.

After BOARS released its paper, townhall meetings were held at every campus to give the faculty a forum to discuss the proposal and recommendations. During this time, BOARS also had extensive interactions with the two national testing agencies, ACT Inc. and the College Board, to discuss the possibility of developing tests that would address BOARS' principles. After review by campuses and the Academic Council, BOARS' recommendations were presented to the Regents and the Academic Assembly of the Senate. In May 2002, the Academic Assembly unanimously passed resolutions in support of BOARS' continuing work with the two testing agencies to develop improved admissions tests.

After the Assembly vote, ACT announced its intention to enhance their existing exam by adding a writing sample for California test-takers. By June 2002, the trustees of the

College Board approved changes to the SAT, including adding a writing section, new reading questions, and more-advanced mathematics. College Board officials said the new test would relate more closely to high-school curriculum and more accurately predict a student's performance in college, which would be consistent with BOARS' recommendations.

BOARS will continue its collaborative work with both the College Board and ACT on the development of admissions tests that reflect the specifications outlined by BOARS. That work will continue through the next academic year. BOARS had also begun working on additional recommendations regarding the use of supplemental subject matter tests, which will be presented to the Academic Council, the Senate Divisions, and the Assembly for review and approval.

A-G COURSES. BOARS approved new descriptions for the VPA "f" requirement and Lab Science "g" requirement. As high school courses become more non-traditional and unique, additional policy clarifications were needed to help staff assess new course submissions. The policy clarification for the VPA requirement, which takes effect for students entering the University in fall 2003, was drafted by a statewide VPA committee and presented for BOARS' approval. The Lab Science policy clarification was drafted by a BOARS subcommittee, and approved by the whole committee. Both of these new descriptions will be posted on the a-g interactive guide website.

ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT (ELC). As ELC completed its first admissions cycle this year, BOARS was asked to consider uncapping the GPA to determine ELC eligibility. BOARS approved changing the GPA calculation used to identify ELC students by including all UC honors courses without capping at eight. This method will reward those students who have completed challenging work.

DUAL ADMISSIONS. In June 2002, the Legislative Conference Committee funded \$2.5 million for the Dual Admissions initiative recommended by BOARS last year. UCOP is in the process of identifying 30-40 community college campuses to pilot the program. BOARS will stay updated on the implementation of the program is rolled-out.

REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES. During the course of the year, the committee also discussed and/or commented on the following proposals and issues:

- The Subject A Examination
- ICAS' draft revision of the 1982 English Competency Statement
- The May 2002 draft Master Plan for Education in California
- Establishing guidelines to help assess alternative educational institutions, e.g. home schools

BOARS REPRESENTATION. Members represented BOARS in a number of other committees including the Admissions Processing Task Force, California Articulation Numbering, MOU Implementation Committee, UCCP Initiative, and UC Undergraduate Experience Survey. Several members also participated in the counselor conferences. Chair Perry represented BOARS on the UC Merced Task Force, UCEP, and UCOPE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. BOARS would like to acknowledge following UCOP consultants for their contribution, work, and insight over the past year: Pat Hayashi, Associate President; Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President – Student Academic Services; Carla Ferri, Director – Admissions; Saul Geiser, Director – Research and Planning; Nina Robinson, Director – Policy and External Affairs; Judy Kowarsky, Associate Director – Admissions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Perry, Chair (UCSF)
Barbara Sawrey, Vice Chair (UCSD)
Calvin Moore (UCB)
Patrick Farrell (UCD)
Linda Georgianna (UCI)
Philip Curtis (UCLA)
Dennis Focht (UCR)
Jane Stevens (UCSD)
Verna Gibbs (UCSF)
Michael Brown (UCSB)
Karen McNally (UCSC)
Kenneth Burch (Graduate student rep, UCSD)
Christopher Diaz (Undergraduate student rep, UCLA)
Emily Hung, Committee Analyst:

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (UCOC)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is charged in Academic Senate Bylaw 150 to "appoint the Chairs and, where specified in the Bylaws, the Vice Chairs and all appointed members of all other Senate committees that report to the Assembly [see Bylaw 35]." This includes 16 of 18 Senate committees, excepting Academic Council and UCOC. The Assembly elects the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council, who also serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly. UCOC nominates two members at-large to the Assembly, from which its own Committee Chair is appointed. To fulfill its charge, UCOC held four meetings in Academic Year 2001-02: December 14, 2001, February 11, March 11 (by teleconference), and April 19, 2002.

Academic Senate Committee appointments

UCOC first completed 2001-02 Committee memberships, then turned to 2002-03 appointment process, for which it addressed the issues of 1) defining "administrator" as it applies to faculty, and 2) deciding whether administrators, as defined, should serve on Senatwide Committees and, if so, in what capacity. Department Chairs would be excluded only from Committees agreed upon as dealing with issues that are sensitive with respect to administration—UCAF, UCAP, and UCP&T. Titles above Department Chair level were determined to be primarily administrative in their line of reporting, thus being in potential conflict of interest with Senate business and therefore excluded from Senate Committee membership. Certain lower level administrative positions such as residential College Provosts would be excepted when/if these positions are deemed not to be in conflict of interest with most Senate business.

UCOC established goals, objectives and a timeline for appointments. One Committee goal is to achieve overall balance within Committees with respect to gender, discipline, and northern/southern campus representation. Another is to make it as attractive as possible for Senate members to serve on Committees. (UCOC remained sensitive to the many concerns of Senate members in working out potential obstacles to travel to meetings and achieving a quorum at meetings in the wake of travel problems related to airport and other security measures following the September 11, 2001 World Trade Center/Pentagon tragedies.)

UCOC developed a process whereby its members were assigned Committees, and engaged in several uniform, fact-finding queries and procedures to:

- determine the need for Chairs and Vice Chairs after addressing succession, continuity, availability (e.g., not planning to be on sabbatical) and willingness to serve
- consult with and consider observations from prior and current chairs and vice chairs and also current committee members to identify potential candidates, and also to consider nominations from Divisions
- identify potential candidates for nomination

- ensure confidentiality throughout the process until appointments are final.

The Committee discussed all nominations, voted, and contacted those who were selected. Subsequently, a slate of Appointments of Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs, 2002-03 was presented to the Assembly at its May 29, 2002 meeting.

Members recognized that several Committees need more disciplinary balance, especially for the purpose of achieving balance in work related to reviewing proposals that are discipline-related. UCOC members contacted their own campus representatives to systemwide Committees to determine which representatives would be continuing their service. Members discussed developing a statement to outline what terms members are to abide by when they serve on Committees in terms of service and consonance between Divisional Senate and Systemwide Senate Bylaws; however, no action was taken. Members were to remind Senate Committee members to take term into consideration when accepting Committee membership and to honor Senate Bylaw. Although members acknowledged that Divisional Committees may need to be notified when members are not being appointed for an appropriate term of service, they favored avoiding a blanket rule that could deter Senate members from serving on Committees. The issue is unresolved, but subject to future discussion. UCOC was to complete appointments remaining after its final meeting by E-mail.

Standing and Special Committee appointments

UCOC was requested to appoint, as appropriate, new members to the UC Merced Committee on Academic Personnel (UCM-CAP) for two-year terms. Four current members whose terms were ending did not wish to continue, and two members requested reappointment. This action was to have been completed by E-mail after the final meeting.

The Panel of Counselors was established to aid Divisional Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Committees on campuses that have no Law School and who are thus disadvantaged in not having available legal expertise to deal with P&T cases. UCOC members updated the member list by omitting names of those who will not continue on the Panel and nominating possible replacement faculty members who have law degrees or appropriate related training.

Appointment of emeritus faculty members to Academic Senate Committees

UCOC discussed appointment of emeritus faculty members to Committees when regular faculty are available and willing to serve. This appears to be neither a widespread problem, nor a regular practice; these appointments are made on a case by case basis. Primary considerations in appointment are a potential member's merit and usefulness to a Committee. Members were generally in favor of allowing opportunity to people who are willing and able to serve, including emeriti. They favored informal measures over a systemwide policy on emeritus faculty appointments. Data on emeriti appointments to systemwide committees will be analyzed to determine whether there are any noticeable trends from one or more campuses that would need to be addressed.

Oliver Johnson Award

UCOC amended language in nomination criteria for the Oliver Johnson Award. The award, bestowed biannually, honors a UC faculty member who has demonstrated: "1. Outstanding and creative contributions at the divisional and systemwide levels as evidenced by major impact on faculty governance; 2. Sustained excellence in serving the Academic Senate; 3. Exceptional abilities in working effectively with different university constituents." UCOG set a deadline for and received nominations, voted on and forwarded two nominees for the Academic Council to consider as a recipient. [The Academic Council subsequently voted on and announced the recipient.]

Additional business

- Members were apprised of a recent Senate Workload survey conducted among Academic Senate Committee Chairs indicating that many Chairs and Vice Chairs are spending time well in excess of what had been expected for their years of service as Committee officers. Results will be sent to UCOG for review. Members discussed how to promote and support Senate service in a way that does not interfere with faculty career advancement.
- Members discussed restructuring of the Systemwide Academic Senate Committee structure, and folding several Committees together into one larger committee, as several Divisions have done. Both of the above items will be discussed at a two-day systemwide Chairs retreat in the fall.
- UCOG remains concerned about how the move to year-round session might affect the Senate, through faculty service on Committees. How would an active year for a Senate member be defined and what would be the new model for Senate service?
- UCOG provided input on the Academic Senate website and on what it would like to provide on a UCOG web page. This included information on how faculty may contact the Division Senate about Senate service, a statement of encouragement for Senate service, and a Senate faculty survey on how to have the Senate built more visibly into the University.

In addition, UCOG benefited from consultation and updates on Academic Council business and office procedures as needed and presented by Academic Council Chair Chand Viswanathan, Academic Council Vice Chair Gayle Binion and Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló.

Respectfully submitted,

Concepcion Valadez, Chair (UCLA)

Richard Lyons (UCB)

Rozanne Sandri-Goldin (UCI)

Georgia Warnke/Albert Stralka (UCR—fall, winter/spring, summer)

Theodore Groves (UCSD)

Steven Buratto (UCSB)

Chand Viswanathan, *Ex officio* member, Academic Council Chair

Gayle Binion, *Ex officio* member, Academic Council Vice Chair

María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director, Academic Council

Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

Ronald Stroud, Vice Chair (UCB)

Jessica Utts (UCD)

Neal Garrett (UCLA)

John Kane (UCSF)

Shelly Errington (UCSC)

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is charged with advising University administration and the Senate on all matters related to graduate education and reviewing all campus proposals for new graduate programs and schools. During the 2001-2002 academic year, CCGA met eight times and additionally conducted business by email.

Growth and Support of Graduate Education. CCGA continued to keep apprised of issues pertaining to expanding graduate student enrollment at the University and increasing financial support for those students. Early in the year, the UC Commission on the Growth and Support of Graduate Education presented their recommendations to the Board of Regents. The Commission found that by 2010, the University will need an additional \$215 million annually to provide the financial support needed to add 11,000 graduate students and be competitive for the best. Much of the necessary additional support will come from traditional sources, but a \$65 million shortfall is anticipated. The Commission therefore recommended several initiatives which can be found in greater detail in their report.

Evidence from the 2001 Graduate Student Support Survey was also compiled in a report which analyzed how UC's student financial support packages compared with those offered by other institutions, and how support offers affect enrollment decisions. The survey indicated that the financial assistance offered by UC to students admitted to doctoral programs is not fully comparable to offers from non-UC competitors. On average, UC offered \$1,363 less in financial support than other competitive institutions. The report concluded that while students are attracted by the academic programs and reputation of UC, the differences in support offers put UC at a disadvantage in attracting students to its doctoral programs.

In May 2002, the Governor proposed to cut the entire budget for graduate and professional school outreach. This cut would have been detrimental to the targeted growth of graduate education. Thankfully, the entire \$5.2 million budget was restored by the Legislature's Budget Conference Committee.

Joint UC/CSU Ed.D. Initiative. In November 2001, the University of California and California State University agreed to jointly develop, implement, and fund educational doctoral programs that meet the educational leadership needs of specific regions across California. This agreement was reached after CSU agreed to withdraw their initiative to independently award doctoral degrees. A Joint Ed.D. Board was established under which both CSU and UC jointly makes decisions on doctoral programs leading to the Ed.D. Both CSU and UC committed to contributing \$2 million each over the first two years to fund the proposals. In May 2002, CCGA received for review the first joint Ed.D. proposal from UC Santa Barbara and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

Postdoctoral Scholar Issues. CCGA spent a considerable amount of time discussing postdoctoral scholar issues. As the number of postdoctoral appointments continues to increase, there is a need for greater awareness and attention to postdoctoral affairs. There is currently a wide variety of policies, practices, benefits, and services for postdocs among the nine campuses. CCGA recognizes the need for consistent and equitable

treatment of postdocs systemwide. The committee reviewed a proposal by the Council of Graduate Deans (COGD) to improve postdoctoral education, which recommended offering full health benefits, providing a retirement investment option, and establishing a minimum stipend. The UC Council of Postdoctoral Scholars also recommended improving postdoctoral training and resources, such as better mentorship and career services. Both of these groups supported creating a systemwide professional research series with a specific title code for postdoctoral appointments. UCOP is expected to present a policy proposal on postdocs next fall.

Graduate and Professional School Admissions. Graduate and Professional School Admissions processes were brought under scrutiny by Assembly Concurrent Resolution 178, legislation requiring UC to implement a comprehensive review in the admissions process for graduate programs and professional schools and to prohibit standardized test scores from being used as the sole or primary criterion for determining admission or rejection.

After lengthy discussions, CCGA concluded that UC graduate and professional schools were already in compliance with the requirements of ACR 178. Graduate and professional school students are admitted based on a thorough evaluation of a range of academic and professional criteria, including standardized tests, grade-point average, the quality of the undergraduate education, letters of recommendation, research and practical experience, and personal interviews. The purpose of admissions screening is to predict success in and beyond the program. It is recognized that no single criterion is adequate. Therefore no applicants are ever rejected solely on the basis of a standardized test score.

CCGA also opined that a narrowness of admissions policies or an over-reliance on standardized tests is not responsible for the distressing decrease in the number of underrepresented minorities in UC graduate and professional schools in recent years. Rather, the cause of this problem lies elsewhere.

Review of Other Policies and Issues. During the course of the year, the committee also reviewed and commented on the following issues and proposals:

- Inclusion of a member of COGD as a representative to CCGA, and extension of this principle to include a member of CCGA as a representative at COGD meetings next year.
- The proposed augmentation of salary scales for graduate student researchers and postgraduate researchers.
- The proposal for a systemwide program of instruction on the responsible conduct of research.
- The policy proposals on faculty publications drafted by the UC Standing Committee on Copyright.
- The fifteen-year review reports of three Multicampus Research Units: UC Observatories/Lick (UCO), Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (INPAC), and White Mountain Research Station (WMRS).
- The proposal for a Laboratory Professorship Program at Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Laboratories.

- Streamlining the review process.
- Revising the CCGA Handbook section on Conflict of Interest.

Reviews of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs. The following table is a summary of graduate program proposals reviewed by CCGA during the 2001-2002 academic year, and the disposition of these proposals as of August 2002. A total of 19 proposals for new graduate degree programs, including a proposal to reconstitute the UC Davis Division of Education as a School of Education, were forwarded to CCGA for review. In a few instances, programs were approved only after being revised in accordance with CCGA recommendations.

Program Proposed	Disposition
UCB, Joint Ph.D. in Demography & Sociology	Approved 10/9/2001
UCLA, M.S. in Biomathematics clinical training	Approved 10/9/2001
UCI, M.S./Ph.D. in Networked Systems	Returned to campus 11/27/01 (Revision submitted 5/20/02; Review deferred to Fall 2002)
UCR, M.F.A. in Creative Writing, Writing for the Arts	Approved 11/27/01
UCB, Graduate Group, M.S./Ph.D. in Molecular Toxicology	Approved 1/29/02
UCLA, M.A. in Moving Image Archive Studies	Approved 1/29/02
UCLA, M.S./Ph.D. in Neurobiology (renaming, restructuring)	Approved 2/26/02
UCSF, M.A.S. in Clinical Research	Approved 2/26/02
UCI, M.A.S. in Criminology, Law, & Society	Approved 3/19/02
UCI, M.S./Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering	Approved 3/19/02
UCI, Ph.D. in Psychology and Social Behavior	Approved 3/19/02
UCSC, M.S./Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering	Approved 4/2/02 (via email)
UCB-Columbia, Executive M.B.A. Program	Approved 5/15/02 (via email)
UCLA, discontinue M.A./Ph.D. Folklore & Mythology	Approved 5/21/02
UCD, reconstitution of the Division of Education as a School of Education	Approved 5/21/02
UCSC, Ph.D. in Education	Approved 6/18/02
UCD, Master of Public Health	Approved 7/8/02 (via email)
UCLA, S.J.D. in Law	In progress
UCSB-Cal Poly Joint Ed.D.	In progress

Respectfully submitted:

Charles L. Perrin (SD), Chair
 W. Zacheus Cande (B)
 Edward Wagner (I, fall/winter)
 William Worger (LA)
 Anne Hoger (SD, fall/winter)
 Burt Feuerstein (SF)
 Quentin Williams (SC)
 Dorothy Kim (graduate student)

Richard L. Church (SB), Vice Chair
 Kent Erickson (D)
 Mary Gilly (I, spring)
 Thomas Morton (R)
 Andrew Dickson (SD, spring)
 Joshua Schimel (SB)
 Edward Collins (graduate student)
 Emily Hung, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM (UCEAP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Education Abroad met a total of four times in the 2001-2002 academic year, including a two-day meeting that was in part a joint meeting with the Council of Campus [EAP] Directors. The issues considered and activities undertaken during the year by UCEAP are noted in the following report.

Liaison with UOEAP

Committee members were regularly briefed by the senior administration of the University Office of Education Abroad Programs on a range of issues and processes, which included updates on changes and improvements in student enrollment and course approval processes; in depth reports on EAP marketing and communications projects, and strategies for meeting curricular and enrollment goals; regular reports on programs in development; updates on the reorganization of UOEAP; the status of formal reviews of programs. Because of the events of September 11, 2001, the escalating violence in the Middle East, and events in India, safety and security measures for the study centers was a primary focus of administrative reports and UCEAP's discussions.

Israel EAP Program and Student Travel Restrictions

UCEAP was kept apprised of the decision-making process regarding the eventual suspension of the EAP program in Israel. The committee also discussed various aspects of the case of two EAP students who violated EAP travel restrictions and UOEAP's decision to expel the students from the program, as well as the wider issues raised regarding safety and the role of center directors and student conduct guidelines. The committee plans to follow up on this incident and its related issues in the coming year.

UCEAP Response to UOEAP Planning and Reorganization

In February, UCEAP was apprised of and discussed UOEAP's planning strategies, which included marketing initiatives, staff training, safety and security review; academic integration and articulation projects, the development of web tools for program information, course information and articulation, and the reorganization of UOEAP senior management positions. In response to UOEAP's planned reorganization, UCEAP voiced concern that faculty maintain a strong role in systemwide administration. Following UCEAP's recommendations, the new Associate Director of Integration position (a faculty position) was made full time, and faculty were directly involved in the hiring process of both the UOEAP Chief Administrative Officer and the Associate Director of Integration.

Joint Issues with Campus Directors

In its joint meeting with the campus EAP directors, UCEAP members discussed the following issues:

- *Articulation / Integration* -- EAP course offerings need to be better aligned with both GE courses and with major requirements. UCEAP and the campus offices will

work to better coordinate directly with departments for course approval and requirements for majors.

- *Professional status of EAP staff* – Directors and committee members considered ways to support staff professionalization and address the retention problem.
- *Housing for Reciprocity students*-- Strategies were discussed to address the acute housing problem, hiring student interns who will work specifically on housing, and housing exchanges.
- *Uniformity of course units and assignment of course units*
- *Student discipline*
- *Timeliness of grade reports*
- *The impact of the Patriot Act on EAP and its reciprocity students*

Selection of Study Center Directors

UCEAP devoted most of its December 2001 meeting to the selection of study center directors from among top faculty candidates. The committee made its final recommendations to the President for directorships of twelve EAP programs: Bordeaux, France, Lyon, France, Paris, France; Germany; India; Israel; Italy; The Netherlands; Scandinavia; Granada, Spain; Madrid, Spain; London UK/Ireland. The committee also approved administrative appointments of directors for an additional two programs.

Approval of New Programs

UCEAP reviewed and made recommendations on proposals for new programs, and approved the following new programs: Waseda University, Japan; University College, Dublin; Thammasat University, Thailand; Summer Language Program, Barcelona; Paul Sabatier University, Toulouse; James Cook University, Australia; Prague; Royal Holloway College, University of London. Two new UC-constructed programs were also approved: one in Rome and the other, Casa de California in Mexico City, which will be an integral part the establishment of a UC research hub in Mexico City.

Formal Review of Programs

UCEAP approved appointees to the formal review committees for the Scandinavia, India, and Spain programs; and nominated review committee members for the formal review committees for the Costa Rica, Vietnam, and Italy programs. UCEAP members presented final committee reports on the formal reviews of the UK/Ireland, Australia/New Zealand, South Africa programs.

UCEAP Subcommittees

UCEAP appointed members to each of its standing subcommittees -- Academic Quality; Program Development; Advisory Committee and Formal Review Committees. Members also sat on the curriculum advisory committees for EAP “stand- alone” programs in Rome, Mexico, and Paris.

Revision of Bylaw 165

The committee reviewed its bylaw, and submitted proposed changes to the ad hoc Committee on Bylaws. Principle proposed changes to Bylaw 165 included: changing the committee’s name to Committee on International Education; the inclusion of a vice chair,

the inclusion as ex-officio member the Chair of the Council of Campus Directors, and a definition of the committee's scope of oversight.

Respectfully submitted:

Michael O'Connell, Chair (SB)

Armen der Kiureghian (B)

Peter Schiffman (D)

Timothy Bradley (I)

Gordon Kipling (LA)

Richard Godbeer (R)

Charles Oates (SD)

Afaf Meleis (SF)

Christine Kennedy (SF)

Mark Cioc (SC)

Gayle Binion (Academic Senate Vice Chair, ex officio)

Brenda Foust, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) held eight meetings during Academic Year 2001-02 to conduct its business with respect to its charge in Bylaw 170. Issues considered by the Committee this year are outlined briefly as follows:

Subject A Examination

UCEP committed a substantial portion of its meetings this year to studying and analyzing the Subject A requirement and examination as they are administered currently. Provost and Senior Vice President King followed up on Academic Planning Council discussions to request that the Academic Council review student preparation in writing. The Provost outlined fundamentals and questions for the Council to address; these were forwarded to Senate Committees and Divisions for their responses. UCEP reviewed SR 636, UCOPE's Report on Assessment of the Subject A Examination August 2001 and numerous other documents on Subject A and writing instruction, and also consulted with BOARS and UCOPE Chairs, UCOP consultants, and one campus Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. UCEP summarized its findings in "UCEP April 15, 2002 Response to Subject A Charge from Academic Council Chair Viswanathan and Provost and Senior Vice President King."

- UCEP recommended that UCOP collect reliable data on writing ability among upper division undergraduates and monitor improvements resulting from various interventions.
- UCEP supported BOARS's working with secondary schools to improve writing skills among students admitted to UC, and developing a future entrance examination that would include meaningful evaluation of writing skills that is consistent with UC expectations.
- UCEP recommended further study of the present policy that allows a single community college course to satisfy both Subject A and the first freshman composition course.
- UCEP urged that UCOPE consider ways to modify use of the Subject A test to reduce its potential for stigmatizing students.
- UCEP proposed that UCOP hold a system-wide conference on Subject A that would address campus procedures, identify administrative barriers and articulate best practices.
- UCEP proposed creation of a Task Force to develop an English composition graduation requirement that would provide for independent assessment of student writing.

UCEP was further charged by Council to prepare a summary analysis of all Divisional and Senate Committee responses. UCEP stated in its May 29, 2002 letter to the Council Chair that most of the reports presented arguments that were consistent with its own. UCEP identified a system-wide concern that incoming students can satisfy Subject A by taking a community college course, thus not taking what might be a more valuable

composition course offered on their UC campus. To address this concern, we propose a study to develop evaluative data comparing the academic progress of incoming UC students who have satisfied their Subject A requirement in their freshman year composition courses on their UC campus with those meeting the requirement in a community college course before matriculating at UC. Such data could be used to guide future development of policy in this area.

BOARS Proposal to replace two-tier admissions system with comprehensive review

UCEP supported the Proposal, acknowledging it as an important step forward in returning admissions decisions to the faculty and lauding BOARS for its efforts in that regard, while observing that implementing changes on campus will be costly.

BOARS Report, “The Use of Admissions Tests by the University of California”

UCEP supported developing better assessment of college-level reading and writing skills and endorsed having BOARS continue to review, assess and improve admissions testing.

UC Systemwide Ed.D. Initiative

In its review of the Initiative developed by the Systemwide Ed.D. Initiative Work Group, UCEP objected to prescriptive language in the guidelines that appeared to take away individual campus authority for operating its own program and also to the strong recommendation that each general education campus set aside funding for this specific program during a time when other quality programs are competing for funding. UCEP supported assessment to determine whether California needs more Ed.D. degree holders, and also recommended vetting the proposal through Schools of Education.

Freshman Seminar Program Initiative

UCEP endorsed in principle the provision for increases in freshman seminars on all campuses and the educational objectives and potential educational benefits of the Program. UCEP recommended that campus CEPs and Committees on Courses monitor and protect the educational offerings to guard against erosion of the core academic enterprise and that funding incentives be defined to safeguard against allocations made at the expense of current core curriculum efforts. UCEP would prefer that the Program increase student-faculty contact rather than simply replace one set of courses for another. UCEP expressed concern about overload teaching as a potential threat to educational quality.

Approval of Change to Irvine Regulation 515. Residence Requirement and Addition to Appendix III: Assembly Approved Variances to University-wide Regulations, C. Regulation 630.

UCEP approved UCI’s request for a Variance to SR 630 that would place its Regulation 515 into system-wide compliance.

UC Berkeley Proposal to Reduce Its Number of Days of Instruction

UCEP found merit in the Berkeley proposal’s issue of equal opportunity for Berkeley students to enroll in summer sessions closer to home, but did not favor adopting a system-wide rule to govern campus calendar/s. UCEP recognized the advisability of aligning summer sessions for increased use but maintained that each campus must decide

on its faculty teaching load. UCEP noted that system-wide policy change could pressure campuses into making decisions that would affect equal opportunity among students.

ICAS Draft, “Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California’s Public Colleges and Universities”

UCEP welcomed the call for increased efforts in raising academic literacy standards among college applicants and agreed that students can and should be better prepared in composition.

UC Davis Proposal to Reconstitute the Division of Education as a School of Education

As a Committee charged with overview of reconstitution process, UCEP approved the reconstitution proposed by UC Davis.

State of Instructional Technology at UC

UCEP discussed developing a comprehensive survey of system-wide resources that would provide data for comparing UC’s information technology (IT) capability with its comparison institutions and also address budgetary concerns related to leveraging resources to support IT infrastructure (e.g., hardwiring buildings, IT training, troubleshooting support). UCEP recognizes increasing demand for IT, and faculty interest for its use in distance learning. UCEP discussed planning related to infrastructural support, and how faculty use IT. Liaison with Information Resources and Communications will continue. UCEP provided suggestions for improvements to a new online webzine for University-wide Teaching, Learning and Technology Center (TLtC).

Other

The following reports, items and issues were received and discussed:

- Commission on the Growth and Support of Graduate Education’s report, “Innovation and Prosperity at Risk; Investing in Graduate Education to Sustain California’s Future.”
- Three draft policy proposals prepared by the UC Standing Committee on Copyright.
- Staffing to teach summer session under UC’s year-round plan: UCEP remains interested in whether there is a fair proportion of junior and senior faculty teaching summer sessions (the profile of faculty teaching summer session should be the same as during the regular year). UCEP sees the need for summer session faculty to switch their research and teaching responsibilities quarter by quarter/semester by semester. UCEP recognized that it is important to move away from overload teaching
- Time to degree and the 120 percent rule (accountability measures in UC’s Partnership Agreement with the State): UCEP reviewed Partnership Agreement language related to the above and also campus data on the effects of unfunded enrollments on the system. It appears that UC has fulfilled its agreements with respect to the partnership.
- Power point presentation on UC Washington Center from Director Larry Berman: UCEP discussed distance learning opportunities and expressed its support for easing articulation and approval of the Center’s courses among all campuses.
- May 2002 Draft – The California Master Plan for Education.
- Campus Five-year Perspectives for 2002-07.
- Do student evaluations affect the academic freedom of faculty? UCEP formulated a response that was forwarded to the Academic Council on June 3, 2002.

UCEP Representation

UCEP was represented on additional Committees, Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including: Assembly, Academic Council, Academic Planning Council, BOARS, ICAS, National Science Scoping Committee, UCDC Steering Committee, Educational Financing Model Steering Committee, and UC Merced Task Force.

Acknowledgements:

UCEP benefited from the consultation and reports of the following UCOP staff members: Julie Gordon, Coordinator of Intercampus Academic Programs, who is designated as UCOP's regular consultant to UCEP; Julius Zelmanowitz, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives; Carla Ferri, Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Immouna Ephrem, Coordinator, Admissions and Outreach; Sandra Smith, Assistant Vice President for Planning and Analysis; Linda Guerra, Director, Policy Analysis; Jim Dolgonas, Assistant Vice President, IS&C, IR&C; Paula Murphy, Managing Editor, TLtC.

Security changes following the events of September 11, 2001 greatly increased the difficulty of air travel to and from UCEP meetings. Nevertheless, attendance was excellent at all meetings, and the Chair commends all members for their faithful and professional service.

Respectfully submitted,

David Dooley (I), Chair

Andrew Grosovsky (R), Vice Chair

Lisa Alvarez-Cohen (B)

Terence Murphy (D)

Dennis Kibler (I)

Robert G. Frank, Jr. (LA)

Linda Walling (R)

Walter Burkhard (SD)

Patricia Benner (SF)

Michael Crandall (SB)

Carol Freeman (SC)

Chand Viswanathan (*Ex officio* member; Chair, Academic Council)

Ping Yeh (Graduate student representative)

Matthew Dean Kaczmarek (Undergraduate student representative)

Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) met eight times and had one conference call and the UCFW Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans met five times and held two conference calls. All meetings of the UCFW and its Task Force were held at the Office of the President, Oakland.

Under Senate Bylaw 175 the UCFW is charged with conferring with and advising the President and University Administration on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty—such as salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. The UCFW continues to enjoy a dynamic and productive relationship with Universitywide Administration, an indication of a healthy system of shared governance. Though UCFW's mission is to protect and augment faculty interests, the benefits derived from its work frequently extend to and are enjoyed by all constituencies within the University of California.

During the 2001-2002 academic year the UCFW considered and acted upon the following major issues:

UCFW INITIATIVES: BENEFITS

Child Care Policy and Programs. The UCFW began work on this issue in 1997, spearheaded by the efforts of Professor Judy Gruber. Because the state did not fund the Regents' request for one-time monies for new childcare facilities, in 2001-02 President Atkinson created a program of matching UCOP funds for construction of new childcare facilities. All nine campuses are actively moving forward on the childcare front, not only constructing new facilities but expanding existing facilities to accommodate all of the children on the waiting list for child care services.

Domestic Partner Benefits. UCFW continued to press for the extension of benefits to all domestic partners of UC employees. Since 1993 the UCFW and the Academic Council have recommended that health and retirement benefits be provided to same- and opposite-sex domestic partners. In November 1997 the Board of Regents approved the extension of University health benefits to same-sex domestic partners. In January 2000 the Academic Council unanimously endorsed UCFW's proposal *Ensuring Full Equality in Benefits for UC Employees with Domestic Partners*, which recommends extending retirement benefits to all domestic partners and health benefits to opposite-sex domestic partners. In May 2002 the Regents approved extending survivor retirement benefits to both same-sex and opposite-sex domestic partners of UC employees. Employees who register domestic partners will now have the opportunity to designate them as beneficiaries, entitling them to receive an actuarially adjusted payment at the time of the employee's death. UCFW members also supported extending survivor benefits to designated beneficiaries and regretted that this was not supported by the Academic

Council (where it was rejected by a vote of 8-6-2) or by the Regents. UCFW suggested that this piece could return to the Academic Council for further consideration at a later date.

Educational Fee Waiver for Dependents of UC Employees. UCFW continued its effort to achieve funding for its fee waiver proposal, unanimously adopted by the Academic Council in 1999. In May 2001 the Academic Council unanimously approved UCFW's recommendation that the funding of the fee waiver be taken "off the top" of the University's budget before OP allocates budget dollars to each campus. Though the Chancellors deferred implementation of the program because of the state's budgetary uncertainties, President Atkinson assured the UCFW that the proposed fee waiver program remains a high priority and would be revisited in 2001-02. In a letter to President Atkinson, forwarded by Council Chair Viswanathan, UCFW urged President Atkinson's continued interest and support for the Educational Fee Waiver program -- a relatively inexpensive initiative that will enhance faculty recruitment and retention and overall employee morale in this time of fiscal constraint. The 2002-03 UCFW will continue to search for ways to fund the Educational Fee Waiver program and to keep it as a high priority for the University.

Faculty Housing Programs. Housing is one of the top concerns for faculty recruitment and retention, and UCFW continues to take an active role trying to redress the high housing costs facing most new faculty who are trying to buy homes close to campus. UCFW was consulted on a number of changes introduced to the Mortgage Origination Program, including an increase from 25 to 30 percent of the share of STIP funds designated for this program, a reduction in the minimum down payment from 10 to 5 percent, an increase from 30 to 40 years in the repayment period, and the institution of a graduated payment schedule which will shift debt burden toward later years of higher income.

Faculty Salary Continuance and Disability Insurance. At its June 2002 meeting UCFW received an extensive presentation by Mercer Human Resource Consulting. The following issues will continue to be discussed by the 2002-03 UCFW: faculty salary continuance; partial disability definitions; definitions of occupation; premium rates, issues for younger employees if age-banded and service-adjusted premium rates are used to reflect disability pension offset; mandatory coverage of employee-paid disability; employer-provided disability benefit that provides 80 to 85 percent replacement of net pay; and uniform UC-systemwide disability benefit for Y and Z compensation. UCFW will continue to explore efforts to ensure that faculty can obtain disability coverage based on normal salary levels, even if the disability occurs while the faculty member is temporarily on leave or otherwise earning only a fraction of normal salary.

Parking Policy Principles. On June 19, 2002, the Academic Council unanimously adopted a carefully-drafted set of proposed systemwide Parking Policy Principles that were approved by UCFW on June 12, 2002. UCFW had been actively developing these Principles for the past two years, incorporating the suggestions of the 2000-01 Academic Council, the 2001-02 Academic Council, as well as the comments of each campus's Faculty Welfare Committee. The Principles are aimed at slowing the rapid increases in

permit fees seen at many campuses over the last several years by setting a limit to the diversion of parking fees for other purposes and by establishing a replacement policy for state-funded as well as non-state-funded construction projects that destroy spaces that have been paid for from parking revenues.

Legal Liability and Legal Representation. UCFW continued to investigate issues of legal liability and legal representation, issues that might arise if a Senate member is sued or threatened with suit for acts related to University employment, or is the target of a whistleblower's accusation. UCFW is concerned that faculty members may be insufficiently protected by current policies that do not guarantee independent counsel for faculty members who are innocent of any wrongdoing, but whose self-interests may be in conflict with the self-interest of the University. UCFW is in the process of forming a Subcommittee on Legal Liability Issues. This UCFW subcommittee will strive for revised policies that will be more protective of the rights and due process of faculty members.

HEALTH CARE ISSUES

UCFW Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans. The Task Force continued to work closely with Administration and to engage UCFW in consultation on strategies to deal with the increase in health care costs for 2001-02. These were handled through a combination of minor modifications in benefits and, in some plans, modest hikes in co-payments and premiums. The goal was to moderate cost increases and assure stability of coverage, particularly for low-income employees. Though the UC budget makes allowance for a 6.7 percent increase in benefit costs, the preliminary indications are that the cost of some health care plans could rise by as much as 25 percent or more—a substantial gap in funding that UC will have to bridge. UCFW and its Task Force will continue to work with Administration in finding ways to respond to these severe inflationary cost pressures in the health care sector, including looking at recommendations in the area of contribution strategy that could be implemented in the next year or two.

Health Care Facilitator Program. In response to recommendations from the UCFW, UC Emeriti Associations, and UC Retiree Associations, a Health Care Facilitator pilot program was developed in 1999-00 by UCOP at Berkeley and Irvine using HR&B staff development internship funds. The HCF program has been extended to all campus and laboratory locations. Seven facilitators have now been hired at UCB, UCI, UCSB, UCSC, and more recently at UCR, UCD, and UCSF. Both UCSD and UCLA are in the recruitment process. LANL recently received approval to extend the program to their location. LBNL has submitted a proposal, currently under review.

Medical Spending Accounts. At UCFW's urging Administration soon will implement medical spending accounts, allowing employees voluntarily to set aside pre-tax dollars that can be used to cover a variety of medical expenses that are not covered by the health insurance programs, e.g. co-pays, orthodontics or laser eye surgery.

RETIREMENT ISSUES

Health Sciences Faculty Retirement Benefit Enhancement. UCFW was consulted by Administration on the reevaluation and possible reform of retirement benefits for health science employees. Medical school faculty receive a substantial portion of their income from clinical and other sources that are not integrated with UCRP, and retiring medical school faculty face a much more substantial diminution of their customary income than do other faculty. To improve the competitiveness of retirement benefits of health science faculty, a Task Force on Health Sciences Retirement Benefits was convened in August 2001 by Associate Vice President Judy Boyette and Assistant Vice President Ellen Switkes. The Task Force will be issuing a report by the end of the 2001-02 academic year. Once in final form, the report will be distributed for broad systemwide review.

Phased Retirement (Phased Employment). UCFW has been working with Administration to develop a proposal for a new, voluntary phased-retirement program that would allow Senate members to enter into pre-retirement contracts governing the terms and extent of postretirement teaching and service. Mutual agreements between the University and the individual employee, who would have to be at least 60 years old, would be drawn up to cover a period of three to five years. The employee would retire and immediately begin to draw full retirement pay while continuing to work on a pro-rated basis for any percentage up to 50 percent time. At the end of the agreement, retirement benefits would be recalculated, taking into account the additional (pro-rated) service and any merits or range adjustments received in the interim. Administration is gathering detailed information on the strengths and weaknesses of existing programs at comparison institutions; full benefits implications also need to be worked out. Though a number of potential problems exist, specifically involving startup costs, laboratory and office space, steady progress has been made throughout the year on this proposal.

Miscellaneous retirement issues. UCFW was consulted on a variety of issues, including the reallocation of retirement funds to an individual Capital Accumulation Provision (CAP) account, in lieu of salary increases; the academic service credit allocation program to grant service credit for some forms of previously non-qualifying academic employment; analysis of the impact on UCRP of changes in federal tax laws; and effect on UCRP annuitants of proposed changes in the Social Security offset to make it applicable to surviving spouses eligible as such for Social Security.

SALARY AND WAGE ISSUES

COLAs: Three-Month Delay from Start of Fiscal Year. UCFW considered the Davis divisional CFW's proposal to end the cost of living adjustment (COLA) offset. When COLAs are next funded, the COLA delay could be abolished simply by returning to the historic practice of having the effective date of a COLA coincide with the start of the fiscal year, July 1 (rather than being offset to October 1). Ending the COLA offset would prospectively spare new retirees the financial prejudice that has been caused to retirees over the past decade, who have had their base income for retirement purposes diminished by the delayed receipt of annual COLAs. The coming year, in which range adjustments

are expected to be small to non-existent, could be an appropriate time for UC to commit to the normal July 1 date. This was discussed in a preliminary way with Larry Hershman. The COLA offset discussion will need to be continued in the future.

REVIEW OF OTHER UNIVERSITYWIDE POLICIES AND ISSUES

Copyright Issues. UCFW was consulted on new policies intended to protect the intellectual property of faculty members, including the design and content of courses, course notes, and class presentations.

Sabbatical Policies. At UCFW's initiative, various reforms of the sabbatical leave policy (APM 740) are under consideration. The proposed revisions to in residence sabbatical leave will permit the substitution of substantial service activities for the teaching requirement. Proposed revisions to the standard sabbatical program will permit faculty on sabbatical leave to engage in outside professional activities to the same extent as faculty not on leave, and to permit faculty receiving less than full salary while on leave to "top up" their income to its normal level by receiving outside research funds. At the request of the Office of Academic Advancement, the proposed revisions are undergoing informal review by the Academic Vice Chancellors and DANR. Formal systemwide review of the proposed revisions to APM 740 is slated to begin in 2002-03.

Two Proposed Draft Policies regarding University Policy Implementing The Amended California Whistleblower Protection Act. *UCFW was consulted on the revision of UC policies in compliance with amendments to the California Whistleblower Protection Act, to protect the interests of Senate members who may secretly, even groundlessly, accused of misconduct. Extensive consultations with Administration have produced a far more balanced and even-handed document.*

Respectfully submitted:

Renée Binder, Chair (SF)

Katharine Hammond (B)

Bruce C. Straits (SB)

Roger Anderson (SC)

Julian Feldman, CUCEA Chair (I)

Lawrence Waldron, CUCEA Chair-Elect (B)

Daniel J. B. Mitchell, UCRS Board Member (LA)

Stephen Sugarman, UCRS Board Member (B)

Harold Simon, Co-Chair and Lawrence Pitts, Co-Chair, UCFW Task Force on the Future of UC Health Plans (SF)

Jeannene Whalen, Committee Analyst

Mark Traugott, Vice Chair (SC)

John B. Oakley (D)

Abel Klein (I)

Susan Ettner (LA)

John T. Trumble (R)

Douglas H. Bartlett (SD)

George A. Gregory (SF)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND
TELECOMMUNICATION POLICY (ITTP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) held one meeting during Academic Year 2001-02 to conduct its business with respect to its charge in Bylaw 155.

Status/Role/Future direction of ITTP

The Committee concurred that Senate input on issues related to courses on Internet and digital technology is appropriate and important during this age of high technology. Courses offered on the Internet are within the authority and interest of the Senate, and faculty are interested also in copyright issues (e.g., ownership of course materials). ITTP members discussed the Committee's role with respect to oversight for academic issues related to computing and technology and also discussed establishing a link with a specifically designated UCOP consultant who would deal with the Committee on a regular basis in working on these issues. Further, the Committee seeks appropriate links to systemwide ad hoc committees, task forces or work groups that are created to deal with policies and issues that are within the Committee's purview, and that also deal with allocations and appropriations related to infrastructural support. ITTP seeks to end a period of relative inactivity by becoming more proactive in developing and/or forwarding recommendations related to telecommunications policies. ITTP is interested in and concerned about security issues related to computing and information technology and whether the right people are being hired to oversee security. ITTP recognizes futuristic problems with respect to network connectivity and conductivity, network service and support, redundancy and network overload. Members considered whether the Committee should hold its meetings by video teleconference.

ITTP Bylaw 155

ITTP proposed a change to its Bylaw that would designate a Vice Chair position within the Committee membership and add the *ex officio* membership of the Chair of the Academic Senate to the Committee. The proposed changes were forwarded to the Academic Council for further consideration.

Copyright Policy

ITTP reviewed and discussed the one draft policy change in "Policy on Reservation of Rights" that was proposed. The Committee drafted and approved the following statement:

- We endorse the several comments that the "Policy on Reservation of Rights" be extended and clarified. Several committees, including the Committee on Educational Policy at UCSF, recommend that guidelines and sample documents be developed for faculty use, when dealing with different kinds of publishers. We recommend that additional rights be reserved, beyond royalty-free use within the University. These

should explicitly include posting on faculty web pages and creation of derivative works.

- We also recommend that UC consider a much more proactive role in dealing with major academic publishers. It is unrealistic to expect individual faculty, negotiating as individuals, to have much leverage with major publishers. UC action should include negotiating with publishers, and encouraging joint action with other groups in specific academic areas where a critical mass of faculty can catalyze a fundamental shift. This has happened, for example, in physics with the Los Alamos online archive.
- Any approach by the University to reservation of rights from publishers should not attempt to mandate specific faculty behavior. Individual needs, such as for publication in particular journals recognized in their field, preclude a uniform or mandatory policy.

Other

The following items and issues were received and discussed by the Committee:

- The Academic Senate Website Committee—the Academic Council will look into placing an ITTP representative on this Committee.
- Wider use of Smart Cards University wide—members discussed campus use of smart cards for parking, library charges, student cafeteria and other. Customizing, interface, computer reader use, security passwords and upgrading issues were discussed.
- Computer and network security—Policy needs to address those documents that are legally and ethically confidential, with respect to the capability of forwarding these electronically. Certain encrypted documents can be decrypted and left on a personal hard drive. What forces are in place to deal with security issues? ITTP will continue to discuss these issues.

ITTP representation

ITTP is also represented on University Committee on Library—the ITTP Chair is an *ex officio* member of UCOL.

Acknowledgements:

ITTP benefited from consultation with Academic Council Chair Viswanathan on various Senate matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Kemmerer (SB), Chair
Richard Plant (D)
Mark Warschauer (I—spring/summer)
Thomas Payne (R)
Thomas Ferrin (SF)
Geerat Vermeij (*Ex officio* member; UCOL Chair)
Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

Michael Frenklach (B)
Andre Ouellette (I—fall/winter);
Donald Nierlich (LA)
Roger Bohn (SD)
Charlie McDowell (SC)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

UCPB met 10 times in the 2001-2002 session. The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed during the year are noted herein.

Consultations with UCOP

UCPB was briefed on and responded to a range of issues that included:

- State budget negotiations and economic projections.
- Planning Issues -- enrollment projections; summer instruction; graduate student growth, graduate student support; building use standards
- Endowment Spending
- Multicampus Research Units (see below).
- The State Audit of the Partnership Agreement
- Unit 18 Lecturers Negotiations

Criteria for Budget Cuts

In response to the decline in the state economy and clear indications that the university would be facing budget cuts in the coming year, UCPB formed a subcommittee in December to put forward a set of criteria for making budgetary decisions. This project evolved into developing a set of recommended actions for achieving a long term budgetary strategy that maintains and improves the university's core instructional and research mission. In addition to calling for full and ongoing state support of the core budget, UCPB recommended enhancing revenue by, among other means, investing in increased development funding, increasing recovered indirect costs, and an orderly increase in student fees. A final version of these recommendations was submitted to the Academic Council in June, and an appended statement was submitted in July that puts UCPB on record as objecting in principle against across-the-board cuts as a means of addressing fiscal crises.

Multicampus Research Units

15-Year Review: A UCPB subcommittee studied the 15-year comparative review of White Mountain Research Station, UC Observatories/LICK, and INPAC, concurring with the Review Committee that all three MRUs fill an important mission in support of the University's commitment to education, research and service, and should continue. UCPB commented on the need for both more strategic planning in each case in order to utilize currently available funds in an optimal manner, and more development of extramural funding. For White Mountain and for UCO/LICK, UCPB supported funding for facilities maintenance, but did not unconditionally support increases in their permanent budgets. UCPB did, however, recommend significantly increased funding for INPAC's long-range conceptual studies.

Other MRU Issues: UCPB commented on the 2000-2001 MRU Financial Report, and on the proposed new category of Intercampus Research Programs. The committee also discussed the larger issues of MRU viability, the definition of an MRU, and the Senate's oversight role in regard to other research units (see CISI issue below).

California Space Institute

Twice in the year UCPB considered the issue of disestablishing the California Space Institute. In a discussion at its March meeting, the committee concurred with UCORP's call for the immediate disestablishment of CalSpace, expressed dissatisfaction with the administration's response to last year's Senate recommendation for disestablishment, and questioned the efficacy of the review process. At its May meeting UCPB discussed the question in more detail, and proposed a plan for the disestablishment of CalSpace that addresses organizational and budgetary particulars associated with the transition. UCPB recommended that the California Space Institute be disestablished, with the portion of its operating budget that is not supporting FTEs to be returned immediately to UCOP. As a transitional arrangement, the remaining budget should be retained for FTE salaries only until UC San Diego absorbs those positions as part of its normal FTE allocations. UCPB advised that the transfer of these positions to regular campus FTEs be given first priority from among San Diego's allocation of growth positions.

Academic Initiatives

Freshman Seminar Programs: While UCPB sees the benefits of Freshman Seminar Programs, it expressed concern about the proposed wording of the university-wide program announcement and the development procedure itself. UCPB felt that assuring freshmen access to the seminars could amount to an un-funded mandate and carry a budgetary impact at a time of serious budget constraints. UCPB urged the Academic Council to request that the Administration submit a detailed description of the proposal to the Senate for due review prior to making its formal public announcement.

5-Year Perspectives: As set out in the Compendium, UCPB receives a compilation of campus Five-year Perspectives each year from UCOP. Because the information on the lists is often neither current nor substantive enough for meaningful review, UCPB discussed the value of this process with the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives. UCPB will continue to receive the lists of proposed campus programs and schools from the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives, but primarily as an information item.

Indirect Cost Recovery

This issue has been reviewed in the past by UCORP and UCPB, but because of on-going concerns and questions about allocation and its process, the Academic Council charged UCPB in November of 2001 to initiate a new university-wide review, specifically looking at allocations at the campus level. A Joint UCPB-UCORP subcommittee was formed that oversaw an informal survey on the allocation of recovered overhead at the departmental and decanal levels. UCPB was also briefed on the breakdown of recovered funds at the systemwide level. An interim report was submitted to the Academic Council that outlined the subcommittee's progress and set forth as a guiding principle that the first priority for use of ICR funds is to provide research support services (as they are defined in OMB Circular A-21). The subcommittee will continue its work in the coming year.

“Accountability 1.5”

Another issue that was revisited by the committee this year was the 1999 UCPB report, “Accountability 1.5.” The report proposed measures of accountability of the university administration to the faculty and to the core academic enterprise, looking at faculty productivity and support for that work. Since this report was not followed through on either by the committee or by the reviewing bodies, UCPB took up the task to review the report, decide what the measures should be, update them, and then assume responsibility for reviewing updates annually. The subcommittee reviewed the 1999 report and will, next year, work together with campus budget directors and with the Associate Vice President of Planning and Fiscal Analysis to establish whether and to what extent valid accountability measures can be generated, and what data is available for application.

Budgetary Model for Professional Schools

Since reviewing proposals in recent years for new professional schools, UCPB has been discussing how those proposals should be judged. This year a subcommittee was formed to draft guidelines and offer a budget template for such proposals. This model was submitted for Council approval, and UCPB hopes that it will be of value for future professional school proposals.

CISI Long-term Planning

In the second half of the year, UCPB addressed the question of long-term planning for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. The committee articulated four areas of concern: the lack of permanent funding for CISI operating costs; the lack of Senate oversight of the CISI; the level of integration of the Institutes with their host campuses, and how intellectual property policy was being implemented or developed. UCPB first discussed these issues with the Associate Vice Provost for Research in June. At their July meeting, UCPB discussed these questions in person with the Directors of QB3, of CITRIS, and of CNSI. A written response was sent in from the Director of Cal (IT)2. A summary of that discussion reiterating UCPB’s concerns was forwarded to the Vice Provost for Research. UCPB will continue its dialog with the Directors and with UCOP, and will work to establish clear policy for Senate oversight of the CISI.

Other Business

Academic Units:

- UCPB reviewed a revised proposal for the Reconstitution of the Davis Division of Education to the School of Education. The committee recommend: 1) slowing the proposed hiring rate down to two per year; 2) including clear evidence of sufficient student and market demand, and 3) indicating how the School will participate in undergraduate teaching and help address the University’s growth needs.
- A preliminary proposal for a School of Management at UC Merced was reviewed, and although UCPB saw the eventual establishment of a school of management at UCM as reasonable, it considered this proposal premature and opined that it would not be appropriate until the basic academic structure and curriculum for UCM is consolidated.
- UCPB was kept apprised of the negotiations between UC and CSU that led to an agreement to establish the Joint Ed.D. Program.

UC Merced: The committee was regularly updated on planning developments for UCM from the committee liaison to the UCM Task Force.

Laboratory Professorship Program: Noting that a call for pre-proposals for the Lab Professorship program had already gone out before the proposed program had received full Senate review, UCPB requested that the current pre-proposal process be suspended pending Senate review. UCPB's recommended that a revised proposal address the disparities between the resources provided by the labs and the commitment expected from or benefit to the campuses.

State Negotiated Air Fares: In an effort to cut travel costs, UCPB looked into reasons why discounted state air fares (available to UC employees) were not more easily and more broadly used. According to the Vice President of Business and Finance, mechanisms will be set up on all campuses, through their respective Vice Chancellors for Administrative Affairs, allowing easy authorization for the negotiated state airfares. UCPB will monitor this process and hopes that easier access to these discounted fares will, however modestly, help ameliorate budget constraints.

UCPB Representation

The Chair, Vice Chair or a member represented UCPB on these committees: Academic Council, Academic Planning Council, Executive Budget Committee, Council on Research, UC Merced Task Force, Technology Transfer Advisory Committee, UCORP Subcommittee on Laboratory Management, SLASIAC.

Acknowledgements

UCPB would like to extend sincere thanks to the following UCOP consultants for their consistently valuable contributions: Larry Hershman, Vice President-Budget; Sandra Smith, Assistant Vice President-Planning & Analysis; Jerry Kissler, Associate Vice President-Budget, Planning, & Fiscal Analysis; Carol McClain, Director of Multicampus Research.

Respectfully submitted:

Alan Jackman, Chair (D)
Richard Price, Vice Chair (SF)
Stephen Mahin (B)
Robert Powell (D)
Michael Burton (I, 9/01-4/02))
Rajeesh Gupta (I, 5/02-8/02)
Richard Goodman (LA)
Anthony Norman (R)
Michael Parrish (SD)
Stanton Glantz (SF)
Joel Michaelsen (SB)
Robert Meister (SC)
Gayle Binion, Vice Chair, Academic Council
Brenda Foust, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE (UCP&T)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Universitywide Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCP&T) met twice during the 2001-2002 academic year. UCP&T wishes to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of its administrative consultants, Carole Rossi, University Counsel; and Sheila O'Rourke, Executive Director Academic Compliance and Special Assistant to the Provost.

Revision to Senate Bylaw 195 Privilege and Tenure

In May 2001 the Academic Assembly overwhelmingly approved a series of revisions to Senate Bylaws, as proposed by UCP&T, including a revision to Bylaw 195. Revised Bylaw 195 requires UCP&T to maintain statistical records of the grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases taking place on each of the campuses (as specified in newly-enacted Senate Bylaw 334).

Statistical record keeping. So that a database may be maintained, Divisional P&T Committees are to provide UCP&T with general, non-confidential information on their caseloads. Because discipline and grievance cases are relatively rare and always treated as confidential, P&T Committees and even UCP&T do not have a good perspective on the nature or disposition of these cases. It would be useful to know how many cases there are, whether the number is increasing or decreasing, what kinds of Code of Conduct violations are being prosecuted, what sanctions are appropriate for each type of violation, and whether different campuses generate different types or numbers of cases.

Format for reporting; reporting guidelines. UCP&T discussed the issue of reporting guidelines during its last meeting on April 5, 2002. In compliance with revised Senate Bylaw 195, a format for reporting is being created for use by Divisional P&T Committees. Both the format and the reporting guidelines will be finalized by the 2002-03 UCP&T.

Provision for a UCP&T Chair revision in process. UCP&T's Bylaw 195 needs to be revised in order to provide for a Chair. An Academic Council working group on bylaws is in the process of recommending this revision.

Divisional P&T Bylaws

Divisional P&T bylaws need to be revised to be in conformance with the recent changes to Senate Bylaws 334-337 and APM 015-016, and most campuses have not yet completed this task.

Proposed Revised Draft Policies Regarding University Policy Implementing the Amended California Whistleblower Protection Act

At its January 2002 meeting, UCP&T reviewed the proposed revised draft policies and requested that the intersection between Divisional P&T Committees and the proposed revised policies needs clarification, and that disciplinary actions must be carried out through existing P&T processes. A re-revised draft policy, incorporating UCP&T's suggested revisions, was distributed at the Committee's April 2002 meeting.

Faculty-Student Relations

The UC Board of Regents recently raised a question concerning policy governing faculty-student relations. Beginning in January 2002 UCP&T began discussions about possible courses of action, and those discussions were continued on campus at the Divisional P&T Committees. At its April 5, 2002 meeting, UCP&T members unanimously approved the motion to propose to the Academic Council that the November 30, 1983 Academic Assembly Resolution on Faculty-Student Relations be added as an appendix to both APM 015 The Faculty Code of Conduct, and to APM 035 Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination in Employment (sexual harassment policy).

Although not uniform in their agreement about all of the statements in the 1983 Assembly resolution (some campus P&T Committees preferred appending definitions of conduct that violate the Code of Conduct, rather than the 1983 resolution's general statement of philosophy), UCP&T members regard the 1983 Assembly resolution as a useful guide to faculty-student relations. Once appended to systemwide policy, the resolution will become visible and accessible.

The 1983 Assembly resolution, in its final point, requests that UCP&T consider proposing an addition to the Faculty Code of Conduct in order to give force to the Assembly resolution. Before UCP&T begins drafting this revision language, which would define specific activities that could result in faculty disciplinary proceedings, the Committee requested an initial response about this proposed action from the Academic Council. This item will be considered by the 2002-03 UCP&T.

Respectfully submitted,

Jodie S. Holt, Chair (R)
William Drummond (B)
Arnold Sillman (D)
Richard M. Friedenberg (I)
John V. Richardson, Jr. (LA)
Colin M. Bloor (SD)
Gary C. Armitage (SF)
Martin Scharleman (SB)
Jeannene Whalen, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy and its subcommittee on UC-DOE Relations met a total of nine times during the 2001-2002 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Representation on the Academic Council. As a result of the 2000/01 Committee's proposed Bylaw change, this year UCORP's Chair attended the meetings of the Academic Council. If approved, the Bylaw change would make the UCORP Chair a permanent member of the Academic Council. While that approval is in process, members of the Academic Council invited the UCORP Chair to attend the meetings as a non-voting guest.

UCORP Subcommittee on UC-DOE Relations. With the approval of the Academic Council, a Subcommittee of UCORP was formed last spring to examine issues about the cost/benefit relationship of the University of California and the Department of Energy Laboratories. The Subcommittee's membership is composed of ten faculty members who represent a broad spectrum of interests. The Vice-Provost for Research and the Associate Vice-Provost for Research and Laboratory Programs are regular consultants. During the year, the Subcommittee consulted widely, holding meetings with the executive committees of the Senate Divisions on each of the campuses, and visiting all of the Labs. Since the events of September 11, there has been more support, on many of the campuses, for UC's management of the Labs, but there remain a number of questions about how the University might reap a greater benefit. The Subcommittee is in the process of drafting its preliminary report to the Council, which will be completed in Fall 2002. A final report, with recommendations, will be completed by Spring 2003. One of the recommendations will be that the Senate creates a Committee that would interact regularly, with the Labs, on a wide spectrum of unclassified issues.

UCORP-COR Joint Meeting. UCORP used its April meeting time at UCR to hold a joint meeting with the Chairs of the Divisional Committee on Research (COR). This was the first meeting of its kind, and was intended to provide participants with an opportunity to share information and to discuss common problems and local solutions. The major issues of common interest to the CORs included indirect cost recovery, inadequate support for graduate students, ethics in research, intellectual property rights, understaffed COR function, and how to increase the importance of the CORs' reviews of Organized Research Units (ORUs). At the conclusion of the meeting, there was a consensus that it had been both useful and informative, and participants expressed the hope that a joint UCORP/COR meeting would become an annual UCORP tradition.

In-Depth Discussions. UCORP members devoted significant portions of their meetings to in-depth discussions on selected research policy issues. Those included:

National Labs. John McTague, Vice-President of Laboratory Management, came to a fall and spring meeting to brief the committee on the state of the University's relationship with the Labs and on UC's management performance record. He reported that the University was performing well and there were currently no problem areas. At the May meeting, the Vice-President agreed to meet with members of the local campus Committees on Research (CORs), during the 2002/03 academic year, to provide information about the Labs and to answer questions. COR Chairs should work through their Divisional Senates to extend an invitation to the Vice-President.

Industry-University Relations and Intellectual Property Rights. The morning session of the May meeting was devoted to a discussion of issues around intellectual property rights. Guest contributors included Bill Hoskins, the Director of UCB's Office of Technology Licensing; Ed Penhoet, Dean of UCB's School of Public Health; David Kirp, Professor at the UCB Goldman School of Public Policy; and Susanne Huttner, Assoc. Vice Provost-Major Research Initiatives & Industry-University Partnerships. An interesting fact that emerged from the discussion was that it is difficult for the University to form an all-encompassing policy on intellectual property rights because of the basic cultural differences between electrical engineering and biology and chemistry. For electrical engineers, the emphasis is on open access and rapid progress, whereas for biologists and chemists, because of the necessary long lead-time, licenses are the rule rather than the exception.

“Laboratory Professorships”. UCOP presented the idea of “laboratory professorships”, which would be a campus FTE with partial support from one of the UC/DOE coupled with use of a laboratory facility, to UCORP in November 2001. After extensive discussion UCOP was asked to return with revisions of its proposal. Further discussions were held in January 2002. Unfortunately no further consultations with UCORP were held and there was considerable discomfort with the proposal that UCOP promulgated in Spring 2002. UCORP recommended that the “laboratory professorship” proposal be reviewed by several Senate committees before being announced by UCOP.

eScholarship. A presentation by the California Digital Library about eScholarship was heard by UCORP in April 2002. There was significant interest in the opportunities for enhancing UC faculty/student research through this mechanism, and UCORP plans further interaction with this office. The goal would be to develop opportunities for eJournals, eConferences, and other eResearch options bringing faculty and students from various campuses together.

“California House” and Other EAP Research Opportunities. With consultation from the UCEAP administrator, UCORP inquired into the opportunities for UC faculty and students to utilize the facilities such as “California House” in London and equivalent facilities in other locations to enhance research possibilities. UCORP discussed the possibilities for holding meetings at California House or through California House's auspices at Oxford University or other British University locations, to seek joint research ventures using California House as a joint meeting location, etc. This was a new set of

opportunities not known to the faculty before this year and holds much promise beyond the original EAP undergraduate educational goals of the program and facility.

Research Funding Activities in Sacramento. A lobbyist from the UC Office of State Governmental Relations was invited by UCORP to explain the lobbyist's role, and to answer questions on the funding of research initiatives. Of particular interest to UCORP was the issue of unsolicited initiatives, because those can have a negative impact on the University's research program. Lobbyists work closely with the campus Governmental Relations Directors to identify campus research interests, and an attempt is made to channel the unsolicited initiatives into areas of interest to the University. The University does retain the right to decide how to implement a state research initiative, and it is not required to implement any initiative that it believes is not adequately funded.

UC Intercampus Research Programs (UC IRPs). UCORP reviewed a proposal from the Vice-Provost of Research to create a new MRU category called Intercampus Research Programs (IRPs). The IRPs are intended for faculty groups that are seeking only formal recognition from the Office of Research. Although they would receive no funding, they would be required to undergo a rigorous peer review every three years. While UCORP recognized the need for a separate MRU category that would accommodate this distinct faculty group, there was a consensus that it would not be desirable to add yet another category to the existing MRU classification system. With that in mind, the Committee proposed a restructure of the system that would result in just two classifications – funded MRUs and not funded MRUs.

MRU Comparative Reviews.

CalSpace. When UCORP was asked last year to review the five-year report on the California Space Institute (CalSpace), it recommended that this MRU be disestablished. Among the reasons for making that recommendation was that, during the past twenty years, CalSpace had only limited success in establishing and maintaining multicampus programs. In April 2001, the Academic Council voted to endorse UCORP's recommendation. The Office of Research responded that it planned to continue CalSpace, as an MRU, pending the results of the 15-year sunset review that is scheduled for 2003-04. In May of this year, UCORP was asked by the Academic Council Chair to comment on the position that the Office of Research had taken on CalSpace. After an extensive discussion, UCORP voted unanimously *not* to support the Office of Research's position and recommended that CalSpace be terminated immediately, and that those funds be directed to new MRUs and to bolster vigorous MRUs.

INPAC/WMRS/UCO. During this academic year, UCORP reviewed the reports on the 15-year comparative review of the Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology (INPAC), the White Mountain Research Station (WMRS), and the UC Observatories (UCO), and recommended that these three MRUs be continued.

Other Reports. The Committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following policies/proposals: Three Policies on Copyright, UC Davis Proposal to Reconstitute the

Division of Education as a School of Education, and Proposal for Laboratory Professorship Program.

UCORP Representation. The Chair, Vice-Chair, or a member represented UCORP on the following Committees during the year: Academic Council, National Labs President Council, National Labs Science and Technology Panel, Council on Research, University Committee on Planning and Budget, Subcommittee on Research Initiatives, Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee, Scholarly Information Program Task Force, UC Merced Task Force, Whistleblower Task Force, Responsible Conduct of Research Workgroup, and Workgroup on MRU Funding.

Acknowledgment. UCORP is grateful for the invaluable contributions made by the following members of the Office of Research: Larry Coleman, Vice-Provost of Research; Rulon Linford, Vice-Provost for Research and Laboratory Programs; Susanne Huttner, Associate Vice-Provost for Major Research Initiatives and Industry-University Partnerships; Carol McClain, Director of Multicampus Research Programs; and Allison Rosenberg, Director of Research Policy and Development.

Respectfully submitted:

Henry Abarbanel, Chair

Darrell Long (SC), Vice Chair

Todd LaPorte (B)

Tu Jarvis (D)

Alexei Maradudin (I)

Hans Schollhammer (LA)

Max Neiman (R)

Stefan Tanaka (SD)

Girish Vyas (SF)

Janis Ingham (SB)

Betty Marton, Committee Analyst