

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **George Blumenthal, Chair**

- 1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2005-2006 (oral report, action)**
- 2. Approval of the Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education (action)**

At its December 15, 2004 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously approved a proposal to introduce this year in both houses of the Legislature a Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education at the University of California. For some time now the deteriorating state of graduate education has been a matter of intense concern to UC faculty. The Academic Council believes that this resolution is a crucial first step in our efforts to educate political leaders about graduate education and to let them know why it is critically important to the state's economic health and cultural vitality for them to support policies that will enable the University of California to compete for the strongest possible pool of talent from within the state, across the nation and around the world. The Senate leadership will be working with UC's Office of State Governmental Relations on crafting the final language and on getting this important initiative before legislators. As part of an effort to ensure that the Senate leadership and the President take the necessary steps to accomplish this endeavor, the Academic Council approved the following resolution:

"This resolution requests that the Chair of the Academic Senate and the President of the University take whatever steps are needed to ensure that the Senate's resolution on graduate education is introduced in, and passed by the 2005-06 Legislature."

ACTION REQUESTED: Since the Academic Council has called upon the Chair of the Academic Council to present the Concurrent Resolution on behalf of the Academic Senate, **the Academic Council therefore requests that the Assembly approval the following resolution:**

"Be it resolved that the Assembly of Academic Senate urges the Chair of the Academic Senate and the President of the University to take all possible measures to ensure that the Academic Senate's resolution on graduate education is introduced in and adopted by the State Legislature, and signed by the Governor in 2005."

The proposed language of the Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education that is currently under consideration is as follows:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution Relative to Graduate Education at The University of California and The California State University

This measure would request that the Legislature of the State of California and the Governor join together with the University of California's Regents, President, and Faculty; the California State University's Board of Trustees, Chancellor, and Faculty; and California's business and industry leaders to acknowledge the critical importance of graduate education to California's economy and to

support policies to ensure that California's graduate education programs remain competitive for the very best students.

WHEREAS, California's future economic strength and cultural vitality depend fundamentally on a workforce with advanced training; and

WHEREAS, the state of California faces an increasing challenge in its ability to meet this need in the areas of biotechnology, telecommunications, engineering, computer science, multimedia and the digital arts, education, management, health care, microelectronics and in many other professions that require advanced degrees; and

WHEREAS, University of California graduates with advanced degrees have founded one third of California's biotechnology companies, one sixth of the communications and networking firms, and are on the leading edge of advances in the sciences, engineering, medicine, agriculture, the arts and entertainment; and will become the next generation of faculty for California's colleges and universities, which will need 40,000 new professors/instructors by the year 2010; and

WHEREAS, California State University awards one third of all masters degrees awarded in the state in 162 fields that prepare degree holders for careers in computer science, education, nursing, business administration, public administration, social work, health care, communications and the media, civil engineering, and many more; and produces approximately sixty percent of all K-12 teachers and teacher-administrators; and

WHEREAS, more than one third of the world-class scholars who are attracted to California by the outstanding graduate degree programs of the University of California and California State University remain in the state to work after receiving their degrees; and

WHEREAS, graduate degree programs at the University of California and California State University both enhance the educational experience of our undergraduates, to whom we are committed, and are welcoming to and supportive of the diverse population within California; now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California and the Governor join together with the University of California's Regents, President, and Faculty; the California State University's Board of Trustees, Chancellor, and Faculty; and California's business and industry leaders to acknowledge that California's future economic strength depends on investing in graduate education today, and to support policies to ensure that California's public graduate education programs retain the excellence they have achieved over the past half century and remain competitive in their ability to attract the very best students from within California, across the nation and around the world.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

A. Academic Council (Cont'd.)

• George Blumenthal, Chair

3. a. Approval of the Proposed Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New UC Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus (action)

The following proposed guidelines and procedures are intended to provide the future leadership of the Academic Senate with direction on the Senate's role in the development of a new UC campus, clarify the process by which new Divisions of the University of California Academic Senate are authorized, and amend the bylaws to allow for the implementation of these policies. This proposal, including the proposed amendments to the Academic Senate Bylaws, which were found to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J), was approved by the Academic Council on November 22, 2004 and is presented here for the Assembly's approval.

Action Requested: Approval of the following proposal:

The Proposed Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New UC Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus

(Approved by the Academic Council on November 22, 2004)

Introduction

The Academic Senate has played a key role in the development of new UC campuses since the early sixties and, in 1998, when the University entered into the academic and physical planning stage for UC Merced, the Senate leadership drew on the sixties experience to help identify the nature and extent of its responsibilities in the development of the new campus. While those precedents were helpful in providing a general framework for the Senate's role, there were no written guidelines that the leadership could follow. This proposal is intended to provide the future leadership of the Senate with direction on the Senate's role in the development of a new campus, clarify the process by which new Divisions of the UC Academic Senate are authorized, and amend the bylaws to allow for the implementation of these policies. These proposed guidelines are based on the historical precedents provided in the last major period of new campus development in the sixties¹, and are closely structured on the Senate's recent experience with UC Merced and its progress toward Divisional status.²

Background

The present-day Divisional structure, and the universitywide Senate structure with Divisional representation was the outcome of three All-University Faculty Conferences held between 1957 and 1961 when the reorganization of the Academic Senate was proposed. A Special Committee

¹ Douglass, John A. Planning New UC Campuses in the 1960s: The Role of the Universitywide Academic Senate Special Advisory Committees, December 1998; Fitzgibbon, Russell H. The Academic Senate of the University of California. UCOP 1968.

² Part A of this proposal is modeled on the September 9, 1998 Charge and Membership of the Universitywide Academic Senate Task Force on UC Merced that was drafted by the then-Academic Senate Chair, Aimee Dorr, and enlarged by the experiences of the first Chair of the UC Merced Task Force, Fred N. Spiess, who held that position from 1998 to 2001.

on the Reorganization of the Academic Senate, which was impaneled by the Assembly to study the resolutions of these conferences, prepared a series of reports and recommendations for the Assembly based on its findings. One report included the following outline on a three-step process for establishing a Division on a new campus.

Step 1. Once the Regents establish a new campus, a Chancellor or Chief Campus Administrator should be appointed from a panel of names submitted by an *ad hoc* committee of the Academic Senate – an *ad hoc* committee chosen by the President from names submitted by the Universitywide Committee on Committees.

Step 2. The University Academic Senate Budget Committee (Committee on Personnel), in consultation with the President and the new Chancellor, “should appoint at least five members of the Academic Senate to serve the new campus as a Staffing Committee. This Committee would serve as a local Budget and Interdepartmental Committee, and in this capacity would review and make recommendations on all proposed academic appointments. It would also serve as a Committee on Committees and at the earliest opportunity should appoint such committees as Educational Policy, Courses, and Library.”

Step 3. The Staffing Committee should be disbanded only when the number of new faculty is large enough to fill the “essential Senate committees with tenured personnel.” After formal approval by the Academic Assembly, and then Regental approval, “The establishment of [a Division of] the Academic Senate would begin with the election of a Committee on Committees,” the election of officers and the approval of Divisional Bylaws and Regulations by the Academic Assembly.

Faculty Advisory Committees

Though the three-step process was never *formally* proposed or adopted by the Assembly, Step 2 and parts of Step 3 were followed in the early sixties when the Academic Senate formed Faculty Advisory Committees for the new San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz campuses. President Kerr was a strong advocate of the advisory committee concept, especially since decentralization was underway and he was concerned about the chancellors becoming too powerful. The advisory committees were charged with the responsibility of reviewing academic and physical plans, reviewing faculty hires, and approving courses prior to the establishment of a Division. An important last provision was that they “guide the creation of a Division and ensure that the Academic Senate became a full partner in new campus development.”

The Faculty Advisory Committees played a key role in the formation of the new campuses and established an important precedent upon which the creation of the Academic Senate’s Task Force on UC Merced was based. The Academic Council constituted the UC Merced Task Force in September 1998 when the academic and physical planning process began for UC Merced. The following year, the Academic Council asked the Assembly to take the following two actions: First, to amend Senate Bylaw 116.B to make more explicit the Assembly’s breadth of authority over Senate activities on campuses that lack Senate Divisions, and to permit the Assembly to delegate that authority to Standing or Special Committees; and second, to name the Task Force on UC Merced a Special Committee of the Assembly, and grant it the authority to approve courses and curricula for UC Merced until such time as a Senate Division is established on the campus.

Experiences of the San Diego, Irvine and Santa Cruz Campuses on Becoming Divisions

It was left to the Senate eligible faculty on the San Diego, Irvine and Santa Cruz campuses to decide, usually by vote, whether they could fill the essential Senate committees³ and thereby assume the responsibilities of a Division. If the faculty decided to seek Divisional status, they prepared a proposal for the Academic Council requesting that Divisional status be granted to their campus. At the time each of the three campuses submitted a proposal to the Academic Council, they had no fewer than 60 Senate eligible faculty.

San Diego

When the San Diego faculty voted in 1961 to request Divisional status, it had 65 faculty from the Assistant, Associate and full Professor ranks. In their application for Divisional status, they wrote, “the faculty feels ready to assume the separate Divisional status now enjoyed by the Senate members at Santa Barbara and at Riverside.” [Douglass 1998]

Council Action on a San Diego Division

The application for Divisional status was sent to the Academic Council, which decided that this was a matter for Southern Section action. At a meeting of the Southern Section on May 23, 1961, a unanimous vote approved the admission of the San Diego faculty as an independent Division of the Academic Senate. [Fitzgibbon 1968]

Irvine

With the help of its Faculty Advisory Committee, the Irvine faculty developed a proposal for Divisional status and submitted it to the Academic Council in the fall of 1964. The campus had 86 Senate eligible faculty at the time. Simultaneous with this request, and one year before the reception of the first students, the faculty elected a Committee to Develop the Academic Senate. This committee developed the Divisional Bylaws and certain parts of the Senate’s constitution so that when the new Division was approved in 1965 it came into existence with a complete set of Senate officers and a standing committee structure, and immediately took over all functions delegated to the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee ceased operation immediately after the establishment of the Irvine Division. [Douglass 1988]

Council Action on an Irvine Division:

J. W. Peltason, Vice-Chancellor—Academic Affairs, Irvine, was introduced. He described the present situation at Irvine to the Council and requested authorization to commence plans for some faculty organization, preferably a Division of the Academic Senate, there. Chairman Taylor read the Bylaws of the Academic Senate relating to the establishment of new Divisions to the Council. Professor Jennings moved that the Chairman of the Academic Council be authorized, in consultation with the University-wide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and with a committee of Senate members of the Irvine faculty, to prepare amendments to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate establishing a Division of the Senate on the Irvine campus. The motion was passed. Professor Jennings moved that the Academic Council urge the Senate members on the Irvine campus to proceed to take steps to prepare the Bylaws and Regulations necessary for them to function as a Division as soon as they are so constituted. The motion was passed. [Minutes of the November 18, 1964 Academic Council, p. 1]

³ Committee on Courses, Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Budget, Committee on Research, Committee on Graduate Affairs, Admissions Committee

UC Santa Cruz

The Santa Cruz faculty applied to the Academic Council for Divisional status in January 1965 with 61 Senate eligible faculty (eleven of whom were located at Mt. Hamilton). Although the Academic Council approved the Santa Cruz proposal, members did question whether the faculty was large enough to support a Divisional structure. In two inaugural meetings of the Senate, the first on November 23, 1965 and the second on December 14, the Faculty Advisory Committee “turned over most of its functions to the fledgling Divisional organization, but because of the novel programmatic structure at Santa Cruz, the advisory committee continued to assist the new faculty with the organization of its Divisional structure and with the academic personnel process well into the spring of 1966.” [Fitzgibbon 1968]

Council Action on a Santa Cruz Division:

Chancellor Dean McHenry gave a progress report on faculty at Santa Cruz, stating that by the beginning of the fall semester there would be approximately fifty individual Senate members on campus, plus about eleven members at Mt. Hamilton, who will have come under the administrative jurisdiction of Santa Cruz. The question was raised whether the Santa Cruz faculty would be large enough to support an Academic Senate Division (with its committees) there this fall. After some discussion of this and related points, Professor Jennings moved: That the Chairman of the Academic Council be authorized, in consultation with the University-wide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and with a committee of Senate members of the Santa Cruz faculty, to prepare amendments to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate establishing a Division of the Senate on the Santa Cruz campus. The motion was passed unanimously. [Minutes of the January 20, 1965 Academic Council, p. 2]

Divisional status was granted to the Irvine and Santa Cruz campuses when the Assembly approved a proposal submitted by the Academic Council to amend the Senate Bylaws governing Divisional and Assembly membership.

Assembly Action Establishing Irvine and Santa Cruz as Divisions

A proposal to establish Divisions at both Irvine and Santa Cruz was sent forward to the Assembly for approval in October 1965.

“Establishment of Divisions at Irvine and Santa Cruz. Professor Taylor [Chair of the Academic Council] then presented Part II concerning the establishment of Divisions on the Irvine and Santa Cruz campuses. His motion that the amendments to Bylaws 10* and 50** be approved as recommended on pages 6-7, to become effective immediately, was seconded.The motion to amend was put to vote and carried.” [Minutes of the October 15, 1965 Meeting of the Academic Assembly]

*Assembly of the Academic Senate, Membership

**Divisions (Title I. Membership and Authority)

[Since renumbered]

Proposal

The following three-part proposal is intended to both delineate the Senate’s role in the development of new UC campuses, and to clarify the process by which new Divisions of the UC Academic Senate are established. Part A defines the specific responsibilities that would devolve to the Assembly of Academic Senate and to the Academic Council when the academic and

physical planning process begins for a new campus; Part B formulates the procedure by which the Academic Council and Academic Assembly grant Divisional status to a new campus; and Part C amends the Senate's Bylaws to allow for the implementation of these policies.

PART A. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE ACADEMIC ASSEMBLY AND THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW UC CAMPUS

1. Appointment of a Special Committee by the Academic Council

Under the provisions of the Senate Bylaws 125.B.12 and 116.B, the Academic Council will constitute a Special Committee to enable the Academic Senate to fulfill its obligations in the development of a new UC campus. The Special Committee will be granted the authority to exercise all functions of an Academic Senate normally vested in a Division, including authority over courses and curricula. As a Special Committee of the Academic Council, the Academic Council will assume responsibility for the maintenance of the Special Committee, including the appointment of its members. The Special Committee will be impaneled until the new campus is granted Divisional status by the Assembly.

Specific Charge to the Academic Council Special Committee:

- Advise President's Chancellorial Search Committee on the preferred candidate/s
- Serve on search committees for the senior administrators
- Assist in the recruitment and hiring of the founding faculty; assume departmental role in recommending appointments to CAP
- Guide the overarching academic structure
- Develop and approve courses and curricula
- Approve undergraduate degrees and develop graduate degrees for approval by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
- Within the guidelines as set forth by the Assembly, establish admissions policy
- Coordinate policy issues that should be brought to relevant Senate committees for formal consideration by the Academic Council and Assembly
- Provide Senate consultation on opportunities for endowed chairs. In considering the merits of the proposed chair, the Special Committee will consult with the Chair of the campus Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) [See A.2 below]
- Review and make recommendations on proposed naming opportunities
- Advise on the physical development of the campus
- Advise on student affairs and student life issues
- Provide faculty participants, either from the Task Force or from the larger UC community, for other campus planning committees on such matters as student affairs and physical development
- Guide the creation of a Division, including advising on the campus' Bylaws and Regulations and assisting the campus faculty with their proposal to the Academic Council for Divisional status
- Establish an effective version of shared governance

Membership of the Academic Council Special Committee

The members of the Special Committee will provide the key linkages to the Academic Council, the Universitywide Academic Senate Committees and to the Divisions. The membership will consist of one representative from each of the Divisions and a principal leader from the following six Universitywide Academic Senate Committees: University Committee on Educational Policy, University Committee on Academic Personnel, University

Committee on Planning and Budget, University Committee on Research Policy, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the Board of Admissions and Relations with School. The Divisional representatives shall come from an array of academic disciplines. Representatives shall be nominated by the Divisional Senate Chair, in consultation with the Committee on Committees, and appointed by the Academic Council. The six Systemwide Senate Committees shall select their own representatives. Appointments shall be for two to three years and renewable. Terms of service shall be arranged so that turnover is staggered. *Ex-officio* members will include the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council, and the Chair and Vice Chair of the new campus CAP. The membership of the Special Committee shall be as follows:

- a. Chair of the Special Committee. He or she shall be a UC faculty member with a record of distinguished Academic Senate service and experience in academic program development. The appointment will be a three-year, renewable appointment. In addition to his or her other duties, the Chair of the Special Committee will serve on the President's Chancellorial Search Committee, and attend meetings of the Academic Council and Assembly, as a non-voting guest participant.
- b. Vice Chair of the Special Committee. He or she shall be a UC faculty member with a record of distinguished academic service. The appointment will be a three-year, renewable appointment.
- c. Leaders of Six Universitywide Academic Senate Committees. The committees represented are those whose responsibilities are most relevant to the development of the new campus; specifically, the University Committee on Educational Policy, the University Committee on Academic Personnel, the University Committee on Planning and Budget, the University Committee on Research Policy, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. The choice of the committee's representatives will be left to the discretion of each committee. The appointment will be for two years. At the end of the two years, the committee has the option to renew the appointment for one additional year.
- d. Representatives from Each of the Senate Divisions. Each Division shall have one representative on the Special Committee, as appointed by the Academic Council. Appointments shall be for three years and renewable. The Divisional Chair shall be consulted about whether a representative whose term has expired should be reappointed. Whenever a Divisional representative is needed, the Divisional Chair, in consultation with the Divisional Committee on Committees, shall identify at least two faculty who could serve, and submit their names to the Academic Council. The Divisional representatives should have expertise in academic areas relevant to the potential programs of the new campus, provide past experience in the development of a new campus or major teaching or research program, assist in providing a balance of disciplinary perspectives to the Special Committee, and be well situated to engage their Division in matters relevant to the development of the campus. As newly appointed faculty members assume their responsibilities on the new campus, they may be appointed to replace the *Divisional* representatives when their terms of appointment on the Special Committee are completed. The new campus Committee on Committees shall submit the names of its nominees to the Chair of the Academic Council, who will make the appointments in consultation with the Academic Council.

e. Ex-officio Members.

- a. The Chair and Vice Chair of the new-campus CAP
- b. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council

2. Appointment of a Committee on Academic Personnel Constituted as a Special Committee of the Academic Council

Under the provision of Senate Bylaw 125.B.12, the Academic Council will appoint a Committee on Academic Personnel constituted as a Special Committee of the Academic Council. The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will help define the standards and quality of the founding faculty. In consultation with the Special Committee, the CAP will formulate and implement procedural guidelines governing the initial academic appointments at the new campus. It will be responsible for evaluating and making recommendations about proposed academic appointments and appropriate rank and step. As needed it will establish ad hoc committees to evaluate dossiers drawing on faculty expertise from across the UC system. In addition, the CAP will make recommendations to the chancellor on endowed chair appointments. The new-campus CAP will have representation on the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP).

Membership of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

Each Division shall have one representative on the CAP. As a Special Committee of the Academic Council, the Chair, Vice Chair and members will be nominated by the University Committee on Committees, and appointed by the Academic Council. To ensure that the membership represents a broad spectrum of academic expertise, the Council Chair may request representative/s having specific academic interests. The term of appointment shall be for two years, renewable. As newly appointed faculty members assume their responsibilities on the new campus, they will be eligible to serve on the campus CAP, replacing the Divisional representatives when their terms of appointment are completed. When the new campus becomes a Division, it will have the option of assuming all CAP responsibilities.

3. Operational Costs of the Academic Council Special Committee and Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

The costs of the Academic Council's Special Committee and Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) will be shared equally between the new campus and the systemwide Academic Senate for a period of two years, and thereafter borne entirely by the new campus.

PART B. PROCEDURES OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL AND ACADEMIC ASSEMBLY FOR GRANTING DIVISIONAL STATUS TO A NEW UC CAMPUS

1. Approval of Proposal for Divisional Status by the Academic Council

The Senate eligible faculty on the new campus will decide, by a two-thirds affirmative vote, that they are ready to apply for Divisional status when they believe that there are enough resident faculty to support the essential Senate committees, and to represent the new campus on the equivalent Systemwide Standing committees. The essential Senate committees will include a Committee on Committees, Committee on Educational Policy/Committee on Courses, Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, Committee on Academic Personnel, Committee on Budget, Committee on Research Policy, and a Graduate Council (or their equivalents). With the help of the Special Committee, the faculty will prepare a proposal for the Academic Council requesting Divisional status for its campus. The proposal will include draft Bylaws and Regulations for the new campus, and demonstrate evidence that:

- The resident campus faculty is large enough both to support a Divisional committee structure and to fulfill its Divisional obligations to the systemwide Academic Senate⁴; and
- There are guaranteed current and future resources necessary to support a Senate operation, including operating funds, sufficient professional staff FTE, and the dedicated funding to enable the faculty to participate fully in the governance of the University.

When the proposal is submitted to the Academic Council, the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) will review the proposed Bylaws and Regulations to ensure that they are consonant with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Systemwide Senate.

2. Granting of Divisional Status by the Assembly

At the time the Academic Council approves a proposal for Divisional status, the Council Chair, in consultation with the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, will prepare a proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 305 governing Divisional membership. Divisional status will be conferred upon the campus only on the recommendation of the Academic Council and with the Assembly's approval of the proposed Bylaw change.

⁴ Based on the experience of the three newest Divisions that were established in the sixties, the Academic Council recommends that a new campus have a minimum of 60 resident faculty before applying for Divisional status.

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE (Cont'd)

A. Academic Council (Cont'd)

- **George Blumenthal**

3. b. Approval of the proposed amendments to Academic Senate Bylaws 116.A, 116.B and 125.B to allow for the implementation of the policies in the above proposal (action)

(The following is Part C. of the previous agenda item, "The Proposed Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New UC Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus)

PART C. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BYLAWS 116.A, 116.B AND 125.B TO ALLOW FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICIES IN THIS PROPOSAL

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 116. Authority of the Assembly – Part II. E. "The Assembly is authorized to approve modifications to the University Academic Senate legislation...Except for Bylaws marked '{[Protected](#)—see [Bylaw 116.E](#)}', modification of Bylaws requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting members of the Assembly present;" Modification of Bylaws shall take effect immediately following approval unless a different date is specified or required.

Action Requested:

To allow for the implementation of the policies in the above proposal, the following proposed amendments were approved by the Academic Council at its November 22, 2004 meeting, and found to be consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J). The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Assembly approve these proposed amendments.

SBL 116. Authority of the Assembly – Part II

Current

- 116.A The Assembly shall have sole authority to establish committees of the Assembly and Divisions of the Academic Senate, but Standing Committees and Divisions may be established only by amendment of these Bylaws.

Proposed

- 116.A The Assembly shall have sole authority to establish committees of the Assembly and Divisions of the Academic Senate, but Standing Committees and Divisions may be established only by amendment of these Bylaws, **and in the case of Divisions, only on the recommendation of the Academic Council [See Bylaw 125.B]**

Current

- 116.B In the absence of a Division of the Academic Senate on a campus, the Assembly is authorized to establish Faculties on that campus and to exercise all other functions of the Academic Senate otherwise vested in the Divisions under these Bylaws. In exercising these functions, the Assembly may delegate all or part of its authority to one or more Faculties established on the

campus by the Assembly or to one or more Standing or Special Committees of the Assembly. (Am 20 Oct 99) [See Bylaw 230]

Proposed

116.B In the absence of a Division of the Academic Senate on a campus, the Assembly is authorized to establish Faculties on that campus and to exercise all other functions of the Academic Senate otherwise vested in the Divisions under these Bylaws. In exercising these functions, the Assembly may delegate all or part of its authority to one or more Faculties established on the campus by the Assembly, ~~or~~ to one or more Standing or Special Committees of the Assembly **or to the Academic Council, which may further delegate this authority.**

SBL 125.B Academic Council – Authority and Duties

Current – first five provisions

1. The Academic Council shall have only the authority enumerated by these Bylaws.
2. The Academic Council normally shall advise the President of the University on behalf of the Assembly. [See Bylaw 115.e]
3. The Academic Council shall have the continuing responsibility to request committees of the Senate to investigate and report to the Council or to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.
4. The Academic Council shall appoint two Senate members to serve on the Governing Board of the University of California Retirement System. (En. 4 May 89; CC 28 May 03)
5. If a proposed Divisional Regulation, which has been submitted to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for approval, is at variance with the Universitywide Regulations and cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Divisional action, the Academic Council, with the advice of the appropriate University Senate committees, is authorized to approve provisionally such proposed Regulations. Such approval is effective until the end of the next following term in which a regular Assembly meeting is held. Such approval must be reported to the Assembly. [See Bylaw 115.F and Bylaw 206.D]

Proposed – first five provisions

1. The Academic Council shall have only the authority enumerated by these Bylaws.
2. The Academic Council normally shall advise the President of the University on behalf of the Assembly. [See Bylaw 115.e]
3. The Academic Council shall have the continuing responsibility to request committees of the Senate to investigate and report to the Council or to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.

4. The Academic Council shall appoint two Senate members to serve on the Governing Board of the University of California Retirement System. (En. 4 May 89; CC 28 May 03)
5. **The Academic Council shall have the authority to consider proposals for Divisional status, and to recommend to the Assembly that Divisional status be conferred. [See Bylaw 116.A]**
6. If a proposed Divisional Regulation, which has been submitted to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for approval, is at variance with the Universitywide Regulations and cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Divisional action, the Academic Council, with the advice of the appropriate University Senate committees, is authorized to approve provisionally such proposed Regulations. Such approval is effective until the end of the next following term in which a regular Assembly meeting is held. Such approval must be reported to the Assembly. [See Bylaw 115.F and Bylaw 206.D]

JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed amendments would: 1) Stipulate that at the time the University begins the academic and physical planning process for a new UC campus, the Academic Council will constitute a Special Committee charged with fulfilling the Senate's obligations in the development of the new campus; 2) Clarify that the Academic Council has the authority to consider proposals for Divisional status; and 3) Specify that Divisional status will be granted to a new UC campus by the Academic Assembly only on the recommendation of the Academic Council.