**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE. The Academic Council is the administrative arm of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts in lieu of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility via its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of University-wide concern.

2003-2004 ISSUES:
During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Academic Council took under review and made recommendations on more than seventy initiatives, proposals, reports, variances, and APM policy changes covering a wide range of issues. Some of these issues carried over from last year, such as retirement benefits for health sciences faculty, review of the Reports on Faculty Instructional Activities, and revision of the Senate Bylaws; others included: proposed guidelines for the establishment of a new division; equivalent status for Cooperative Extension Specialists; the University Professor review procedure; Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards Policy and Procedures; proposed new policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relations, the Senate's request for a broad review of DANR; and a Senate proposal to align the campus calendars. The Academic Council's final recommendations on many of these issues are posted on the Senate's website at: http://www.Universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/. Matters that were of particular and/or persistent focus for the year are noted below.

THE STATE BUDGET
The budget and other funding matters were either explicitly or implicitly at the center of many of Council's deliberations for the year. Particular effort was made to develop as far as was possible proactive recommendations and strategies to address potential budget cuts, such as the proposed cut in enrollment funding. In the process of looking at a wide scope of strategies, budgetary principles and priorities were distilled.
Budget strategies and priorities. After broad Senate discussion of the budget and its effect on enrollment, the Academic Council finalized a formal Resolution, "California's Budget Crisis and the University of California," which was adopted by the Assembly at its May 12, 2004 meeting. The Resolution was part of a general university advocacy and education campaign to bring attention to the unique role of UC in the economic and cultural health of the state. Council is continuing its interest in further developing faculty advocacy activities. In light of the "compact" that was made with the Governor, which intends to provide UC with stable funding in coming years as well as possible funding for initiatives, Council made preliminary recommendations for budget priorities in the context of long-range planning. Early in the year Council also endorsed the proposal "Increasing Access and Sustaining Excellence," which had been updated to reflect the current budgetary situation, and delineates funding principles consonant with the fulfillment of the University's mission.
Graduate education. Giving high priority to graduate education, Council endorsed and sent forward to the President: 1) "A Crisis in Graduate Education at UC," a letter

highlighting the contributions of graduate education to the state and calling for a commitment to greater fundraising efforts for graduate education; and 2) a "Resolution on Graduate Support," which calls for changes in the return-to-aid formula that will enhance graduate student support.

ADMISSIONS ISSUES
The Academic Council and its committees reviewed BOARS' recommended changes to the eligibility criteria that were developed in response to the findings of the 2004 CPEC Eligibility Study. In order to adjust UC's eligibility pool to the level set out in the Master Plan, recommendations were made for procedural changes and for raising the GPA required for eligibility. The recommendations were endorsed by the Assembly at its Special Meeting on June 30, and then forwarded to the Regents. Throughout the year, the Academic Council Chair and the Chair of BOARS served as key members on the President's Admissions Study Group, which was empanelled to look at a wide range of admissions issues. Council will continue its close involvement with a continuing Study Group next year, and BOARS has been charged with carrying out a number of the group's recommendations.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES
Significant faculty welfare matters taken under review in 2003-04 included:

Resolution on Including Private Equity Investments in the 403(b) Plan and the Proposed New 457(b) Plan. The Academic Council endorsed this resolution in support of allowing employees and retirees the option of including private equity investment in their UC equity portfolio.

Academic Council Resolution on Educational Fee Waiver. This long-standing recommendation of the Senate's to institute an educational fee waiver for qualified children, spouses and domestic partners of all faculty and eligible UC employees was again forwarded to administration along with a proposed gradual implementation schedule to minimize initial costs.

Model Plan for Faculty Recalled for Post-retirement Reaching. The result of a two-year consultative process between the Senate and the Council of Vice Chancellors, this model can be used as a normative "floor" for negotiations with faculty for post-retirement teaching. The Council has asked that a follow-up study be conducted of the types of recall agreements reached under the plan with a report to come out in spring 2006.

Proposed Changes to Retirement Benefits for Health Sciences Faculty. In recognition of the opposition among health sciences faculty to the proposed changes, and in light of impending increases for voluntary tax-deferred savings, the Academic Council recommended that the proposed changes not be made and that other options having minimal impact on the UCRS continue to be explored.

TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:
Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions. This group was established last year to review graduate and professional school admissions guidelines and principles, in part in response to a resolution of the State Legislature calling upon the University to implement comprehensive review at the graduate and professional school level. The task force report, which was completed and sent forward in December, found that comprehensive review of applications to UC's graduate academic and professional

programs is the standard process implemented for selection of high quality graduate and professional school students. Completion of an addendum to the report relating specifically to diversity in graduate and professional school programs is pending.

Honors/AP. Last year, a task force was empanelled by the Academic Council to formulate a recommendation on the appropriate role of Honors/AP/IB and community college courses in the admissions process and, in the case of AP and IB courses, the credit given by the campuses. Completion of the task force report is expected in the 2004-05 session.

Professorial Step System. This task force was formed last year in response to concerns raised about the rationale behind the professorial step system, and to consider whether a step with uniquely high standards - a so-called barrier step - should be maintained, and, if so, whether Professor Step VI is the right point for a review of that nature. The final report of the task force raised questions as to possible inequities in the academic promotion of women and underrepresented minorities. Council responded to the report by: 1) establishing a subgroup to identify the type of data needed to carry out a study of the effect of Step VI on the advancement of women and minority groups through the professorial ranks; and 2) asking UCAP to review and recommend more appropriate language for the Step VI criteria. Next year's Council will address the outcome of both of these efforts.

Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL). This special committee was given the charge to:1) consult with the Administration regarding the management of the DOE Labs, the decision about whether to compete to continue managing the laboratories, and the circumstances surrounding any possible bid; 2) report to the Academic Council on the relationship between the DOE Labs and UC; 3) advise the Academic Council about the best timing and form of Senate input, both at a system-wide and campus level, regarding the advisability of UC competing to retain management of the Labs. The group met monthly throughout the year. A central effort of the group was the development and administration of a system-wide survey of all Senate faculty on questions relating to UC's competing to continue to manage LANL and LLNL. The survey had a response rate of 26%. Of those faculty members who completed the survey, a more than 3-1 majority was in favor of competing for both labs. The full results were reported to the Board of Regents, which took them under consideration. The final report on the survey was completed in July and made public on the Senate website. ACSCONL will continue its work in 2004-05.

Special Committee on Scholarly Communication. This committee was conceived to investigate a wide range of scholarly publication issues including: cost-effective production and optimal dissemination of scholarly works; dissemination methods and use for peer review and academic advancement; assessing faculty interest in and legal issues related to new methods of publication. The committee will begin activities in 2004-05.

OLIVER JOHNSON AWARD
The Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate is given every other year. Professor Aimee Dorr and Professor Calvin Moore were selected by the Academic Council and approved by the Assembly as the 2004 co-recipients of the award, which was presented at the annual Chair's Dinner in July.

RESEARCH ISSUES

Restrictions on Research Awards. In the spring of 2003 the Academic Council gave UCORP the charge to investigate university policy concerning external restrictions attached to research contracts, grants and gifts, and the nature of such restrictions. Coming out of that investigation were three documents, which were reviewed and adopted as Council positions. The first, the Academic Council Resolution on SUTI (Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information), formalized the Senate's opposition to the implementation of this new federal research category that is inimical to fundamental research. The second and third documents were the final committee report on the types of restrictions, "Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants and Gifts for Research," and its accompanying " Resolution on Restrictions on Funding Sources," which supports the right of individual researchers to accept funding from any source that is legitimate under university policy.

Senate Review of System-wide Research Units. Council reiterated its request (originally formulated last year) for a formal response from administration to the Senate's recommendation for a joint Senate/administrative work group that could develop a review structure for the California Institutes for Science and Innovation, taking as a point of departure previously submitted Senate reports. It is anticipated that progress on this matter will be realized in the coming year. Council also forwarded a report recommending a revamping of the MRU review process by re-categorizing units according to their primary function and restructuring the review cycles and criteria in a way that would free up funding for new initiatives.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat: The Academic Council has recently established the practice of meeting in alternate years with the chancellors and with the executive vice chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the chancellors to discuss: 1) shared governance practices in regard to budgetary decisions; 2) improving efficiency in the academic personnel process; and 3) support for campus Senate offices. Following up on topic #1, divisional chairs subsequently reported general satisfaction with the process of campus budgetary decision-making. As an outcome of topic #2, a joint administrative-senate workgroup on improving efficiency in the academic personnel process was formed, the activities of which will continue to be monitored by next year's Council.

The Regents. Last year, the Academic Council recommended that the non-voting status of the Faculty Representatives to the Regents be maintained for another year, during which time the Senate Chair and Vice Chair would work toward achieving greater integration into the Regents' deliberations process. At the July 2004 Council meeting, Chair Pitts reported that as non-voting Faculty Representatives both he and the Council Vice Chair have enjoyed a significant degree of access to regental meetings and deliberations, noting that this access (and other advantages of having a non-voting status) might diminish if the faculty representative were a Regent. It was argued on the other hand that a Faculty Regent with voting rights would have a given and unvarying authority and that such status would have significant symbolic meaning. In a close vote, the Academic Council opposed a change in the current status of the Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents. This outcome will be conveyed to the 2004-05 Academic Council

members, who will revisit the question of the status of Faculty representation on the Board of Regents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:
We express our sincere gratitude to the following members of senior administration for their time and effort this past year in maintaining the other half of a productive dialogue with the Senate: Richard Atkinson, former President; C. Judson King, former Provost and Sr. Vice President-Academic Affairs; Robert Dynes, President; M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Sr. Vice President-Academic Affairs; Bruce Darling, Sr. Vice President-University Affairs; Joseph Mullinix, Sr. Vice President-Business and Finance; and Lawrence Hershman, Vice President-Budget.

Respectfully submitted:

Lawrence Pitts, Chair
George Blumenthal, Vice Chair

Senate Committee Chairs:
Barbara Sawrey, BOARS

Divisional Chairs:
Ronald Gronsky, Berkeley — Kent Erickson, CCGA
Bruce Madewell, Davis — Ramon Gutierrez, UCAP
Abel Klein, Irvine — Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, UCEP
Clifford Brunk, Los Angeles — Ross Starr, UCFW
Irwin Sherman, Riverside — Janis Ingham, UCORP
Jan Talbot, San Diego — Richard Goodman, UCPB Sept.-Dec.
Leonard Zegans, San Francisco — Michael Parrish, UCPB Jan.-Aug.
Walter Yuen, Santa Barbara
Allison Galloway, Santa Cruz

Guests:
Peter Berck, UCM Task Force
Sam Traina, UCM Task Force (June, July)

Council Staff:
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director
Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst
Betty Marton, Policy Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)
2003-04 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Budget restrictions limited the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to two meetings in Academic Year 2003-04: November 21, 2003 and March 23, 2004, in Oakland. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Resolution on the USA Patriot Act

UCAF was interested in the mounting efforts on campuses to address the USA Patriot Act, which included divisional resolutions at Berkeley, Santa Cruz and Irvine opposing the Act and planned resolutions and educational forums at other divisions. To UCAF, these efforts revealed a widespread concern that the Patriot Act might be implemented in a way that could compromise civil liberties and academic freedom on campus. Members agreed that it would be important for members of the campus community to educate themselves about actual and potential dangers posed by the Patriot Act. A resolution was also developed and set before the committee in April, which passed unanimously.

"Be it resolved that the University of California Senate Committee on Academic Freedom supports efforts in the UC Academic Senate and on UC campuses to implement safeguards against potential threats to civil liberties and academic freedom posed by the USA PATRIOT Act and related acts of government legislation."

In June, Academic Council unanimously endorsed a similar version of UCAF's resolution, which was forwarded to the president.

UCAF members will continue to monitor the implementation and effects of the Patriot Act along with efforts to oppose or address it at the campus level. In addition, members may consider taking steps to gather, compile and disseminate data on faculty opinion and experiences in relation to the Patriot Act.

APM 010

In November, several months after the Academic Assembly approved a revised University statement on Academic Freedom, UCLA's CAF asked UCAF to endorse its position that APM 010 be re-opened to a system-wide examination on the grounds that not enough time and effort had been devoted to educating faculty and involving them in the revision. UCAF members agreed that the process of Senate review had been conducted hastily and that educational efforts could have been more thorough, but the committee declined to endorse the UCLA position. Nevertheless, members thought that current interest around the APM revision provided an ideal opportunity to increase educational efforts about academic freedom and to clearly communicate the new policy at the campus level. Members were considering ways to engage their local committees in this effort.

Academic Freedom Forum Website

A webpage for the June 2003 System-wide Senate Forum on Academic Freedom was created on the Senate website. It contains speaker presentations, along with other relevant materials, academic freedom links, and resources. Members saw the webpage as a good means to disseminate information and knowledge from the event to a larger audience. http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucaf/afforum/

Academic Freedom and Students

Student Regent Matt Murray joined UCAF in March to get input into a policy he had drafted on academic freedom for students. Regent Murray's position was that a new policy should address ambiguities about student academic freedom—in particular, students who are engaged as teaching assistants, post docs or researchers in scholarly inquiry, research and publishing activities in a capacity similar to faculty. It was not clear to UCAF that the notion of academic freedom as it relates to the professoriate can apply in the same sense to students. However, members concluded that it would be useful to have an affirmative policy or statement, consistent with the faculty code of conduct, as a clear reference for students about their rights and responsibilities. It was suggested that the starting point for such a policy or statement might be the faculty regulations relating to students outlined in APM 015. UCAF plans to take the issue up again next year.

Corporate and Economic Pressures on Academic Freedom

UCSF Professor Lisa Bero joined UCAF to discuss her research into the correlations between corporate sponsorship of research and research findings that are friendly to the interests of the funders. The committee discussed how such ties could compromise freedom of inquiry and the stated mission of the university to discover new knowledge, and how inappropriate influences make it difficult for the academic community to judge scholarship quality, cast suspicion on the professoriate, and call into question the notion of self-regulation, a foundation of academic freedom. UCAF believes that it is the responsibility of the academic community to take control of this issue by managing its own conflicts of interest ethically, so controls are not imposed from the outside. In July, UCAF was asked to comment on a UCORP resolution regarding restrictions on sources of research funding. The committee took the opportunity to discuss some of these issues, and called upon Academic Council and appropriate Senate committees to investigate the problem.
Members also discussed the extent to which corporate funding of grants and clinical trials interacts with the academic personnel process as a possible incentive or disincentive for merit increases and promotions. It was suggested that CAPs and CAFs could work together on the issue. The committee will continue to discuss these issues in the future.

Proposed New Policy on Sexual Harassment

In November, UCAF sent comments to Council about a proposed new university policy on sexual harassment. The comments focused on Paragraph G of the policy, entitled "Free Speech and Academic Freedom." UCAF suggested that more emphasis be placed

on protections for students, and the protection of scholarship. UCAF submitted two alternative formulations of Paragraph G to Academic Council.

Other Issues and Activities

Finally, members devoted part of each regular meeting to reports and updates about issues facing local committees. Discussion included the authority of Institutional Review Boards (IRBs); civil liberties issue in connection with federal government access to student records; hate speech and conditions of civility on campus; university policy regarding the withholding of pay during a strike, political influence in federal scientific review panels; and discussion of academic freedom cases at other universities.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Watson, Chair, Riverside
Philip Bonacich, Los Angeles
Barbara Epstein, Santa Cruz
Patrick Fox, San Francisco
Peter Irons, San Diego
Gregory Kelly, Santa Barbara
Carol Redmount, Berkeley (Fall)

Jerold Theis, Davis
Howard Tucker, Irvine
David Vogel, Berkeley (Spring)
Mark Higgins, (student representative-San Diego)
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL (UCAP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel held five meetings during Academic Year 2003-04, including one teleconference meeting, and conducted additional business by E-mail. A summary of issues considered this year by UCAP are outlined as follows:

Report of the Professorial Step System [Step VI] Task Force.
UCAP submitted a response letter to the Academic Council on 18 May 2004 including recommendations and voting action taken on individual recommendations in the report.

As a related but separate issue, UCAP submitted a letter to the Council outlining the need for more comprehensive faculty personnel data/statistics and urging that administration and the Office of the President be requested to construct a systematic database to allow studies and make accurate assessments of the way in which faculty move through the ranks, by including individual time at each rank and step, accelerations and decelerations, step merit increases, and bulges at major career reviews.

Electronic Publication and Scholarly Communication, including publication review.
UCAP has maintained that electronic scholarly works should be considered as other scholarly work. Individual campuses are dealing with developing principles and quality measures for assessing electronic publications. Members were invited to submit comments on local practices with respect to consideration of electronic publications in the review process. This was preliminary to the establishment of an Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communications to study these and other issues related to electronic publications. UCAP considered barriers that make it difficult to assess electronic publication during promotions and reviews. Most campus departments are keeping abreast of developments in electronic publication and new citation practices in their respective fields. UCAP discussed these issues with Associate Vice President and University Librarian Greenstein.

Series considerations for clinician-scientists in the health sciences.
Members from campuses with medical schools were asked to consult with their CAPs to assess the degree to which clinical and adjunct faculty may be misclassified.

Personnel actions: University Professor.
UCAP acted on the following: a) provided nominations for faculty to serve on an ad hoc review committee to consider an appointment to the title University Professor; b) approved a proposal from the Provost to change the APM so that UCAP reviews University Professor appointments and makes recommendations to the Provost and President; c) considered nominations for appointments to the title University Professor and forwarded recommendations.

Amendment to SB 335.B to comply with existing Whistleblower Policies.
UCAP endorsed the Bylaw change as reported to Council on 28 October 2003.

Reports from the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities.
On October 7, 2003 UCAP responded to Council on Describing and Reporting Faculty Instructional Activities and Faculty Instructional Responsibilities: Guidelines for Departmental Policies, endorsing the tenor and content of both reports, and lauding the University's move toward greater accountability with respect to instructional workloads.

Academic Personnel Manual: New Proposals, Amendments:
- Supervisor of Physical Education Title Series—UCAP affirmed that this was a superfluous title and recommended to close the series.
- UCAAD Proposal to revise APMs 210, 240 and 245—UCAP participated actively in fine-tuning with UCAAD the proposed amended language. In its letter to Council on 24 February 2004 UCAP reported on its endorsement of modifications proposed to APMs 240 and 245, and in its April 21, 2004 letter, UCAP reported that it was not in full agreement on the proposed revisions to APM 210; however, the majority endorsed most of the revisions.
- Family friendly policies: Proposed revisions to APMs 133 17-g-j; 210-1-d; 2b and 5d; 220-10, 15, 16 and 18-b; and 760—UCAP endorsed the direction of proposed changes to these policies.
- Formal Review of APM 260 – University Professor—UCAP submitted response to Council on 18 May 2004 endorsing all the proposed revisions save the numeric limitation outlined in 260-0-e. UCAP members believed this was an unwarranted limitation and that the University should be able to appoint all those incumbents who are worthy of this honor regardless of the number already on a campus. UCAP also recommended that OP consider adding language to specifically state that the appointment is indefinite only as long as the University Professor is fully performing as described in the APM.
- Formal Review of APMs having to do with salaried Clinical Professor series and Community Health Professor series: APMs 278, 279, 133-0, and 210-6—UCAP submitted a lengthy response to the Academic Council on 18 May 2004 in which it outlined its own several changes and recommendations.
- Correction to APM 137-30-c--on April 21, 2004 UCAP reported to Council that it endorsed this APM revision, which involved a wording change.

Development of Policy on Administrative Structures for Interdisciplinary Activities.
UCAP was requested to consider a question from one Division Chair as to whether there are administrative mechanisms for review and funding sufficient to attract, retain and promote individuals who are not in established departmental units. UCAP was invited to draft best practices. UCAP did not make specific recommendations, since campuses vary with respect to the kinds of administrative structures they have in place; however, members forwarded values and goals that they favor, including encouraging each campus to develop a checklist of explicit expectations in terms of teaching, research and service for use in all appointments, that should be discussed at the time of appointment with department and program chairs. Also, there should be clear, full and explicit

communication among departments, programs and ORUs about the faculty in them, at review time.

Member Items:
- Campus Procedures for Gender Equity Review—Members discussed individual campus practices and numbers of overturns of CAP decisions by administration.
- Solicitation of External Letters of Evaluation by Departments—members shared individual campus practices.
- CAP Activity Survey—as per UCAP's annual practice, members submitted data on CAP activities for AY 2002-03.
- UCSD CAP recommended revision to APM 620-16, -18, and –24; removing a stipulated but frequently excepted limitation on salary at $100 less than the step at the next rank—UCAP did not express any sentiment for changing the language, and tabled the issue.
- How criteria for above-scale promotion are decided—members shared individual campus interpretation and practice.

Additional business:
UCAP also received and discussed and/or commented on the following reports and issues, some of which are outside of its specific charge and duties:
- Graduate Admissions Task Force Report.
- Budget Restrictions and Effect on Enrollment—UCAP and Division CAPs remain concerned about available funding for faculty hiring during the current budget shortfall. UCAP reaffirmed the importance of consulting faculty when there is a budget shortfall and when/if further reductions are considered, with respect to monies available for faculty merits, and other decisions related to faculty salaries.
- UC Health Sciences Faculty Retirement Proposal—UCAP approved.
- Conflict of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships—UCAP approved.
- Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Report of Sexual Harassment—UCAP approved.
- Efficiencies in Personnel Review Process—UCAP discussed possible efficiencies within CAPs to save both money and staff time.
- Specialists in Cooperative Extension—After further discussion by this year's Committee, UCAP's recommendation and action taken in 2002-03 not to approve equivalent rank status for this group remained as its standing response.
- UC Outreach Strategic Panel Report, *Forging California's Future through Educational Partnerships: Redefining Educational Partnerships*—UCAP submitted a response to the report on 25 February 2004 that addressed the importance of rewarding faculty outreach efforts, and listed ideas that merit further discussion with respect to incorporating outreach into the University's research and teaching missions.

UCAP Representation.
UCAP was represented on additional Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including: Academic Council (UCAP Chair is a member), Assembly of the Academic Senate, UC Merced Task Force, and Step VI Task Force (UCAP Chair is a member).

Acknowledgement of Committee Consultants:

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Assistant Vice President for Academic Advancement Ellen Switkes and Director of Academic Personnel Myron Okada. UCAP also consulted with UCAAD Chair Ross Frank on its proposed changes to APM language that addresses diversity issues, Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts and Academic Senate Vice Chair George Blumenthal on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate, and Academic Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo on Senate office procedures and Committee business. In addition, UCAP received reports from guest consultants Geoffrey Mason, Merced CAP Chair, Daniel Greenstein, Associate Vice President and University Librarian and John Ober, Director, Education and Strategic Innovation, CDL.

Respectfully submitted,

Ramón Gutiérrez (SD), Chair
Alan Barbour (I), Vice Chair
Janet Broughton (B)
Anna Maria Busse Berger (D)
John Hemminger (I)
Inder Chopra (LA)
Roland Winston (M)
Raymond Williams (R)
Salah Baouendi (SD)
Joseph Guglielmo (SF)
Martin Scharlemann (SB)
Joyce Brodsky (SC), fall/winter
Alan Richards (SC), spring/summer
Lawrence Pitts (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)
George Blumenthal (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)
Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY (UCAAD)
2003-04 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity met twice in Academic Year 2003-04 and held four conference calls to conduct its business with respect to its duties outlined in Senate Bylaw 140. The issues that UCAAD considered this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245 – Appointment and Promotion
UCAAD drafted revisions to three Academic Personnel Manual sections—210, 240 and 245. The committee recommended to Academic Council that these APM sections outlining rules for the evaluation and recognition of faculty, department chairs, and divisional deans be amended to include efforts that contribute to diversity—"to more explicitly include diversity activities as part of the measure of excellence in the University."
In APM 210, which outlines criteria for the appointment, promotion and appraisal of faculty, UCAAD drafted language asking reviewing committees to specifically consider a candidate's contributions to a broad range of diversity efforts in teaching, research, and service. New language was also added to APM 245 requiring department chairs to submit an annual affirmative action plan, and to APM 240, asking deans and provosts to make a similar commitment to maintain a divisional affirmative action program.
UCAAD worked in conjunction with the University Committee on Academic Personnel and consulted with a UCAP subcommittee to fine-tune the final language.
Chair Frank and UCAP's Chair presented the revisions to the Academic Council in March. During the process of Council review, several committees and divisions suggested modifications, and in June, modified versions of the APM revisions passed Council unanimously and were forwarded to the Provost asking her to initiate a process of formal campus review.

The Budget Crisis and its Effect on Enrollment
UCAAD examined several of the alternatives the Senate and University were considering to respond to the budget crisis and the decision by the California legislature not to fund new enrollment growth at UC. In December, UCAAD submitted comments to Council recommending that the University pursue, above all, options that would have the least adverse effect on diversity and underrepresented student populations. UCAAD expressed strong support for the current system of comprehensive review; and opposition to lotteries, increases to faculty workload, fees, and the faculty-student ratio. Finally, the committee submitted its members' rankings of 17 options to limit enrollment, which were tabulated into a Senatewide "score card" aggregate total.

Report of the Professional Step System Task Force
UCAAD discussed the Step System Task Force Report in the context of its implications for diversity and equity. Members submitted comments to Council expressing concern about the apparent disproportionate number of women and underrepresented minorities

sitting at the barrier between step V and VI. UCAAD recommended that the problem warranted further study and asked that more satisfactory data be provided to the Academic Senate.

Report on Diversity in Graduate and Professional School Enrollment
Academic Council Chair Pitts asked UCAAD to consider the problem of low minority enrollment in UC's graduate and professional schools in a formal report and recommendation addressed to the graduate and professional schools. Committee members researched and shared campus best practices related to recruitment, admission and retention; the role of affirmative action officers. At the end of 2003-04, a draft of the report was pending.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In addition to discussing and submitting official responses to senate issues, UCAAD members discussed and reported on news and items of interest from campus committees. These included discussion of local search committee practices, local faculty hiring data, exit interviews and surveys, creation of and liaison with campus equity officers, recruitment practices, equity reviews and career reviews, and concerns about faculty enrichment. Members were also particularly concerned about the decimation of the Outreach budget and disappointing data related to faculty diversity. Finally, the committee endorsed a Senate bylaw change proposal to formally eliminate the University Committee on Student Affirmative Action—which has not operated for over 20 years—and include student diversity issues within the charge of UCAAD.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements:
UCAAD would like to extend thanks to UCOP consultant Sheila O'Rourke, Executive Director, Academic Compliance, who provided the committee with regular consultation, reports and data and briefed members on numerous items and issues, including:

- Data and statistics on faculty hiring and retention.
- University obligations and responsibilities for faculty and student affirmative action in relation to both Proposition 209 and Federal Affirmative Action Regulations.
- UC policies on conflicts of interest created by consensual relationships and on sexual harassment and procedures for responding to reports of sexual harassment.
- The rights of faculty or the public to request salary data.
- Career equity review procedures on the campuses.
- UC programs and fellowships that target diversity.
- President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

In its research on the **Report on Diversity in Graduate and Professional School Enrollment**, Mark Westley, Director of Graduate Student Advancement provided the committee with important information and James Litrownik, Coordinator – Data Management Analysis, organized and prepared data for our use. UCAAD would like to thank them for their time and expertise.

Finally, UCAAD occasionally consulted with Academic Council Chair Lawrence Pitts and Vice Chair George Blumenthal on Academic Council business, and Academic Senate Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barceló on Committee and Senate office matters.

Respectfully submitted,

    Ross Frank (UCSD), Chair
    Allan Stewart-Oaten (UCSB), Vice-Chair
    Gibor Basri (UCB)
    Charles Elkan (UCSD)
    Bruce Haynes (UCD)
    Cynthia Hudley (UCSB)
    Vanna Gonzales (Graduate Student, UCB)
    Cesar Oyervides-Cisneros (Undergraduate Student, UCR)
    Katherine King (UCLA-Fall)
    Muriel McClendon (UCLA-Spring)
    Diane Wara (UCSF)
    Stephen Jenks (UCI)
    Triloki Pandey (UCSC)
    Christine Gailey (UCR)
    Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) convened eleven times which included a two-day meeting, a joint meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council, and a joint meeting with the UC Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs. Additional business was conducted in subcommittee meetings, by teleconference, and by email. Highlights of the committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Eligibility
Reexamining the eligibility index was BOARS' primary focus this year. As established by the California Master Plan for Higher Education, 12.5 percent of the state's public high school graduates are to be deemed eligible for UC. Early in the academic year, preliminary estimates suggested that UC's eligibility rate was above 12.5 percent. In anticipation of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) study's release, BOARS began studying options for adjusting the criteria to make no more than 12.5 percent of California public high school graduates eligible for UC.

The committee began by developing a set of principles to guide their formulation of eligibility. The principles focused on the need to continue emphasizing high academic achievement and likely success at UC while also maintaining access for high-achieving students from a breadth of different backgrounds. The principles were approved by the Academic Assembly in May 2004.

In May 2004, the results of the CPEC study were released indicating that 14.4 percent of California public high school graduate were meeting UC eligibility. BOARS reviewed the current eligibility components, which include the a-g course pattern, grade point average (GPA), standardized test scores, and Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Changes in each of the factors and various combinations were simulated and BOARS studied the effects of each. Overall, the simulations showed that changes to the minimum GPA were most effective in increasing the academic quality of eligibility pool and the expected college performance. Adjusting the minimum GPA also had the least negative impact on students from disadvantaged populations.

The Academic Council and the Academic Assembly endorsed BOARS' recommended adjustments to the freshman eligibility requirements in June 2004.

Study Group
In November 2003, President Dynes charged a study group of regents, faculty, and administrators to examine undergraduate eligibility and admissions policies and implementation issues facing the University. Chair Sawrey represented BOARS on the study group. After five meetings, the study group adopted 15 findings and

recommendations that address eligibility, admissions, oversight, efficiency, and clarity. Many of the recommendations proposed further examination to be conducted by BOARS. These included reexamining current guidelines for the admission of ineligible students, examining the policy of admitting students from the full range of the eligibility pool, considering how greater commonality in the implementation of comprehensive review can be attained, reviewing the feasibility of requesting applicants to submit at least one letter of recommendation, examining the extent to which campuses consider the quality of writing in the personal statement, and including data on appeals in the BOARS' comprehensive review annual report. BOARS has begun addressing some of these issues and will continue examining them next year.

Comprehensive Review
BOARS continued to refine the admissions selection process also known as comprehensive review. The committee considered how participation and achievement in outreach and other academic preparation programs should be evaluated in the comprehensive review process. BOARS agreed that simple participation in an outreach program should not be accorded any weight and that sustained involvement is required. Principles and a rationale were developed to guide campus admissions staff on this topic. Changes in the application will reflect this decision by asking students to describe their involvement in outreach or academic preparation programs.

High School Issues
Granting program status. BOARS reviewed and approved a policy for granting program status to organizations that have standardized curriculums that meet a-g requirements. Prior to approving the policy, UC had agreements with several organizations, such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB), to accept their courses as meeting the a-g requirements. To identify other programs that might qualify for program status, BOARS approved a list of criteria for evaluating programs. Upon approval of the policy and criteria, the BOARS high school subcommittee approved and denied program status to several organizations.

Earth Science as d-requirement. BOARS considered a request from a UC faculty member to accept earth science courses as fulfilling the d-laboratory science requirement. The high school subcommittee concluded that the current doctrine, under which biology, chemistry, and physics are regarded to be the most fundamental science subjects, is sound and should remain in place. The full committee has not yet taken action on this topic.

WASC-accreditation policy. BOARS' policy requiring schools to be WASC-accredited in order to establish an a-g course list came under fire by Christian schools that felt the policy was discriminatory. No changes were made in the policy, but work is underway at WASC to streamline procedures for accreditation.

Admissions Tests
In anticipation of the release of new SAT and ACT exams, BOARS began preparing guidelines for evaluating the new tests. BOARS will also continuously monitor and evaluate the role of test scores in the eligibility criteria.

Joint meeting with CSU Admissions Advisory Council
For the first time, BOARS meet with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council. The meeting was held in Long Beach at the CSU Chancellor's Office and the two groups discussed a number of common issues. Information was exchanged about enrollment reductions plans, collaborative opportunities in admission and enrollment, use of SAT, ACT, CST, and other standardized tests, and alignment of a-g subject areas. Members from both groups thought the meeting was productive and suggested that future meetings be scheduled periodically.

Joint meeting with Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs
BOARS met jointly with the Admissions Directors and Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs. Each campus updated BOARS on the 2004 admissions process, new and continuing challenges in admissions, and plans for the 2005 admissions season.

Review and Updates of Other Issues
During the course of the year, the committee also discussed and/or commented on other issues such as the budget and its effect on enrollment and a web policy for Senate documents.

BOARS Representation
The Chair, Vice Chair, or members represented BOARS in various other committees including the Academic Assembly, Academic Council, UC Merced Task Force, UCEP, UCOPE, ICAS, the Admissions Processing Task Force, and Eligibility and Admissions Study Group. Members also participated in the counselor conferences.

Acknowledgments
BOARS would like to acknowledge the following UCOP consultants for their contribution, work, and insight over the past year: Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President-Student Academic Services; Sue Wilbur, Director-Admissions; Nina Robinson, Director-Policy and External Affairs; Judy Kowarsky, Associate Director-Admissions; Roman Stearns, Special Assistant to the Admissions Director; Roger Studley, Coordinator-Admissions Research.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Sawrey, Chair (UCSD)
David Stern (UCB)
Mark Rashid (UCD)
James Given (UCI)
Keith Stolzenbach (UCLA)
Dennis Focht (UCR)
Jane Stevens (UCSD)
Dick Flacks (UCSB)
Karen McNally (UCSC)
Carmel Levitan (Graduate student rep, UCSF/UCB)
Fabián Rentería (Undergraduate student rep, UCLA)
Emily Hung, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (UCOC)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

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." This includes 16 of the 18 Senate committees with the exception of the Academic Council and UCOC. The Assembly elects the Chair and Vice Chair of the Assembly. UCOC nominates two members at-large to the Assembly, out of which its own Chair is appointed.

To fulfill its charge, UCOC held three meetings in Academic Year 2003-04: December 9, 2003, and February 11, March 9, 2004. The committee also held three teleconferences: October 3 and November 12, 2003, and April 20, 2004. Committee work was also conducted by email.

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

UCOC began this year by identifying unfilled 2003-04 committee positions, including two UCLA Assembly representatives and one UCSF UCORP representative. In addition, UCOC appointed UCPB vice chair Michael Parrish, (UCSD) to replace Chair Richard Goodman, who passed away during the term, and Stan Glantz (UCSF) to vice chair. Both the chair and vice chair will continue through 04-05.

UCOC established appointment goals, including the achievement of a diverse overall balance within committees with respect to discipline and geographical representation. UCOC members agreed to act as liaison to two committees each and to initiate personal contact with each of their assigned chairs, vice chairs and committee members to identify significant issues and obtain input on potential new chairs and vice chairs. Procedures for appointing 2004-05 system-wide committees reflect recent revisions to Bylaw 128.

Members reported on their interactions with chairs and vice chairs in meetings and over email until a slate of candidates was developed. Members discussed all nominations, voted, and contacted the selected candidates after determining their willingness to serve. With the exception of a vice chair appointment for UCIE, UCOC completed system-wide appointments ahead of schedule, and a slate of committee chairs and vice chairs was presented to the Academic Assembly on May 12, 2004.

In addition to appointing chairs and vice chairs to system-wide committees, UCOC is responsible for appointing members to the Editorial Committee. In 2004-05, the Editorial Committee will align with the other committees to have a chair and vice chair rather than northern and southern co-chairs. In consultation with the Editorial Committee co-chairs and UC Press Director, members worked with their divisional committees to identify candidates with the requested disciplines to fill the Editorial Committee vacancies.

It is also the responsibility of divisional COC members to appoint representatives to the system-wide committees. It was agreed that UCOC members would work with their divisions to identify candidates for these appointments by considering relevant experience and confirming the candidates' commitment and willingness to serve a full term.

OTHER BUSINESS

Searches. During this year, UCOC was asked by President Dynes to select nominees from campuses to be considered for selection on five search committees to replace the UC Provost and Senior Vice President, the UCB, UCSD and UCSC Chancellors, and the Director of the Lawrence Berkeley National Labs. Members held teleconferences to discuss and select their nominees. Names were then forwarded to the president.

Oliver Johnson Award. The Oliver Johnson Award is presented every other year to an individual or individuals who have performed exemplary Senate service. Each local COC appointed one nominee and forwarded the names to UCOC. UCOC reviewed the nominees and selected two to be forwarded to the Academic Council. The Council, in most cases, selects one nominee from the two submitted. This year, the Council selected both nominees.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Utts, Chair (UCD)
Albert Stralka, Vice Chair (UCR)
Julie Carlson (UCSB)
Pamela Den Besten (UCSF)
Sandy Faber (UCSC)
Todd Franke (UCLA)
Manuela Martins-Green (UCR)
Gershon Shafir (UCSD)
Vicki Smith (UCD)
Frederic Wan (UCI)
Sheldon Zedeck (UCB)
Lawrence Pitts, Academic Council Chair
George Blumenthal, Academic Council Vice Chair
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director
Micki Conklin, Committee Analyst

COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) met a total of eight times during the 2003-2004 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Reviews of Proposed Graduate Degree Programs

One of CCGA's primary responsibilities is to review all campus proposals for new graduate degree programs. A total of 13 proposals were forwarded to CCGA for review during the academic year. The following table is a summary of actions of these proposals as of August 2004.

Program Proposed	Disposition
UCD, Ph.D. in Linguistics	Approved 10/7/03
UCI/CSULA/CSULB/CPP with newly added CSUF Joint Ed.D.	Approved 11/4/03
UCSD, Ed.D.	Approved 12/3/03
UCDS, M.A.S. in Marine Biodiversity and Conservation	Approved 1/4/04
UCSF, M.S./D.P.T. Physical Therapy	Approved 1/6/04
UCSC, D.M.A. in Music Composition	Approved 3/16/04
UCSC, M.A. in Social Documentation	Approved 3/16/04
UCSC, M.A./Ph.D. in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology	Approved 3/24/04
UCSC, M.A./Ph.D. in Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology	Approved 3/24/04
UCSB, M.A./Ph.D. in Film Studies	Approved 4/14/04
UCD, M.A.S. in Maternal and Child Nutrition	Approved 4/15/04
UCSD/SDSU/CSUSM, Joint Ed.D. Degree	Approved 5/11/04
UCR, M.A./Ph.D. Religious Studies	In Progress

CCGA also reviewed and approved proposals to reconstitute, change an existing graduate program or unit, and establish a new school. These included:

- UC Irvine proposal to reconstitute the College of Medicine as the College of Health Sciences
- UCLA request to change the name of the School of Public Policy and Social Research to the School of Public Affairs
- UC Davis proposal to establish a Graduate School of the Environment

Budget Crisis and Graduate Education

The effect of the budget crisis resulted in numerous discussions about the impact on graduate education. In the present fiscal environment, CCGA was extremely concerned about the lack of understanding towards graduate education that seems to exist among legislators and the public. The committee was also concerned about the consequences this misunderstanding might have for graduate funding and fees. CCGA took a strong position that increases to graduate fees and non-resident tuition will inevitably decrease

the accessibility and appeal of this highest level of education. The committee maintained that increases in graduate fees and tuition is a major hurdle in UC's ability to attract high quality students. UC struggles to compete with other major research universities across the nation and world to recruit the best graduate students, and every increase in fees reduces UC's competitiveness. CCGA also argued that the quality of graduate education also has profound and hidden ramifications for our state's economy.

In several letters to the Academic Council, the committee tried to highlight importance of graduate education to the State of California. Members advocated committing more fundraising efforts to the needs of graduate education and increasing public awareness about the critical value for the economic and educational advancement of the state and its citizens. Graduate education at UC should be promoted as a profound contributor to the state's industrial, economic, agricultural, and service infrastructure. To ensure the quality and excellence of graduate education and continue driving the California economy forward, the UC graduate enterprise must remain competitive with other institutions in the world.

CCGA members were very disturbed by the budget compact with the Governor which agreed to a 50% differential between undergraduate and graduate fees. The committee will continue to stress the importance of UC's ability to maintain high caliber graduate programs and attract high quality graduate students. The contributions of graduate students help to form an essential component of the University's reputation and are important contributors to the vitality and economy of the State of California. Members also suggested.

Applied or Professional Doctorates
This year, CCGA had several discussions about the challenges UC is facing with the proliferation of applied doctorates, also referred to as professional doctorates. Applied doctorates blend clinical and research components and concentrate on the practice of a discipline in a professional filed. Recognizing that they are uniquely different than PhD degrees, CCGA developed separate guidelines for reviewing applied degree program proposal, which were incorporated into the CCGA Handbook. With last year's approval of two applied doctorates - audiology (AuD) and physical therapy (DPT) – there were concerns that professional associations were elevating entry-level certification to require doctoral-level training. This raised questions about whether degree inflation was a result of an expanding knowledge base in applied fields or an attempt by professional organizations to increase the status of practitioners. In discussions, CCGA concluded that changes in degree requirements should be subject to a rigorous academic review to determine whether doctoral level training is educationally justified. Noting that many applied doctorates are joint degrees with CSU, CCGA also discussed UC's continued role in offered applied doctorate degrees. In many professional fields, CSU has significant master's level programs and has expressed a desire to offer the applied doctorate independently, which is contrary to its role under the Master Plan. CCGA briefly outlined these issues in a letter to Academic Council, which was ultimately forwarded to the Provost.

Graduate Instructional Activities

In reviewing the Report of the Task Force on Instructional Activities, CCGA commented that the report seemed primarily aimed at undergraduate teaching and did not address the complexities of graduate education. Subsequently, the Academic Council requested that CCGA develop alternative metrics for recording faculty activities that more accurately reflected graduate level instruction. A CCGA subcommittee produced several possible algorithms to quantify the broad range of instructional activities associated with the mentor-apprentice-based system of graduate education. The committee also outlined several guidelines to consider when viewing the graduate educational enterprise.

Review of Other Policies and Issues

During the course of the year, the committee also reviewed and commented on the following issues and proposals:

- Report of the Graduate and Professional School Admissions Task Force
- Proposed New Policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships & Proposed
- Revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment
- Course approval for off-campus graduate courses
- Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force
- 15-Year MRU Review Reports: Pacific Rim Research Program and Humanities Research Institute
- UCPB Resolution on Graduate Student Support
- UCPB Report on Restructuring the MRU Review Process

Respectfully submitted:

Kent Erickson, Chair (D)
Quentin Williams, Vice Chair (SC)
Michael Hanemann (B)
Trish Berger (D)
Matthew Foreman (I)
William Roy (LA)
Xuan Liu (R)
James Posakony (SD)
Grayson Marshall (SF)
Gale Morrison (SB)
Bruce Schumm (SC)
Edward Sheen (graduate student)
Emily Hung, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)
2003-2004 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times during Academic Year 2003-04 to conduct its business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 170 and in the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

The Budget Crisis and its Effect on Enrollment. UCEP held ongoing discussions related to the state and university budget crisis. In November, the committee submitted comments to Council analyzing potential options that were being considered to address the legislature's decision not to fund new enrollment growth. The committee outlined several possible approaches, and ultimately favored managing enrollment yield at the level of campus acceptance rates rather than at eligibility. The committee also proposed a set of principles that it felt should guide the decision-making process, emphasizing above all continued adherence to the Master Plan for Higher Education and the preservation of educational and instructional quality. Finally, UCEP members' aggregate ranking of 17 options to limit enrollment were tabulated into a Senatewide "score card" total.

State Budget Mandate on Higher Fees. In a February letter to Council, UCEP spoke against the possible implementation of a state budget mandate to charge higher fees for students who exceed by more than 10% the minimum number of credit units required for graduation. The committee remarked that the mandate was poor educational policy, and could hurt students with double majors, those who enter UC with Advanced Placement or community college credits, and pre-med and engineering majors who routinely need an additional semester to complete their degrees. UCEP also disagreed with estimates that the mandate would save $9.4 million. However, UCEP recommended that if UC was forced to implement the mandate, the university should adhere to four principles that would be least harmful to the educational mission of the university. Council unanimously approved UCEP's principles, and a summary document was forwarded to President Dynes.

Disenrollment. On two occasions, UCEP submitted comments to Council on the option of disenrolling students subject to dismissal for poor academic performance or failure to meet minimum progress. In a January letter, UCEP noted the importance of student progress, but objected to stricter application of disenrollment rules as a means to solve the university's financial problems. The committee asked that campus Senates take steps to involve themselves more in gathering data and monitoring the issue. Later, the committee learned that most campuses do not regularly keep data on the issue, although UCEP did review data from one campus indicating a high number of students subject to dismissal and a correspondingly low dismissal rate. In a June letter to Council, UCEP asked that each campus Committee on Educational Policy require a systematic, annual reporting from the Deans on the numbers of students in various probationary categories,

and report that data to UCEP. Next year, UCEP plans to study these system-wide numbers and convey a set of recommendations to Academic Council.

Impediments to Intercampus Course Enrollment through SR 544. UCEP developed a document affirming the value of Senate Regulation 544, which was crafted with the help of UC Director of Intercampus Academic Program Coordination, Julie Gordon. UCEP expressed concern that not all campuses had developed a mechanism to actually implement 544, which gives students the right to enroll concurrently and receive credit for courses taken on UC campuses other than their own; that the opportunity is not widely known; and that other obstacles impede its use beyond a case-by-case basis. UCEP's document affirmed the principle that the university should strive to minimize barriers to students taking maximum advantage of educational opportunities and resources. It described various impediments to course sharing and proposed ways to better publicize the opportunity and to strengthen existing procedures and regulations, including policy related to faculty and student credit, the course enrollment and approval process, and the role of the registrar. Academic Council endorsed UCEP's SR 544 document, and forwarded it to the Provost for distribution to campuses.

Distance Learning and Hybrid Courses. UCEP met with Robert Blake and Kathleen Dillon, Director and Associate Director of the UC Consortium for Language, Learning and Teaching, a system-wide initiative that also depends upon the smooth implementation of SR 544. The Consortium aims to preserve language resources and enhance cross-campus student access to the less commonly taught languages through course sharing technologies like the Internet and videoconferencing. UCEP endorsed the concept of technology-enabled distance learning, and the notion that such instructional models can give students a wider range of curricular options. UCEP also reviewed two procedural documents used by two local Committees on Courses when reviewing and approving courses with a "hybrid" instructional format using an online or distance component. UCEP members distributed these procedures to their campus committees as examples on which to base local versions.

Senate Regulation 630. Academic Council approved a UCEP request to grant a variance to the residency requirement for students in the UC Sacramento Pilot Program (UCCS), which makes the UCCS exception identical to that for the Education Abroad and UC Washington Center programs. The UCR Office of Student Academic Affairs also asked UCEP to consider changing Regulation 630 to allow for specific residency policy to be set at the local level, but UCEP decided it did not see a compelling reason to relax or get rid of the requirement in favor of local control. Finally, UCEP asked Council to eliminate SR 630b, which provides an out-of-date exception to the residency requirement for students in Colleges of Engineering.

Reports on Faculty Instructional Activities. In December, UCEP commented on two reports produced by the Faculty Instructional Activity Task Force. The committee endorsed the value of a new system to report faculty instructional activities to the legislature in a more comprehensive and accurate way, clarifying the diversity of ways UC faculty deliver education and instruction. Members also consulted with their local

COCIs about how those committees would work with campus registrars in implementing the new system of course categorization.

Transfer Articulation. UCEP discussed two proposed state senate bills affecting articulation and transfer agreements among California colleges and universities, as well as some negative impressions, confusion and problems involved in transfer to UC. Eric Taggart, director of ASSIST (Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer), joined UCEP by phone to discuss his work and UC's possible participation in the California Articulation Number Board (CAN). UCEP sent a memo to ICAS in support of UC's participation in CAN at the level of writing extended course descriptors and by using the descriptors to the greatest extent possible to define what is expected of transfers.

UCEP Review of Domestic Off Site Academic Programs. UCEP agreed to a Council request to accept as part of the committee's charge the review and approval of university-wide domestic academic programs and courses. This includes but is not restricted to such courses and programs as UCCS, UCDC, and the language consortium, and UCEP approval would come only after a course has gone through the approval process at the home campus of record. UCEP approval will preserve faculty input, but will save the time and resources needed to shop a proposal around to each campus. Council approved language for the bylaw changes that will enable the implementation of this approval process. The bylaw change will go to Assembly next year.

Alignment of Campus Calendars. In November, UCEP resubmitted to Council a previous year's recommendation that quarter-based campuses align their calendars and semester-based campuses align theirs. The committee argued that calendar alignment would save UC resources, promote intercampus cooperation and facilitate more efficient use of fully funded summer sessions, Education Abroad, and multicampus programs like UCDC and UC Center in Sacramento, as well as greater use of simultaneous intercampus enrollment via Regulation 544. Calendar alignment would broaden educational opportunity and work for the general educational benefit of all students. Council unanimously endorsed UCEP's sentiments and forwarded a recommendation to the Provost. In August, the committee developed and submitted a lengthier, more formal recommendation, which it expects Council to review, endorse and forward to the administration.

Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force. UCEP discussed the Step System Task Force Report in the context of its educational policy implications—the positive or negative influence the UC personnel system can have on faculty morale and teaching effectiveness. UCEP members were split in their support of the Task Force's recommendation to eliminate the barrier step review, but said the University should have the best possible system, one that keeps faculty active and productive over time and avoids unnecessary disincentives to their full engagement in educational delivery.

Additional business: UCEP regarded its charge and purview broadly, taking the view that the majority of Senate issues have at least some educational policy implications. UCEP also issued formal responses on the following:

- BOARS' Proposed New Eligibility Criteria.
- UCPB Resolution on Graduate Student Support.
- Comments to BOARS about a UCD professor's request to add Earth and Space Sciences to the Core Subject List.
- Comments about a UCOPE proposal to set a maximum class size for the entry-level writing requirement.
- UCAAD's revisions to APM 210, 240, 245.
- Review of APM 278 and 279 – Clinical Professor Series.
- Proposed Revised Family Friendly Policies – APM 133, 210, 220, 760.
- Proposed Policies on Sexual Harassment and Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships.
- UCD proposal for a Graduate School of the Environment.
- UCLA request for a variance to Senate Regulation 764.
- UCI proposal to reconstitute its College of Medicine as the School of Medicine.
- UCLA request to change the name of its School of Public Policy.
- Academic Senate Proposal for Online Posting of Committee Minutes.

Other: UCEP also discussed issues related to buy-out policy and sabbatical accrual, UC Merced Planning, the business of Academic Council, Academic Assembly and ICAS, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy and Courses of Instruction.

UCEP Representation: UCEP's Chair represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, Academic Planning Council, the UCDC Steering Committee, the AP Honors Task Force, and the Implementation Task Force for Faculty Instructional Workload. The Vice-Chair represented UCEP on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) and the UC Merced Task Force. Finally, UCEP nominated one of its members for service on the Academic Council Special Committee on Scholarly Communications.

Acknowledgements: UCEP would like to extend thanks to UCOP consultants Julius Zelmanowitz, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and Julie Gordon, Director of Intercampus Academic Program Coordination for their consistently valuable contributions. UCOP also consulted with and/or received reports from: Dennis Gallagani, Associate VP, Student Academic Services; Lawrence Pitts, Academic Senate Vice Chair; and María Bertero-Barceló, Academic Council Executive Director. UCEP also thanks alternates Richard Hughey (UCSC), and Gregg Herken (UCM) for their service.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Alvarez-Cohen (B), Chair	Robert Newcomb (I)
Joseph Kiskis (D), Vice-Chair	David Rigby (LA)
J. Keith Gilless (B)	Harry Green (R)
David Bunch (D)	Richard Arneson (SD)

Mike Winter (SF)
Denise Segura (SB)
Donald Brenneis (SC)
Anne Kelley (M) (*non-voting*)
Lawrence Pitts (Member *ex officio*, as
Chair of Academic Council)
Ivy Lee (Graduate student, SF)
Christine Gagnier (Undergraduate student, I)
Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) met eight times during the 2003-2004 academic year. Three of the meetings were held by videoconference with sites at UCOP, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles and San Diego. Videoconferencing saves travel expense (to the Senate) and travel time (of committee members). A major focus of UCFW has been to protect the integrity of existing benefits including retirement systems. This year's committee pursued initiatives from 2002-03 and developed new proposals.

UCFW has two focused working groups: TFIR (Task Force on Investment and Retirement) and HCTF (Health Care Task Force). Retirement benefits and health care benefits are by far the largest --- in dollar terms and in personal importance --- of all UC non-salary benefits. These focused task forces are essential to the successful function of UCFW, doing the time-consuming homework needed to keep in touch with developments in these areas.

UCFW Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR). Under the chairmanship of Robert Anderson (UCB), TFIR drafted two resolutions that were endorsed by the full committee. The first opposes any change to UCRP that would reduce benefits --- including projected benefits --- for current UC employees and annuitants, and the second recommends the retention/inclusion of private equity investments in UC-managed funds available within the 403(b) Plan and projected 457(b) Plan. The first resolution was introduced to Academic Council for information only without a request for a Council resolution. The second resolution received the endorsement of the Academic Council and was forwarded to the Office of the President (UCOP). TIFR continues to monitor the financial effect on UCRP of possible separation of the National Laboratories. TFIR has also consulted closely with UCOP on the development of the 457(b) Plan tax-deferred savings plan, to be introduced toward the end of 2004.

UCFW Health Care Task Force (HCTF). The Health Care Task Force consults with UCOP on the rapidly changing health care marketplace and on health care coverage for UC faculty and staff. This year the task force, co-chaired by Harold Simon (UCSD) and Robert May (UCI), has continued this important work with a focus on maintaining affordable health care premiums and investigating possible cost saving options for prescription drug plans. HCTF consults regularly with UCOP on health insurance premiums and the structure and availability of health care programs. In 2002-03 HCTF and UCFW recommended graduating health insurance premiums by salary beginning in calendar year 2004. On the recommendation of HCTF and UCFW, the Academic Council agreed to post an explanation of the tiered health care premium structure on the System-wide Senate website.

Educational Fee Waiver Program. UCFW continued to pursue the implementation of an educational fee waiver for qualified children, spouses, and domestic partners of all UC faculty, and eligible employees. The committee has recommended the fee waiver since 1999, and the Academic Council recommended it to the President in 2000 and in 2002. In light of the current budgetary situation, UCFW proposed a resolution this year recommending gradual implementation to keep initial costs low. The resolution received the unanimous support of the Academic Council and it was forwarded to President Dynes. UCFW regards a fee waiver benefit as an important element in the recruitment and retention of faculty, a prevailing standard of faculty compensation at leading American research universities, and a means of partially mitigating the lack of salary increases for

both faculty and staff. In his letter of response, the President endorsed the concept of the fee waiver while noting that the University was not in a position to implement a fee waiver program at this time. It is the committee's belief that this is a dimension in which the University of California can and should be competitive with its peers.

Model Plan for Faculty Recalled for Post-Retirement Teaching. UCFW has long sought a phased retirement option for UC faculty. Discussions on this subject with the UC Council of Vice-Chancellors (COVC) were a principal focus of the committee in 2002-03 under the direction of chair Mark Traugott. This year, 2003-04, the COVC and UCFW agreed on a model retirement recall plan. UCFW's Resolution on a Model Recall Plan, was unanimously adopted by the Academic Council and sent to Administration in May with a recommendation for immediate implementation. The Model Plan states a norm, but includes flexible language allowing actual recall agreements to differ. The plan provides for a pre-retirement recall agreement of several years duration with compensation proportional to salary prior to retirement and with continuing range adjustment. The introduction of this plan is made possible by the change in UCRP's "Normal Retirement Age" to age 60. This allows campus administrations and faculty 60 years of age or older to agree to binding recall arrangements in advance of retirement. It is anticipated that the Model Recall Plan will become recommended University policy before the end of this year.

Revision to APM 120 – Emeritus Titles. A new initiative rectifies an anomaly in the APM governing the conferral of the emeritus title. Current rules are that faculty members who retire at the Associate and Professor levels are automatically conferred the title *Professor Emeritus*. Those who separate from the University on UCRP disability status do not qualify because, at the time of their separation, they are not officially retired. These faculty are not currently <u>automatically</u> accorded the title when they actually retire. The Academic Council unanimously endorsed UCFW's proposed amendment to APM 120-Emeritus Title. It would automatically grant the title *Professor Emeritus* to faculty members who retire from the University while on UCRP disability status. The Administration is in the process of amending the APM to incorporate this change.

Faculty Home Loan Programs/Faculty Housing. At the request of Academic Council, UCFW reviewed and submitted a report on the adequacy of UC's Faculty Home Loan Programs. The committee found that the Mortgage Origination Program (MOP), funded by the Regents and administered by UCOP is working well. It provides floating rate first mortgage loans limited by 90% loan-to-value and 40% mortgage payment-to-income restrictions. Campuses reported that the availability of MOP loans is very helpful in faculty recruitment and retention. Nevertheless, in high housing cost markets (most UC locations), the loan-to-value and mortgage payment-to-income restrictions may make the size of the MOP loans inadequate to purchase suitable housing, especially for junior faculty appointees. UCFW found that funding for the Supplemental Home Loan Program (SHLP) --- funded by the campuses --- is severely limited and the committee recommended that the campuses and UCOP consider ways to increase the available funding for this program. Since the committee filed its report, the UC Office of Home Loans has introduced several new loan programs: forty-year MOP loans, SHLP loans (subject to funding) at interest rates keyed to some of the lowest prevailing market rates, and graduated payment MOP loans. UCFW recommended that information on these options be made widely available. In a follow-up to its report to Council, the committee held an in-depth discussion on affordable faculty housing at its July meeting. Housing continues to be a major problem in faculty recruitment for most UC campuses (at some campuses a critical problem).

Suggestions for Future UC Budget Allocations. Academic Council asked Senate committees to submit budget priorities for coming years. UCFW's chief recommendation is restoring and

maintaining competitive faculty salaries. Competitive salaries go to the quality of the faculty and hence sustaining the role of the University of California as a leading research university. The committee also made a number of additional recommendations: educational fee waiver for dependents of UC employees, University funding of health care premiums, University funding of UCRP contributions (when contributions resume), child care for children of UC faculty, pre-funding of retiree health care benefits, and expanded programs for faculty home ownership. The committee made it clear that none of these additional recommendations should distract from the singular importance of restoring and maintaining competitive faculty salaries.

In response to requests for comment from the Academic Council, UCFW submitted its views on:
-University-wide Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities
-Senate Bylaw 355 to comply with Whistleblower Policies
-Policy on Conflicts of Interest Resulting from Consensual Relations
-Sexual Harassment Policy
-Health Sciences Faculty Retirement Proposal
-Revised APM-Family Friendly Policies
-University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)'s Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245
-Proposed and New APM Policies for the Clinical Professor Series and the Community Health Professor Series
-Step VI Task Force Report
-Nomination to UCRS Advisory Board

Acknowledgment. UCFW wishes to acknowledge and thank the following members of the Administration for their willingness to consult regularly with the committee: Joseph Mullinix, Senior Vice President-Business and Finance; Lawrence Hershman, Vice President-Budget; Judy Boyette, Associate Vice President-HR&B; David Russ, University Treasurer; Ellen Switkes, Assistant Vice President-Academic Advancement; Michele French, Executive Director-HR&B Policy and Program Design; Jill Slocum, Coordinator- Health Science Compensation. In addition we thank the System-wide Senate staff for meticulous intensive administration and assistance: Maria Bertero-Barcelo (Academic Senate Director), Betty Marton (UCFW Analyst), Kimberly Peterson (HCTF Analyst).

Respectfully submitted,
Ross Starr, Chair (SD)
John Oakley, Vice Chair (D)
S. Katharine Hammond (B)
Jim Chalfant and Elizabeth Constable (D)
Douglas Haynes (I)
Marvin Alkin (LA)
Raymond Russell (R)
George Gregory (SF)
Roger Anderson (SC)
Steven Gross (SB)
Robert Anderson, UCRS Board
Carol Zytowski, CUCEA
Members-at-Large:
    Daniel Mitchell (LA)
    Harold Simon (HCTF Co-chair)
    Robert May (HCTF Co-chair)
Betty Marton, Committee Analyst

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY (ITTP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 155, the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP) is charged with representing the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of information technology and telecommunications and advising the President concerning the acquisition and use of information and telecommunications technology.

ITTP held three regular meetings and two teleconferences during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Sharing Campus Practices
Members reported on the structure and activities of their divisional committees. The committee concluded that there is great value in sharing campus practices and experiences. ITTP intends to explore the ways in which the committee can increase the awareness and propagation of best practices. It is vital that ITTP have a full membership (representatives from each of the campuses and student representatives) so that the committee can be informed of the activities and perspectives of all the campuses and effectively propagate best practices across the system.

Committee Projects
The committee identified several key IT-related topics to explore in-depth. Several members volunteered to research these topics and present reports to the committee for discussion and recommendations.

IT Funding Allocations
The committee is currently conducting a historical assessment of the variances in IT resources funding across campuses. With the assistance of our consultants from the Office of Information Resources & Communications, data has been gathered from a variety of sources in order to evaluate the IT budgets for each campus. ITTP's intention for gathering and analyzing this information is to create a model that will allow a better understanding and comparison of the IT budgets for the campuses.

Status: ITTP's analysis of campus IT funding allocations will continue during the 2004-05 academic year.

Instructional Technology
There is currently no system-wide committee or office that specifically focuses on instructional technology. The ITTP committee is currently creating a central source of information about the different instructional technology projects and initiatives on each campus.

Status: Information continues to be gathered on campus projects, support and other resources (e.g., a designated statewide funding stream) for instructional technology. The committee plans

this fall to invite a representative from UC's Information Technology Learning Center to discuss system-wide projects and resources. ITTP is also considering making recommendations for central coordination and faculty inclusion in instructional technology efforts since the Academic Senate has authority and supervisory responsibility over courses and curricula.

Open Source

A report outlining UC policies current being applied to open source issues was presented at the March 12th meeting of the committee. Issues from both the Office of Technology Transfer (OTT) and faculty viewpoints were compared, and problems with federal export control regulations and contracts and grants, as related to open source, were also identified. There seems to be a lack of uniformity in the way policies regarding open source are applied on the different campuses.

Status: ITTP outlined three recommendations for possible action regarding the open source licensing issues and plans to invite a representative from the system-wide Office of Technology Transfer to discuss these recommendations in the fall:

1. Request the new UC leadership to formalize in an official policy the spirit and principles outlined in President Richard Atkinson's January 30, 2002 letter on computer code distribution, which is provided in OTT Operating Guidance Memo No. 02-02 (http://patron.ucop.edu/ottmemos/docs/ott02-02.html).
2. Ask that the OTTs be reminded of the principles outlined in President Atkinson's letter.
3. Encourage the University to not impede allowing open source language in contracts and grants when the granting agencies indicate that they are willing to accept open source deliverables.

SPAM

Campuses and departments are employing a variety of methods to reduce spam and defend against the problems that spam causes to servers. Approaches to spam reduction often involve several principles: user sovereignty, user flexibility, minimal disruption, and multi-layer defense. UC's responses to spam are constrained by the diverse email client software, greatly varying sophistication of users, and academic freedom. This combination of factors makes it unlikely that a single, consistent approach to spam reduction will be adopted across the UC system in the near future.

Status: ITTP will continue to monitor the issue of spam and the methods employed for dealing with this problem.

Student Technology Fees

As budgets cuts to higher education are increasing nationally, the number of colleges and universities charging student IT fees are on the rise. A technology fee, however, does not currently exist as one of UC's approved categories of system-wide student fees. Demands by students for increased access to new technologies (e.g., wireless access) have prompted some UC campuses and departments to seek out ways in which they can charge these technology fees. The ITTP committee determined that there are currently three different processes through which a student IT fee can be approved at UC:

1. The UC system can institute a student IT fee by obtaining approval from the Regents for a new system-wide fee.
2. A campus can institute a student IT fee by obtaining formal approval from the students for a campus-wide fee.
3. A college, school or department can institute a student IT fee by obtaining approval from the Chancellor for a "course materials fee" for which there is a formal application and approval process. This is the venue now followed by one UC campus for a course fee to support IT in a majority of undergraduate courses.

Status: UC campuses should consider a course fee comparable to IT fees already being charged by other academic institutions to better provide for the rising IT support expectations from students and faculty.

Wireless Policy
Almost all of the UC campuses are implementing some form of wireless, but these efforts are primarily occurring on an ad hoc basis. The committee, in discussion with our consultants and invited guests, began outlining the various issues that need to be considered by a campus before implementing wireless (e.g., ensuring future upgradeability, balancing access management and security).

Status: The 2004-05 ITTP committee will consider developing a white paper outlining a vision and guidelines for the future of UC wireless.

Consultation with the Administration
Kristine Hafner, Associate Vice President of Information Resources and Communications, and David Wasley, Assistant to the Associate Vice President for Information Infrastructure Planning, serve as consultants to the ITTP committee. Members of the committee, in their roles as ITTP representatives, also engaged in regular consultation with their campus Chief Information Officers and other IT-related administrators. This interaction with the administration has been invaluable to the committee by providing a conduit of timely information and resources.

The committee was regularly updated on system-wide activities by the ITTP Chair and consultants from the Office of Information Resources and Communications. The committee is very satisfied with the work of IR&C and continues to be briefed on the following items:

- Plans for the University to transition from a paper-based to an electronic effort reporting system for federal awards.
- Actions taken by the UC campuses to deal with illegal file-sharing of copyrighted materials.
- Efforts of the Information Technology Infrastructure Task Force to develop a resource framework to project a model of the University's long-term infrastructure investment needs for IT.
- Activities of the Information Technology Leadership Council, an organization of UC's chief information officers and other senior information technology leaders, to address common IT challenges for the UC campuses (http://www.ucop.edu/irc/itlc/).

- Implementation of a pilot project of the Identity Management Work Group to create an infrastructure for <u>federated authentication</u> of UC employees and students for the use of system-wide applications and services (http://www.ucop.edu/irc/itlc/ucfedauth/).
- Participation of several UC campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles and Merced) in the Educational Partners Program of the <u>Sakai Project</u>, a collaborative project that is focusing on the development of open source interfaced instructional technology tools for use by higher education institutions (http://www.sakaiproject.org).
- Strategic sourcing activities occurring at the University in an effort to produce savings through the establishment of <u>system-wide vendor contract agreements</u> for software and hardware (http://www.ucop.edu/irc/agree.html). Committee members provided the IR&C consultants with suggestions to increase faculty awareness and use of system-wide vendor agreements – develop a website that: (1) has an easy to remember address (e.g., software.ucop.edu), (2) gives faculty a simple process to purchase the software/hardware under the vendor agreements, and (3) allows feedback on the types of additional agreements that are needed.

Invited Guests

ITTP invited several guests in addition to their regular consultants to inform the committee about IT-related issues. These special guests and their topics included:

Digital Libraries

Peter Brantley, Director of Technology of the California Digital Library (CDL), spoke to ITTP about the CDL and new digital service architectures. Information was provided on the evolution and future of digital libraries, the CDL's current services and technologies, and the development of future services and technologies.

Export Control Regulations

Barbara Yoder, Policy Development Administrator for the Research Administration Office, presented an overview and specific examples of federal export control regulations to the committee. Administrator Yoder answered the committee's questions on how these export controls affect IT-related areas of research and equipment, as well as how policies on open source apply to an exemption from licensing regulations allowed for "publicly available" technical data.

Wireless Implementation

Michael Kleeman, Research Associate for the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy (BRIE), joined ITTP for a discussion on wireless implementation issues and policy. The committee was informed of the various standards for wireless implementation, the evolution of this technology, and the pros and cons of the different wireless protocols. Examples were provided of various institutions that had implemented wide area coverage of wireless, the costs and plans for this implementation, and the problems they've experienced.

Formal Recommendations

ITTP transmitted formal responses and recommendations to the Academic Council on the following issues:
- Academic Senate website posting policy for committee documents

ITTP Representation
The ITTP Chair serves as a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) and as an ex-officio member of the University Committee on Library (UCOL).

Acknowledgment
ITTP is grateful for the invaluable contributions made by its consultants from the Office of Information Resources and Communications: Associate Vice President Kristine Hafner and Assistant to the Associate Vice President David Wasley.

Respectfully submitted:

Alfonso Cardenas, Chair (LA)
Kenneth Goldberg (B)
Caroline Bledsoe (D)
Lisa Naugle (I)
Curt Burgess (R)
Andrew B. Kahng (SD)
Michael Brook (SF)
Kevin Almeroth (SB)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY (UCOL)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 185, the University Committee on Library (UCOL) is charged with advising the President concerning the administration of the libraries of the University in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. UCOL met once during the 2003-2004 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Campus Reports
UCOL members reported on the activities of the divisional academic senate library committees. The primary topics of concern for the campus committees this year have been budget cuts to the libraries and scholarly communications issues (e.g., the economics of scholarly publications, alternative means of publishing). Members shared ideas and best practices for dealing with various issues related to the libraries and scholarly communications.

Information Literacy
Linda Kennedy, President of the Librarians' Association of the University of California (LAUC), provided the committee with a report on LAUC's information literacy developments. The LAUC Task Force on Information Literacy has completed its work, and as a result has adopted a statement defining and affirming the importance of information literacy instruction, and which emphasizes the role of librarians, collaboration with faculty, and the library's role in instruction. LAUC is considering encouraging, through a grants program, projects in the area of information literacy.

UCOL members reported on the information literacy efforts being conducted on their campuses. A few of the members have discussed the information literacy issue and possible options for implementing solutions to the problem with their committees. Several of the campus libraries have also been active in informing the faculty and students of information literacy resources (e.g., information literacy exhibit).

Shared Collections
LAUC President Linda Kennedy informed members of her involvement as the chair of a committee on shared government collections. The committee determined that sharing every single title was not entirely feasible and that the libraries should instead concentrate on sharing large, widely used titles (e.g., journals). It is also important to allow each campus to make its own decision whether to rely on a shared copy or acquire its own. The campuses are currently conducting a pilot project in sharing government collections.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians
UCOL met jointly with the University Librarians for half a day. The University Librarians presented the following topics to UCOL for information and recommendations:

Strategic Planning for Libraries and Scholarly Information
The System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) has drafted a strategic plan for the libraries and scholarly information. This plan identifies five strategic directions for the UC libraries and scholarly information:
1. Collection Management and Coordination
2. Shared Facilities
3. Shared Services
4. Persistent Access to Digital Information
5. Scholarly Communication

The University Librarians plan to publish this strategic plan when it has been finalized. Short summaries aimed a specific target audiences (e.g., faculty, library staff) will accompany the final document.

Scholarly Communication
A summary of the outcome of the Elsevier negotiations was presented. While this short-term problem has been solved, the next step is to deal with the long-term problems with the nature of scholarly communication. The regional faculty forums on scholarly communication produced a variety of helpful input. From these discussions, four priorities have been identified:
1. Expand and extend current infrastructure, encouraging innovation (eScholarship and partnership with UC Press).
2. Expand communication efforts; seize attention and aggressively forward information about the costs, cost distribution, and economic service interdependencies among the university libraries in their selection, acquisition, processing, management, and provision of access the university's library collections.
3. Establish selection principles that account for scholarly value and economic sustainability and operate according to them.
4. Build expertise within and across the university libraries; create a network of highly engaged and informed library staff to shape and support system-wide as well as campus-based efforts.

Regional Library Facility Planning
The Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) Task Force is preparing a final report for the University Librarians. This report identifies key issues for the RLFs, identifies the working group most appropriate to address each issue, and makes specific recommendations where appropriate. One purpose of the report is to provide justification for expansion of the facilities, since, for example, it is projected that the South RLF will have reached full capacity by 2006.

Effects of Budget Cuts on the UC Libraries
The University Librarians presented to the UCOL members the effects of and actions taken as a result of the budget cuts from the last two years. Many of the campus libraries have received significant cuts to their permanent budgets and have had to layoff staff. A few of the libraries received some offset funding from enrollment growth allocations, however UC will not receive enrollment growth funding from the state in the coming year. Some Chancellors have protected the libraries by absorbing some of the general budget cuts. It is not yet clear how the future budget cuts will translate on the campuses, but all of the libraries anticipate significant reductions in their funding allocations.

UCOL Representation
UCOL is also represented on the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy – the UCOL Chair is an *ex officio* member of ITTP.

Acknowledgment
UCOL wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its administrative consultants: Karen Butter, Chair, University Librarians; Daniel Greenstein, Associate Vice Provost for Scholarly Information, University Librarian for System-wide Library Planning, and Executive Director of the California Digital Library; Linda Kennedy, LAUC President; and Gary Lawrence, Director, Library Planning & Policy Development.

Respectfully submitted:

Abdelmonem A. Afifi (LA), Chair
Elaine Tennant (B)
Raymond Waddington (D)
Lamar M. Hill (I)
Eugene N. Anderson (R)
Andrew Mizisin (SD)
Martin London (SF)
Wolf Kittler (SB)
Ben Crow (SC)
Bridget Smith (Graduate Student, UCB)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT for 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
UCPB met seven times in the 2003-2004 session. The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed during the year are noted in the following report.

The State Budget
The impact of the proposed state budget in its various stages throughout the year was the chief focus of the committee in these related discussions and actions:
Consultations with UCOP. UPCB was regularly briefed on the state budget process and outlook, including the transition of administration, gubernatorial and legislative actions, analysis of the state's fiscal situation, and the development of the compact with the governor.
Budget Proposal. UCPB's proposal *"Increasing Access and Sustaining Excellence" was revised and updated to pertain to the current budgetary situation, and was endorsed by Council in December 2003.*
Enrollment Management Options and Academic Senate Statement on the Budget. In response to proposed cuts in enrollment funding, and at the request of Council, UCPB held in-depth discussions of possible options for managing enrollment and formulated a set of principles for the implementation of possible enrollment options. The outcome of these deliberations were incorporated into what would eventually become the Senate's May 2004 "Resolution on California's Budget Crisis and the University of California."
Graduate Education Support. The committee discussed at length the ramifications of proposed increases in graduate student fees, including the relative costs of hiring postdoctoral scholars as opposed to supporting and training RAs and TAs, the role of international students, and the essential role of graduate education in maintaining UC's research mission. In a related action, UCPB drafted a *Resolution on Graduate Student Support*, calling for tuition and fee remissions associated with teaching assistantships to be treated as benefit expenses to be charged to instructional budgets along with the costs of the teaching assistantships themselves, and for financial aid to be allocated to campuses with due regard to graduate student enrollments.
Budget Priorities. In light of the eventual compact with the Governor promising a certain level of funding in coming years, UCPB formulated a list of Budget Priorities for Planning Purposes, setting at highest priority, salaries and benefits and support for graduate education.

Other UCOP Consultations
UCPB was updated on the revised Enrollment Handbook and on follow up to last year's Report of the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities. The committee was also briefed on a possible change in the formula used for payout of the endowment pool, which would keep the payout constant and move with the market, rather than the current formula based on a 60 month moving average.

Multi-campus Research Units
MRU Review Process. Last year, UCPB initiated a consideration of the MRU review structure and this year charged a subcommittee with developing specific recommendations on how to improve and restructure the MRU review procedure, including: making the review more useful and informative; distinguishing among the types of MRUs; and developing a schedule for

transition to outside funding and a structure for competing programs for university funding. The final report, "Restructuring the MRU Review Process," recommended a structure for re-categorizing MRUs according to their primary function and outlined a way that Office of Research funds can be recycled and used for new research initiatives, based on an NIH-like model of regular competition for funding. The report was endorsed by the Academic Council and forwarded to the President and Provost.

Participation in Reviews. In accordance with its role as stipulated in the Compendium, UCPB considered and commented on the 15-year reviews of the President's Initiative for Research in the Humanities and the Pacific Rim Research Program. UCPB endorsed the continuation of both MRUs, recommending that in both cases, the review procedure should apply more clearly defined measures of success.

Senate Review of the California Institutes for Science an Innovation

UCPB proceeded to engage with questions of funding for, long-term planning for, and regular Senate review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. A request was reiterated for a formal response from administration to the UCPB and the UCORP reports that were forwarded through Council last year. A UCPB member participated as an observer in the "mid-launch" review of the Cal ISIs, held in September, and co-drafted a report of the review that was submitted to the Academic Council summarizing the structure and focus of the review. In order to better judge the impact Institutes have on campuses, UCPB began to gather data from campuses on numbers of FTEs, graduate students and the level of graduate student support associated with the Institutes, and requested that the CPBs of host campuses also try to find out what funds may or will be used for operating costs for the Institutes. UCPB will continue its efforts related to this issue next year.

Academic Initiatives

UCPB considered and acted on the following proposed academic initiatives:

UCI Proposal to Reconstitute the School of Medicine as the School of Health Sciences – endorsed.

UCLA Proposal to Change the Name of the School of Public Policy and Social Research to the School of Public Affairs – endorsed.

UC Davis Proposal for the Establishment of the Graduate School of the Environment – not endorsed.

In addition, the annual list of Campus Five-Year Perspectives was received.

Other Committee Initiatives and Issues

Changes in the University Definition of Equipment – UCPB recommended an alternate formula that would mitigate the possible negative impact on individual researchers with respect to indirect costs and the eventual allocation of ICR monies.

Allocation of Summer Funding – At the request of Council, UCPB began an inquiry into how and whether funds for summer instruction are used to offset budget cuts. The committee will continue to monitor this issue in 2004-05.

University Extensions – UCPB briefly reviewed the fiscal health and management of individual University Extensions, finding no cause for generalized concern.

UCPB reviewed and formally commented on the following additional issues and proposals:
Report of the Task Force on Instructional Activities – recommended changes to better define categories of instructional activities.
Proposed Amendments to the Senate Bylaws – endorsed.
Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions – endorsed.
Equivalency Status for Cooperative Extension Specialists – After reviewing administration's response to questions raised in the Senate review last year, UCPB reiterated its opposition to the proposal.
Proposal for a Formal Review of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources – endorsed.
Report of the Professorial Step System Task Force – not endorsed.

UCPB Liaisons with Other System-wide Bodies
The Chair, Vice Chair or a committee member sat on the following committees and reported to UCPB on their activities: Academic Council, Academic Planning Council, Executive Budget Committee, Council on Research, UC Merced Task Force, Technology Transfer Advisory Committee, the Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee; the System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, and the Educational Finance Model Steering Committee.

Acknowledgements
UCPB would like foremost to acknowledge the fine work and dedication of its appointed chair for 2003-04, Professor Richard Goodman (UCLA), who passed away in January of 2004. He is missed. The committee also extends sincere thanks to the following UCOP consultants for their consistently valuable contributions: Larry Hershman, Vice President-Budget; Sandra Smith, Assistant Vice President-Planning & Analysis; Linda Guerra, Acting Assistant Vice President-Planning & Analysis; Jerry Kissler, Associate Vice President-Budget, Planning, & Fiscal Analysis; Cathie McGowan, Director, Science & Technology Programs and Initiatives; Dante Noto, Director, Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Programs and Initiatives; Kate Jeffery, Director, Student Financial Support.

Respectfully submitted:

Richard Goodman, Chair (Sept. '03 – Jan. '04)
Michael Parrish, Vice Chair and Acting Chair (Jan.'04 –Aug. '04)
Stanton Glantz (SF representative Sept. '03-Jan. 04; acting vice chair Feb.'04 –Aug '04)
Calvin Moore (B)
Theodore DeJong (D)
Derek Dunn-Rankin (I)
John Edmond (LA)
Jonathan Turner (R)
Christopher Newfield (SB)
Robert Meister (SC)
David Gardener (SF)
Jean Bernard Minster (SD)
Christopher Viney (M)
Lawrence Pitts, Academic Council Chair
George Blumenthal, Academic Council Vice Chair
Brenda Foust, Senior Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION (UCOPE)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Preparatory Education held two meetings during AY 2003-04 to conduct its business with respect to its duties outlined in Senate Bylaw 192. Committee activities engaged in and issues that were considered this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Senate Bylaw 192. Preparatory Education. As a result of actions taken by the Assembly last year, this year the Senate Chair and Vice Chair were added to UCOPE's membership as *ex officio* nonvoting members. Also, UCOPE's amended and expanded charge now includes advising on "the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds." Next fall UCOPE will include a Vice Chair position from within its membership of divisional representatives.

Name changes for writing exam and writing requirement. The former Subject A examination is now named the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, and the former Subject A Requirement is now named University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement, as proposed by UCOPE and UCEP in 2002-03, approved by the Academic Council and passed by a special Assembly E-mail ballot in February 2004.

Writing Examination Administration. Pursuant to its charge of oversight of standards for administering UC's writing examination, UCOPE received updates and discussed with its regular consultants from UCOP Student Academic Services many writing exam-related issues, including competing of bids for the exam administration contract, concerns about exam fee increases, and preliminary electronic testing models and electronic scoring alternatives being considered as possibilities for future efficiency and/or cost-savings. UCOPE members share concerns about the cost of exam administration, including the significant costs associated with the annual exam reader weekend; however, the Committee deems the reader sessions to be important for norming process and for programmatic accuracy and consistency, and favors retaining these sessions. UCOPE also favors retaining (for an indefinite period) existing hard copy readings simultaneously with any new pilot electronic exam reading or scoring that might be adopted in the near future.

2004 Writing Examination Essay/Prompt Selection. UCOPE completed its annual selection of the essay/prompt to be administered in the 2004 Subject A examination [Note: the former exam name was used because booklets had been printed well in advance of Assembly approval; however, the new exam name will be used hereafter] by accepting unanimously one passage from among a selection of six passages presented by Subject A Examination Chair George Gadda that were selected previously by the Subject A Examination Subcommittee. This exam essay/prompt selection is a confidential committee action.

2004 Subject A Examination Passing Standard/Norming the Subject A Examination. UCOPE members discussed pretest essays provided by the Subject A Examination Committee

Chair and agreed unanimously on all pretest essay scores assigned by that Committee. Norming sets a pass/fail standard that is used by readers in scoring exams.

Collection of data on how students satisfy UC's writing requirement. It is difficult to retrieve and separate data on how students satisfy the writing requirement, since there are multiple ways to do this. It is thought that all the ways in which a student satisfies the requirement should be reported, as well as the student's success in subsequent coursework that requires writing. The main question is whether students are placed correctly in writing/English courses so they can function. There is no system-wide policy on how many times a student may repeat a course until a passing grade is achieved, nor data on the effect on GPA of including both non-passing and passing grades.

Honors credit for Standard Level International Baccalaureate (IB) Courses in writing/language arts. UCOPE did not come to a conclusion or make a recommendation on whether a score of 5 in the Standard Level IB exam is acceptable for satisfying the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement, as is the score of 5 in the Higher Level IB exam. A subcommittee was charged with reviewing materials and drafting a recommendation for the Committee to consider by E-mail. This awaits receipt of additional information to be sent from IB.

English as a Second Language (ESL) Subcommittee. A consultant from the ESL Subcommittee will attend UCOPE meetings to participate in discussion and consult when UCOPE reviews essay prompts and selects essays and to advise on other ESL issues and language diversity issues, to present the ESL perspective and a report from any ESL Subcommittee meeting. UCOPE would like to see ESL as well as writing expertise among its membership; however, only a few Senate members system-wide are involved in ESL programs.

ESL Subcommittee held one meeting this year; ESL Subcommittee Chair Jan Frodesen (who also serves on the IMPAC Project ESL Subcommittee) reported on its deliberations to UCOPE. Individual campus reports on ESL issues, enrollment trends, program achievements and developments, and problems and concerns were provided. ESL Subcommittee's scope includes both lower and upper division undergraduate students and also those who teach undergraduate students (including TA certification). The ESL Subcommittee is concerned about a growing population of students (called Generation 1.5) who have been educated in the US and whose families speak a language other than English at home, who exhibit writing difficulties and need special attention from writing program courses. Their special needs are being discussed throughout higher education systems and on the national level. ESL Subcommittee remains concerned about outsourcing ESL courses to Community Colleges. While many Community College programs are well articulated with the UC ESL programs, courses with variable quality and unworkable high enrollments remain in some colleges. Students seem quite adept in seeking these out and circumventing the system. Just how substantial this problem may be should be evaluated by IMPAC, with possible safeguards suggested.

Class Size for Writing Classes. UCOPE wrote an advisory to the Academic Council [5/21/04] on Class Size in the UC system. Its report addresses and provides information on national standards on writing class sizes, data on comparison institutions, and recommends a cap of 20 students for first year writing (the national standard), and no more than 15 students for basic

writing. UCOPE emphasized the importance of maintaining and monitoring this standard as a budgetary priority. At UCOPE's request, the issue of class size was referred to UCEP.

Math competencies and evaluation of mathematics placement practices—campus practices. UCOPE received reports from its campus representatives on how math placement is handled at the campus level. It is difficult to obtain individual campus information. Additional campus numerical data about test use and cutoffs (adjusted) would be useful to have. Most campuses administer a math diagnostic test (e.g., MDTP); however, the passing grade is different on every campus, as are the courses that students are assigned to meet math requirements.

Additional business. UCOPE received and discussed the following reports that are outside its specific charge and duties:
- Report of the International Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) Literacy Panel, "Digital Transformation, A Framework for ICT Literacy" from Educational Testing Service.
- iCampus MIT Online Assessment Tool (iMOAT)—part of a preliminary examination of the possibility of electronic administrative work for writing exams in the future.

UCOPE Representation. UCOPE was represented on additional Committees, Task Forces and Work Groups this year, including ICAS, and ICAS ESL Subcommittee. UCOPE Chair Arvan Fluharty was a member of ICAS, attended an IMPAC meeting, and also sat in on an IMPAC ESL group session. UCOPE approved slates of members of the ESL and Subject A Subcommittees (to be completed where vacancies occur). The Subject A Subcommittee will discuss a name change that will better reflect changes in writing exam and writing requirement names.

Acknowledgement. UCOPE benefited from regular consultation and reports from the following consultants: George Gadda, UCLA Writing Director and Chair of the Subject A Examination Committee; Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions; Jeanne Hargrove, Subject A and High School Articulation Coordinator, Student Academic Services; and UCOPE's ESL Subcommittee Chair Jan Frodesen, who is an Academic Senate member from UCSB. UCOPE also consulted with Academic Senate Vice Chair Blumenthal on issues facing the Senate this year and Academic Council Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló on Senate office procedures and Committee business. UCOPE thanks Lecturer M. Cecilia Freeman (UCSC) who represented the ESL Subcommittee at one UCOPE meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Arvan Fluharty (LA), Chair	Roz Spafford (SC)
Robert Jacobsen (B)	Lawrence Pitts (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Chair)
Richard Levin (D)	George Blumenthal (*Ex officio*, Academic Senate Vice Chair)
Susan Carole Jarratt (I)	Barbara Sawrey (Member *ex officio*, as Chair of BOARS)
Ali Sayed (LA)	Alfred Ngaw (Graduate student representative)
Deborah Willis (R)	Enrico-Jose Mangahis (Undergraduate student representative)
Pamela Sample (SD)	Jan Frodesen, Chair, ESL Subcommittee
Henry Sanchez (SF)	Louisa Tapley-Van Pelt, Committee Analyst
Susan McLeod (SB)	

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE (UCP&T)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-2004

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 195, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCP&T) considers general policies involving academic privileges and tenure. In addition, the committee constitutes special Hearing Committees for disciplinary cases and maintains statistical records of the grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases taking place on each of the campuses.

UCP&T met once during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Divisional P&T Activity Survey
As specified in Senate Bylaw 334.B, each divisional P&T committee is required to submit a statistical summary of its cases to UCP&T annually. Last year UCP&T created a "Divisional P&T Activity Survey" form, which must be completed and submitted by each campus P&T committee to fulfill this requirement. The committee reviewed and discussed the results of the 2002-03 Divisional P&T Activity Survey, the first year of statistical information collected from the divisional committees. The committee's discussion focused on the usefulness of the information, difficulties with completing the survey, and the accuracy of the results. Reorganization and minor changes to the Divisional P&T Activity Survey form were made as a result of suggestions from the members for clarification and improvement of the survey.

Divisional P&T Committee Issues
The structure of and procedures followed by the divisional P&T committees vary significantly from one another. To gain a better understanding of these differences and to identify possible best practices, each UCP&T member reported on the composition of and procedures followed by his/her divisional P&T committee. Members also provided advice and related their experiences with a number of procedural and organizational issues concerning divisional P&T committees.

Proposed Revisions to SBL 336.B.4
Senate Bylaw 336.B.4, which governs disciplinary cases, states that "No disciplinary action may commence if more than three years have passed between the time when the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee knew or should have known about the alleged violation of the Code of Conduct, and the delivery of the notice of proposed disciplinary action." The interpretation of this statute of limitations has been problematic on at least one campus, and therefore the committee considered potential options for clarifying this bylaw. Two problematic phrases were identified as potentially in need of clarification: "Chancellor's designee" and "should have known."

Three options for UCP&T action were considered: (1) request that the Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) committee make a legislative ruling on the bylaw; (2) write a report indicating UCP&T's interpretation of the bylaw; and (3) revise the bylaw. The committee agreed that the most effective method for clarifying the bylaw would be to revise it. UCP&T submitted a proposal to

revise Senate Bylaw 336.B.4 to the Academic Council in August for consideration and action during the 2004-05 academic year.

Other Reports
The Committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following policies and proposals:
- Proposed New Policy on Conflicts of Interest Created by Consensual Relationships
- Proposed Revised Policy on Sexual Harassment and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment
- UCAAD's Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245

Acknowledgment
UCP&T wishes to acknowledge the assistance and support of its Committee Analyst, Kimberly Peterson, and administrative consultants: Maria Shanle, University Counsel; and Sheila O'Rourke, Executive Director of Academic Compliance and Special Assistant to the Provost.

Respectfully submitted:

Carolyn Martin Shaw (SC), Chair
Jeffrey Knapp (B)
Norman Matloff (D)
Paul Micevych (LA)
Kathleen Montgomery (R)
Duncan Agnew (SD)
Ruth Greenblatt (SF)
Geoffrey Rutkowski (SB)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY (UCORP)
ANNUAL REPORT 2003-04

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

As specified in Senate Bylaw 200, the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) is responsible for fostering, formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures and advising the President on research. UCORP held seven meetings and one teleconference meeting during the 2003-04 academic year. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs)
Throughout the year UCORP discussed concerns about the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). In May the committee cosigned a letter, drafted by UCPB, which reaffirms previous UCORP and UCPB recommendations to establish formal review procedures for the Cal ISIs. UCORP also devoted a portion of one meeting for each committee member to present a brief report on the current status and functioning of the Cal ISI that is affiliated with their campus. Common issues for the Institutes were identified and discussed. Members suggested that conducting and presenting these campus reports on the Cal ISIs become an annual UCORP event. At the same meeting Associate Vice Provost Susanne Huttner reported to the committee on the mid-launch administrative review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs). Two representatives from the Academic Senate were invited to participate in this review and Chair Janis Ingham served as UCORP's representative. One major issue that was highlighted by the review and continues to be a priority is the need for operating costs for the Institutes and that the source of these operating funds will not encumber resources normally designated to the advancement of faculty research (e.g., indirect cost recovery).

Multicampus Research Units (MRUs)
In accordance with the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"), UCORP participated in the Academic Senate's evaluation of the reports of the 15-Year Reviews of two Multicampus Research Units (MRUs): the Pacific Rim Research Program (PRRP) and the President's Initiative for Research in the Humanities (PIRH). UCORP supported continuation of these MRUs and made a number of recommendations for their improvement. UCORP also discussed possible changes to the MRU program and review process, including exploration of potential new sources of funding and/or termination of some MRUs.

Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Research Awards ("Strings")
In July 2003 the Academic Council issued a charge to UCORP to broadly review research-funding policies at UC. In response to this charge, the committee consulted with the faculty and administration, at the system-wide and campus levels, to identify both appropriate and problematic restrictions and requirements ("strings") occurring in research awards, as well as the various policies and principles that are currently used to guide the University's decisions to accept or reject these conditions. UCORP invited several guests to discuss the various issues pertaining to restrictions and requirements placed on university research by sponsors: Brad

Barber, Assistant Vice President – Institutional Advancement; Michael Eisen, Professor and Public Library of Science (PLoS) Cofounder, Berkeley; Joyce Freedman, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Research Administration and Compliance, Berkeley; David Mears, Director, Research Administration Office; Geoff O'Neill, University Counsel; and Barbara Yoder, Research Administrator – Policy Development, Research Administration Office.

UCORP's findings and recommendations were included in a final report, "Problematic Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants, and Gifts for Research," which was submitted to the Academic Council in July. In addition to this report, the committee developed a separate "Resolution on Restrictions on Research Funding Sources" in response to recent attempts by various groups within the University to ban research funding from companies associated with the tobacco industry. This resolution was endorsed by the Academic Council on July 21, 2004 and transmitted, along with UCORP's report, to President Dynes (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/researchstrings072304.pdf).

Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information (SUTI)
After receiving feedback from various system-wide committees and divisional senates, UCORP revised its "Resolution on Sensitive but Unclassified Technical Information (SUTI)," which advocates for SUTI to be treated according to the University's existing policy on classified research. This revised SUTI resolution was adopted by the Academic Council at its November 24, 2003 meeting and forwarded to President Robert Dynes (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucorp/suti_resolution.pdf). In January, Academic Council Chair Lawrence Pitts received a response from President Dynes indicating that he was supportive of the resolution (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucorp/suti_presresponse.pdf).

Topics of Discussion
UCORP members devoted significant portions of their meetings to discussions on selected research- and policy-related topics.

ACSCONL
The committee received regular updates on the activities of the Academic Council Special Committee on the National Laboratories (ACSCONL) of which UCORP Chair Janis Ingham is a member. Members made suggestions for topics for ACSCONL's white papers and tested the electronic survey on laboratory management before it was sent to the faculty.

Export Control Regulations
Consultants from the Office of Research and Research Administration Office reported to the committee on issues related to federal export control regulations. Compliance with these regulations is critical because violation can result in civil and criminal penalties for both the faculty member and the University. Under the export control regulations, actions that can be considered an export and may require a license include: shipping or carrying items subject to controls out of the U.S.; releasing "technical data" to a foreign person in the U.S. or abroad; providing technical assistance or training of a foreign person in the U.S. or abroad; and performing research in embargoed countries. Technical data receive an exemption from these

licensing regulations if they are considered "publicly available" or result from "fundamental research" in which no restrictions on publication or access were accepted.

In an effort to find out what is being done on the individual campuses to inform faculty about these export control regulations, UCORP members communicated with their Vice Chancellors for Research and reported to the committee on their findings. The committee agreed that the University must improve the information and resources provided to the faculty about export control regulations and compliance.

Homeland Security Research
Cory Coll, Director of Laboratory Collaborations, and Cathie Magowan, Director of Science and Technology Research Programs and Initiatives, informed UCORP of several funding opportunities available to the University community for homeland security research. The Office of Laboratory Management has worked together with the Office of Research in coordinating joint UC/National Laboratory initiatives in the area of homeland security research.

Integrated Safety & Environmental Management System (ISEM)
Lawrence Coleman, Vice Provost for Research, and David Belk, ISEM Program Manager, briefed the committee on a project of the Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) Directors to implement the Integrated Safety and Environmental Management System (ISEM). This new environmental management system is based on the system currently used at the National Laboratories and differs from UC's current system because the environmental and safety controls are tailored specifically to the activities of and materials used in each research laboratory. UCORP members provided feedback and expressed concerns about the new system. The campus EH&S Directors intend to visit each divisional senate's Committee on Research for further feedback on how best to rollout this project and to seek volunteers for piloting the program.

Other Reports and Recommendations
The committee also reviewed and wrote opinions on the following policies and proposals:
- Reports from the Task Force on Faculty Instructional Activities
- Report of the Graduate and Professional School Admissions Task Force
- Metrics for Faculty Instructional Activities at the Graduate Level
- Cooperative Extension Specialists "Equivalent Status" Proposal
- UCAAD's Proposed Revisions to APM 210, 240 and 245
- Proposed Senate/Administration Task Force on DANR
- Professorial Step System Task Force Report
- Academic Senate Website Policy
- Budget Planning Priorities

UCORP Representation
The Chair, Vice Chair, or a member represented UCORP on the following Committees during the year: Academic Council, Academic Council Subcommittee on the National Laboratories, Council on Research, Industry-University Cooperative Research Program Steering Committee, National Laboratories President's Council, and National Laboratories Science and Technology Panel.

Acknowledgment

Respectfully submitted:

Janis Ingham (UCSB), Chair
Max Neiman (UCR), Vice Chair
George Sensabaugh (UCB)
James Murray (UCD)
Walter Fitch (UCI)
Hans Schollhammer (UCLA)
Roland Winston (UCM)
David Salmon (UCSD)
Wendy Max (UCSF)
John Melack (UCSB)
Stephen Thorsett (UCSC)
Loren Bentley (Graduate Student, UCB)
Brad Cohn (Undergraduate Student, UCI)
Kimberly Peterson, Committee Analyst