

**ACADEMIC COUNCIL  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
WEDNESDAY APRIL 5, 2006**

**I. Announcements**

Chair Oakley welcomed alternates Mary Croughan (UCAP), Martha McCartney (UCI), Henry Powell (UCSD), and Reen Wu (CCGA), and announced that President Dynes and Acting Provost Hume would be participating in the joint meeting with the Chancellors scheduled for later in the day.

*The Task Force on UC Compensation Accountability and Transparency.* Chair Oakley is now the Senate representative on the Task Force, which is nearing conclusion of its deliberations. To attend a Task Force teleconference today at 3 pm, Chair Oakley will have to leave the Council meeting early, and will turn the meeting over to Council Vice Chair pro tem Brown. Chair Oakley clarified that the role of the senate representative on this group is similar to that played by the Senate Chair or by an appointed Senate representative in certain other confidential contexts in which he or she participates in and informs debate within the group by reporting the Senate view but not reporting in full back to the Senate. Other examples of such groups are the various search committees that advise the president on the selection of Chancellors and other senior administrators, or the Regents committees on which the Faculty Representatives serve.

**Action:** It was unanimously agreed that the role of the senate faculty representative on certain deliberative bodies, such as search committees, Regents' closed sessions, or the current Task Force on UC Compensation Accountability and Transparency, etc., is to represent the faculty perspective and when appropriate report Council or Senate positions, but, because of the confidential nature of deliberations, not be obligated to report back to the Senate.

**Action:** Members were asked to forward any additional comments on the UCPB "Futures" report to UCPB Chair Glantz within the week.

**Action:** Council agreed to invite to the April 19 meeting UCAAD Chair Weiss, UCAAD Vice Chair Basri, and SCSC Chair Pitts.

**II. Approval of the Agenda**

**Action:** The agenda was approved.

**III. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** The minutes of the February 22, 2006 meeting were approved with minor revisions.

**Executive Session – Items IV and V****IV. Selection of the 2006 Oliver Johnson Award Recipient**

**Action:** Council voted unanimously in selecting dual award recipients for the 2006 Oliver

Johnson Award. The award will be formally presented at the 2006 Council Chairs' Dinner.

#### **V. UCOC Member at Large**

**Action:** This item was deferred to the April 19 meeting. Final Assembly action will be taken at the May 10 Assembly meeting.

#### **VI. UCEP Recommendation for the Formation of a Task Force on Undergraduate Education**

**Issue:** Last fall, the Academic Planning Council asked UCEP to consider whether a UC Task Force on Undergraduate Education should be formed that would make recommendations to the President and Provost on enrollment and program planning, as well as working toward an enhanced public understanding of undergraduate education at UC. UCEP Chair Segura briefly outlined the committee's conclusions, detailed in its March 27, 2006 letter. UCEP recommends the formation of such a task force and has identified areas of focus, including general education, the senior 'capstone' experience, integration of undergraduate education with faculty research projects and with the community, international education, among others. The systemwide joint Senate/administrative task force will be able to improve consistency and integration with the systemwide policy process, articulate concrete goals and disseminate best practices in a number of areas.

**Discussion:** Members commented the work of the task force would be helpful for undergraduate program reviews and enhancing undergraduate research activities, as well as providing other benefits to students. It was urged that UCSF be kept in the discussion and that mentoring be and the honors experience be included as additional foci.

**Action:** By unanimous consent, the Council approved the formation of a Task Force on Undergraduate Education as outlined in the UCEP 3/27/06 memo. The UCEP Chair will revise the memo to include consideration of faculty mentoring and the honors experience.

#### **VII. CCGA Law School Comparative Review**

**Issue:** In 2001, the Academic Council endorsed both a UCI law school proposal and a UCR law school proposal, although no subsequent action on either proposal was taken by UCOP at that time. Now both campuses have re-submitted their requests, and the Legal Education Advisory Subcommittee (LEAS) of the Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education Task Force (PDPE) has initiated a review of the requests and issued a set of evaluative criteria. CCGA has raised objections to LEAS taking the lead on this re-review. CCGA's 3/27/06 letter asks that initial review be conducted by divisional graduate councils and CCGA, and recommends, as well, that proposals for programs or school proposals expire after three years, if, by that time students have not been admitted.

CCGA Vice Chair Wu reported that the committee originally wanted to be involved in the initial review and has as well concerns about adequate Senate involvement on the Planning for Doctoral and Professional Education Task Force. CCGA met yesterday and decided, however, to wait until the LEAS review is completed (rather than trying to participate in what is already underway) and then to conduct a final assessment of the proposals. Therefore, CCGA is withdrawing its request for primary review as stated in the committee's 3/27/06 letter. CCGA

has reviewed and endorsed the LEAS evaluation criteria, which are based on a Senate-developed template for professional school proposals.

**Discussion:** A member expressed the view that the process of re-reviewing proposals is unfair by creating a ‘double-jeopardy’ situation for the proposer, and unnecessarily extends the time before implementation. On the other hand it was noted that new criteria should be taken into consideration, which point is relevant to CCGA’s additional recommendation that a school or program proposals expire after 3 years. Members agreed to consider whether there should be a proposal ‘shelf life’ and, if so, how long that should be. It was noted that both the Riverside and Irvine proposals include substantial new material in their submittals, however, the question remained for one member of whether this should fundamentally affect the status of a proposal that has in fact been approved.

**Action:** CCGA’s role in the comparative law school review will be addressed at the April 19 Council meeting, at which time the membership of the PDPE will be reviewed. In addition, the Divisions are asked to provide input on the question of how long proposals for new academic programs and schools should be viable.

## **JOINT CHANCELLORS /ACADEMIC SENATE SESSION**

### **VIII. Welcome and Introductions**

Participants in the joint meeting introduced themselves and indicated their respective academic disciplines.

### **IX. UC Budget Policy: How Should UC Budget Policy Change as Student Fees Increase?**

The University needs to address California higher education funding trends of increasing student fees and a decreasing portion of the state budget. What are the implications of the continuation of these trends for the nature and quality of UC and what should UC’s strategy be for the long term? UCPB is currently working on a report that plays out four funding scenarios of varying degrees of public support, a draft of which is included in the agenda and has been circulated for comment to the Council and among senior management.

#### **Main discussion points:**

- The numbers in the “Futures” report look credible. However, times have changed since the early 90s and it may not be a valid assumption that a return to an earlier level of state funding is possible.
- There has been a large drop state support, comparatively. UC is making its case with the Legislature that renewed support is necessary.
- The area of greatest promise for stronger private support is with alumni.
- It must be remembered that UC is only one segment of California higher education and has to be framed as working with other segments with a shared public mission.
- There is also the question the funding plan for the multiversity. UC’s array of campuses does not follow the model of other states that typically have a flagship campus, so the strategies for funding have to match this vision.

### **X. Systemwide Issues of Academic Planning and Administrative Reorganization**

1. What are the Proper Parameters for Systemwide Planning? Why is it needed?

**Main discussion points:**

- Centralized plans are essential to maintaining a unified strength and the perception of UC as a whole.
- But a balance is always sought between too much or too little control.
- Local control is of primary importance, but central control is of course needed for coordination of policies and to apply economies of scale.
- The development of professional schools, e.g., should always be tied to serving the needs of local populations. Other state universities focus on large local markets.
- Growth is not accounted for in the marginal cost allocation to campuses, which works against growth goals.

2. Should the Chancellors and/or the Senate remain bystanders to the reorganization process?

**Main discussion points:**

- The process is not slow and deliberative, which raises concerns.
- The consultants to the Regents view internal input on reorganization as essential, and input is being sought for discussion at the next Regents meeting.
- A major improvement in compensation practices and policies is needed, but not necessarily a re-organization of OP.
- A compliance officer might be welcome, and there is also the need for a senior appointment to take on the functions that were handled by the former SVP of Business and Finance.

**XI. Faculty Diversity**

The findings of the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity were presented, whose recommendations include integrating diversity strategies in the long term academic planning process, looking beyond resources for what can be done to improve the diversity 'pipeline' and strengthen retention of underrepresented groups.

**Main discussion points:**

- Diversity is a conscious area of focused effort on most campuses, especially with regard to integrating budget plans and diversity strategies, and accountability.
- On one campus an annual statement is published on how well diversity goals have been achieved.
- UC needs to hire leaders – chancellors, vice chancellors, deans, and department heads - who understand the synergy of diversity.

**XII. Consider Whether UC Faculty Salary Scales are an Obsolete Artifact of an Earlier Time**

About 63% of faculty salaries are 'off scale', (72% with the inclusion of Above Scale salaries), which raises the question of whether this has become the norm. Have salaries become separated from the definition of the professor step system?

**Main discussion points:**

- To what degree is non-state money used for these salaries? UC cannot and should not rely on soft money for faculty compensation to the extent that private universities do.
- The salary scale appears to be broken and it is very important that we return to meaningful structure with real steps and a realistic slotting structure. The step system is one of UC's great strengths.
- At one campus, the budget committee looks at all salaries to help maintain equity while also

being responsive to the market.

- Salaries could be tied to the average salary of California residents.
- Other factors have to be considered as well when speaking of compensation – such as quality of life, housing needs, etc.
- There are always three considerations relating to salary: market, merit, and equity. As well, there are A public institution has the obligation to be transparent, and the faculty themselves can, through shared governance, have varying degrees of influence within the process

### **XIII. Wrap Up**

## **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

### **XIV. Additional Recommendations on Senior Management Salaries.**

**Issue:** UCFW's letter of March 21 makes recommendations on pay grades and advancement within grades as well as on the assessment of 'total compensation.' UCPB has reviewed the letter and, while agreeing with most points, urges maintaining a position that calls for full disclosure of all forms of compensation and suggests the development of a Council position incorporating both UCPB's and UCFW's main points.

#### **Discussion:**

Members agreed that a single position go forward from the Council. Amendments to the UCFW letter were agreed upon, replacing the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraphs on the second page of the UCFW letter with the language recommended in the UCPB letter, and making additional revisions of the language referring to published university rankings.

**Action:** UCFW Chair Russell will revise the UCFW letter as an Academic Council missive to President Dynes - incorporating material from both the 3/21/06 UCFW letter and the 4/5/06 UCPB letter - that makes additional recommendations on senior management salary slotting in order to avoid stratifying campuses and to ensure full disclosure of all aspects of compensation. The revised letter will be brought to Council for approval at the April 19 Council meeting.

### **XV. Implementation of Proposed Cap on Class Size for UC Entry Level Writing Courses**

**Issue:** In July 2005, Council submitted a proposal to the Provost to cap the size of entry level writing classes at 20. The Provost's office is uncertain regarding its authority and responsibility for adopting and implementing the recommendation. Capping class size involves both budgetary and policy issues, and therefore needs to be coordinated between the Senate and campus administrations.

**Discussion:** Some members questioned whether the proposal had been adequately vetted by campuses, and requested information on the review history of the proposal. One member clarified that Council can mandate a class size limit through a new regulation; or Council can recommend to the campuses that the class size be 20, which can be implemented through campus regulatory processes.

**Action:** Council members are asked to include in all formal proposals or recommendations a request for the administration to offer reasons why certain recommendations may not be taken.

**Action:** The review history of this proposal will be researched to ascertain the degree of divisional consideration, and with that information, this item will be re-considered for action at the April 19 Council meeting.

#### **XVI. New Business**

1. A member questioned whether there has been a breakdown in the consultative process, in view of the fact that the participation of Senate Division Chairs has not been sought in some recent systemwide activities and deliberations, such as the President's Task force on Diversity and the Forum on UC Leadership.

**Action:** Council members agreed to instruct Council Chair Oakley and Council Vice Chair pro tem Brown to raise with President Dynes the need to better regularize the inclusion of Division Chairs in formal systemwide discussions and policy-related activities.

2. A member suggested that the Council charge UCFW and UCAP (or alternatively a task force) to develop a report on the UC faculty salary structure. It was pointed out that this issue is a planned future item

**Action:** Council will consider the issue of the UC faculty salary structure at an upcoming meeting, and discuss the formation of a group to institute a study that will likely be carried out and/or completed next academic year.

Attest: John Oakley,  
Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by  
Brenda Foust,  
Policy Analyst

#### **Distributions:**

1. "Key Findings and Recommendations of University of California President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity"
2. UC Headcount and Percent of Ladder Rank Faculty at Professor, Step VI and Above Scale, by Campus.
3. 4/5/06 ltr. Glantz/Oakley re: UCFW's additional recommendations on Senior Management Pay.