

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, May 24, 2006****I. Chair's and Vice Chair's Announcements**

Chair Oakley welcomed alternates William Drummond, UCB Division Vice Chair, and Henry Powell, UCSD Division Vice Chair. After asking that agenda items for the June 21 meeting be submitted by June 8, he gave the following announcements:

Cal ISIs Review. Acting Provost Hume has requested input on the upcoming review of Cal IT2 from the Irvine and San Diego Senate Chairs, in addition to which UCORP has brought to Council's attention the recommendations that have just become available from the mid-launch review of the Institutes. If there are additional comments on the Cal ISI review protocol, which was approved as part of the consent calendar in December 2005, members can forward them to the UCPB and UCORP Chairs.

ACSCONL proposal on UC-DOE interactions. A redrafted proposal is being considered in light of input received by Council members and committees. A more detailed ACSCONL update will come later in the meeting.

UC Summit on Faculty Diversity. This all-day meeting was held yesterday, and included several Council members as participants. The material presented and discussed was, in large part, the same presentation that Council received as part of the Council-Chancellors joint meeting in April.

Action: Council members are asked to forward to Chair Oakley, UCORP Chair Sensabaugh or UCPB Chair Glantz by June 1 comments on additional recommendations regarding the Cal ISI review protocol.

Action: Council members will forward to Chair Oakley by June 1 any comments or additional issues that they think should be brought to the attention of Acting Provost Hume relating to the upcoming review of Cal IT2.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Action: Council agreed to include in agenda item VII, as new business, UCFW's Memo to Faculty Concerning Resumption of Contributions to the UCRS.

III. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes of the March 13, 2006, March 22, 2006, April 5, 2006 Minutes, and April 19, 2006 meetings were approved, with minor changes to the April 5 minutes.

Action: The proposed Assembly meeting dates for 2006-07 were approved with the understanding that the first substantive meeting will be held face-to-face.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Rory Hume, Acting Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs

Long-Range Guidance Team. The group's report, which should be complete by late July, will look at planning needs between now and 2025, the major themes of which are the need to think and plan as a system and taking a much more active role with our California public education partners. Campus meeting are now being planned in which the Senate will be a key participant

and which will include productively addressing the role of central administration.

Doctoral and Professional Education Planning. Funding needs are the highlighted issue, and it is hoped more support will be forthcoming this year or next. The two law school proposals are now being evaluated. The question of the authority to grant doctorates is again a topic of concern.

Health Sciences. There are a number of challenges in planning for growth. UC has an obligation to serve the state in this area and to meeting regional needs. Plans for expansion of nursing programs are in place, but there is need for additional growth in public health, veterinary medicine, and pharmacy.

Academic Planning Council. This systemwide group will coordinate much of the planning effort. A draft proposal for an undergraduate education task force will be considered in the next meeting, the focus of which will be to clarify major goals and challenges facing undergraduate education and life.

Q and A

Comment: The decrease in state support for UC should not be taken with passive acceptance, and long-range planning should not be based on the view that support cannot be restored.

A: The focus of the LRGT is to prove the value of UC, and our opposition to cuts is to demonstrate this value.

Q: What has been the reaction to the faculty memorial on non-resident tuition? What indication will there be that the faculty voice carries weight on this issue?

A: The memorial is taken very seriously, but the elimination of NRT needs to be strategized.

Q: When will the resources for nursing program expansion be online?

A: In late fall, probably. There is a big demand for nursing and so strong interest in the Legislature.

Q: What do you mean by a task force on undergraduate education *and life*?

A: The task force will look at the residential and physical and mental health environments along with education.

Comment: The Senate should be involved in the early stages of structural changes at systemwide administration, perhaps through a special group.

Comment: The planning philosophy of cohesion among the campuses is at odds with recent decisions about slotting, which create de facto stratification among the campuses and places centrifugal pressure on the system.

A: This is a large issue and cannot be ignored.

V. University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) Proposals

1. Proposed Principles on Private Funding for Senior Leadership Salaries (revised)

Issue: Input from the Senate review of the proposed principles was positive in general and suggested changes are now reflected in the revised version submitted for Council endorsement and forwarding to the Assembly. It is likely that the Regents will again take up fund raising for SMG salaries, so it is important to have a formal Senate position on the issue.

Discussion: Most members agreed that there is a fundamental difference between a “named” school and a person or position that carries the name of a funder. It was also noted that one-time gifts are actually seen as a source of continued funding.

Action: The Proposed Principles on Private Funding for Salaries of Deans and Above were unanimously approved as revised. The principles will be forwarded to the Assembly for adoption at its June 14 meeting.

2. UCPB Report: Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California.

Issue: Since the report is an analysis and not a policy document, UCPB asks that Council “receive” it and support and encourage its dissemination as well as forward the report to the Assembly as an information item.

Action: Council voted unanimously to formally receive the “Futures” report for forwarding to the Assembly as an information item and to encourage its broad distribution.

Action: The Academic Council commended UCPB for its effective leadership in addressing a number of critical issues this year.

VI. Implementation of the Academic Council’s Proposed Cap on Class Size for University of California Entry Level Writing Classes

Action: This item was deferred to the June 21 Council meeting.

VII. UCFW Issues

1. Recommendations on Early Consultation with Senate Committees re: UC Compensation Issues

Issue: UCFW’s letter calls on the administration and the Regents to consult with the Senate at an early stage when seeking expert advice.

Discussion: Expanding and strengthening the recommendations was suggested by one member along with using the Mercer report as a specific example of how the Senate can lend expert advice on critical issues. Others felt this letter should remain a broad-level approach, but saw the possibility of more specific follow-up communication.

Action: A motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the UCFW recommendations. The letter will be forwarded to President Dynes.

2. Memo to UC Faculty on the Resumption of Contributions to UCRP

Issue: In response to a request coming out of the May 10 Assembly meeting, UCFW has drafted an informational memo on the resumption of UCRP contributions, which is intended for distribution to all UC faculty.

Discussion: It was generally agreed that the letter should go out as soon as possible, as drafted. As a supplement, the Senate Source could print a Q and A on the issue, based on actual faculty questions submitted to the Council Chair.

Action: Council approved the UCFW memo to faculty on UCRS contributions, pending minor revisions. The memo will be sent out to all Senate faculty, posted on the Senate Web site, and included in the June Assembly Blue Book as an information item.

Action: As part of the transmittal of the memo, questions on UCRS contributions will be solicited from faculty, some of which will be selected for a Q and A article in the Senate newsletter.

VIII. Off-Scale Salaries: Criteria and Procedures

Issue: During 2005-06 and as a result of the discussion from the April 5, 2006 joint meeting

with the Chancellors, Academic Council members requested that the issue of off-scale salaries be addressed. Possible options could include the establishment of a task force to propose recommendations to the Academic Council for consideration.

Discussion: UCAP Chair Norman reported that UCAP is working on this issue, intending to have a document ready for the June Council meeting. A stated principle will be that returning to a common salary schedule is of significant benefit to UC. UCAP may also consult with UCFW on the draft. Other members reminded Council that there is still on the table the question of establishing a task force to study the situation in depth next year, including the issues of the role of faculty evaluation, consideration of differences among disciplines, and inequities among faculty due to meeting market demands in recruiting.

Action: UCAP will bring a proposal to Council for consideration at the June 21 meeting.

IX. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers: Part 2

Robert C. Dynes, President

Regents May meeting and senior management compensation.

A five-point plan is in place and being followed to address the recommendations of the Task Force on Compensation. The 1993 policy on compensation, which has been breached over the course of the following years, was not, it turns out, familiar to the top offices at OP. It contains language from a legislative bill at the time and was put in place in response to public pressure. However, no checks and balances accompanied the policy, making it easy to be unintentionally overstepped. The current implementation committee will be looking at an action plan for putting the task force recommendations in place.

FTE Growth in administration. The Senate is asking for an explanation of what appears to be top heavy growth in administrative FTE. One reason for the growth is increased medical services in the past 10 to 15 years. Also, federal contracts and grants have increased by a factor of two or more. A strategy on some campuses is to delay recruitment of faculty while building up resources, and this shows up as slow growth in faculty FTE. At my request, a group of Senate representatives, including Council Chair Oakley, Council Vice Chair Brown, UCPB Chair Glantz and UCPB member Henning Bohn will be looking at this situation more closely.

Faculty Diversity Summit. The meeting was productive in airing realistic means of making a difference, and now the job is to support effective campus action. Comments from those who attended the meeting are welcome.

Lawrence Hershman, Vice President - Budget

Bond issue. The Governor and the Legislature have agreed on an infrastructure package. The education package of a total of \$10B includes \$345M for UC for two years, plus another \$200M in that period for medical school expansion.

The May revise. More revenue has come in from capital gains and stock options than what was projected. This is one-time money, and it is important not to repeat the past practice of applying one-time funds to permanent projects. Despite the increased revenue, there is still a \$3.5B deficit. If these numbers hold, the terms of the Compact will be met.

Other:

- There is no indication that the Legislature is acting in a punitive manner to UC.
- A performance audit of UC is being requested.
- \$11M is included in the budget for research, but the funds are for targeted programs.

Q and A and Comments

Q: What are the plans to respond to the faculty memorial on non-resident tuition?

A [Dynes]: I haven't received the memorial yet. This issue is in alignment with the Regents priorities, but is still a resource problem.

A [Hershman]: It also must be kept in mind that funding non-resident students is against state policy.

Q: What is the status of the UCLA chancellor search?

A: The search committee will reconvene on June 5 to restart the process.

Comment: In filling positions as part of the re-organization of OP, it is important to hire people with a commitment to UC being a public university. As for graduate student fees, about 20 to 40 million dollars will be needed, which seems possible to find.

Comment: There should be a joint Senate/administrative group established to correct and revise the Mercer report, which is an interim plan and should be revised to create job categories across campuses that include in them a broad range of salaries.

Q: How will the Chief Compliance Officer fit in with shared governance practices?

A: The compliance officer would not affect policy, but assure compliance.

Comment: The OP organization chart, which does not at present indicate the place/role of the Academic Senate, should be changed to do so. Alternatively a "UC Governance" chart could be developed.

A: That suggestion warrants discussion.

Q: Who is responsible for the making investments with UC endowment pool and the pension fund?

A: The Regents investment advisory committee makes basic decisions and has followed a development strategy of high yield, low danger.

Comment: The President made compelling remarks at the Diversity Summit. It would be good if the rank and file faculty could hear those statements.

A: Unfortunately, the proceedings of the meeting were not recorded, but the meeting was a beginning that will, it is hoped, lead to solutions. UC has the opportunity of becoming a national and even world leader in the area of diversity.

[Items X, XI and XII were treated together and discussed in executive session.]

X. General Discussion

XI. Academic Council Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSONL) Proposals for UC Faculty and DOE Laboratory Interactions

Issue: UCPB and members of Council have expressed reservations regarding the proposal, suggesting that it is premature to be initiating policy on interactions before questions are sufficiently answered about the fundamental relationship between UC and LANS. In addition, UCORP has suggested additional recommendations for the maintenance and support of research programs associated with the labs. In view of this input, ASCSONL will be reconsidering its proposal.

Action: Davis Division Chair Simmons will draft a revised proposal for consideration by Council at its June 21 meeting.

XII. Campus Stratification and Further Discussion of the May Regents' Meeting

Issue: UCFW, UCPB and Council members have articulated concerns that the Regents' salary slotting structure will have the effect of stratifying campuses based on differential salaries for top level campus managers. A unified statement from Council on this issues is planned.

Action: A subgroup of Council Vice Chair Brown, Irvine Division Chair Janda, UCPB Chair Glantz and UCFW Chair Russell will craft a letter for forwarding to President Dynes to present to the Regents on campus stratification and the SMG slotting structure.

XIII. Approval of the June 14, 2006 (teleconference) Academic Assembly Agenda

Action: The agenda for the June 14, 2006 Assembly meeting was approved with the addition of reports from UCEP, UCAP and SMIG, as follows

1. **Reports from Standing Committees (UCOC, UCFW, UCPB, BOARS, UCEP, UCAP, SMIG)**
2. **ACSCONL Proposal**
3. **UCPB's Proposal on Proposed Principles on Private Fundraising for Salaries**
4. **UCPB's Report: Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California**

XIV. Election Process for the Academic Senate/Academic Council Vice Chair

Issue: During the 2006-07 Assembly Vice Chair election process, Academic Council members requested that the Council review and determine an election process which will be in place early in the year for the 2007-08 election. A protocol for scheduling and process as well as criteria and nomination is needed.

Discussion: A member suggested scheduling the Assembly's election towards the end of the academic year, for a Vice Chair who would take office September 1 of the following calendar year. This plan would in effect create a "vice chair elect" position.

Action: Santa Cruz Division Chair Crosby will draft an election process proposal for consideration at the June 21 Council meeting.

XV. The Academic Council Science and Math Initiative Group (SMIG): Update and Proposal

Issue: SMIG has submitted a proposal for the Academic Council's consideration for on-going administration, oversight and implementation of the SMI. If approved, SMIG requests that it be forwarded to the President with a request for implementation. SMIG Chair Alice Agogino noted the foci of the proposal, including: the need for leadership from the campus level that will effectively coordinate the consortium; the question of Senate representation in the consortium; the need for OP to maintain responsibilities at the systemwide level.

Discussion: Members pointed out that the uneven development of programs across campuses will present a challenge. Noted as important elements of success for the SMI were: 1) better relations with the community college system; and 2) the development of systemwide minors. Specific language changes to the proposal were suggested as well as adding pertinent mention of diversity.

Action: The SMIG proposal will be revised based on today's discussion and distributed to Council members for email vetting and final approval.

XVI. UC Committee on Latino Research (UCCLR): MRU Review

Issue: In accordance with the Compendium (Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units) UCORP, UCPB and CCGA have commented on the 15-Year Review of the UC Committee on Latino Research. University Administrative Policies and Procedures concerning Organized Research Units designates UCORP as the lead Senate committee on MRU reviews. Since there are some points of divergence among the three committees' recommendations, Council shall consider the responses and make a final recommendation to the Vice Provost of Research.

Discussion: UCORP Chair Sensabaugh explained that a basis for UCORP's position was that UCCLR is not functioning as an MRU, i.e., providing value added for UC as a whole. UCORP has suggested two alternatives: re-review the UCCLR in 3 years with the understanding that a change in vision and function is necessary; or disestablish it and re-compete the funds to support other Latino research.

A member argued that UCCLR was not established as an MRU, so it should not be reviewed by those criteria. Another member raised the question of whether the term "Latino" was congruent with gender neutral language practice. While some members were in agreement with UCORP's suggestion, it was agreed that more information was needed from the Director in order to make a decision.

Action: A letter will be drafted to Vice Provost Coleman asking for a response from the UCCLR director to questions regarding a systemwide vision of the MRU and campus integration

XVII. Formal Review of APMs 700, 710, 711 and 080: Proposed Revisions to Systemwide Academic Personnel Policies (APM) Related to Paid Sick Leave, Reasonable Accommodation, Medical Separation and Constructive Resignation

Action: Council will act on this item at the June 21 meeting, after all committee and division comments are received.

XVIII. Academic Council Subcommittee on the Systemwide Senate Leadership & Office Structure: Update from Michael Brown, Subcommittee Chair

Report: The subgroup met in teleconference on the 22nd of May in which the relevant Senate bylaws along with Senate procedural documents were reviewed. They plan to bring recommendations before the Council by July. If bylaw changes are in order, that can be done at the first Assembly meeting of next year.

Action: A further update will be provided next month.

XIX. Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC): Update on GSAC recommendations from Stan Glantz, UCPB Chair

Report: GSAC is finalizing its report, which will recommend a phase-out of non-resident tuition over two years. The language of the recommendations, however, commits to this plan equivocally, saying it will be done "if possible". Chair Glantz will strive to retain an unequivocal commitment to the phase – in plan in the final language of the report.

No Action

XX. Systemwide Standards for Institutional Review Boards: Update on UCORP's report and discussion of draft recommendations from George Sensabaugh, UCORP Chair.

Report: UCORP is submitting its draft recommendations on IRB operations to the Council for

preliminary comment. The Office of Research is reviewing them also. Input on campus policies and practice is still being received, which will go into the body of the report. The final report is expected to be ready for submission for the June Council meeting.

Action: Members are asked to send Chair Sensabaugh comments on the IRB recommendations.

XXI. New Business

None

Attest: John Oakley, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Foust, Policy Analyst

Distributions:

1. 5/22/06 ltr. Oakley/Dynes re: Growth Rates in UC Employment Categories.
2. 5/16/06 ltr. Hume/Oakley et al re: review of Cal IT2.
3. 5/23/06 ltr. Agogino/Oakley re: SMIG Recommendations for On-going Science and Mathematics Initiative Administration, Oversight and Implementation.
4. 5/22/06 ltr. Russell/Oakley re: UCFW comments on the Report of the Task Force on Compensation, Accountability and Transparency.
5. Revised Proposed Principles on Private Funding for Senior Leadership Salaries at the Level of Dean and Above.