

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, May 23, 2012****I. Senate Officers' Announcements****▪ Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair**

- 1. Update on the Memorial to the Regents.** The president did not present the Memorial to the Regents at their May meeting. We anticipate that he will present it at the July meeting.
- 2. Provost and UCB Chancellor Search Committees.** An announcement of the new provost is imminent. The UCB Chancellor Search Committee has had initial meetings and hopes to finish the recruitment by the end of the calendar year.
- 3. Regents' Meeting.** A presentation on the state budget at the May Regents' meeting indicated that the effect of the May revise on the University is less than feared (the \$90M augmentation that the University intends to use to fund employer pension contributions was cut to \$53M), but if the governor's ballot measure does not pass, the University will receive a \$250M cut (\$50M more than in the original budget). However, the governor proposed significant cuts to Cal Grants, including calculating the amount of the grant in the same way as the federal government does for Pell Grants, resulting in far less money for students whose parental income is between \$50 and \$80K. If these cuts are sustained, the University would have to abandon the Blue and Gold program or backfill the loss by diverting funds from other sources. Some Regents suggested revisiting the recommendations of the Commission on the Future, in particular, the idea that not all UC campuses should strive to have comprehensive curricula.

**II. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION:** The agenda was unanimously approved with the following revision: replacement of item IV, UCAP Statement on APM 210-1.d, with a different topic in executive session.

**III. Consent Calendar**

- 1. Approve draft April Council minutes.**
- 2. Approve June Assembly topics**
- 3. Endorse BOARS' disclaimer language for marketing materials of campus-affiliated programs offering courses to non-matriculated students**
- 4. Endorse UCP&T's proposed revision to clarify Bylaw 337 and submit to Assembly for action**
- 5. Endorse UCEP's letter on cuts to the SMI/CalTeach program**

**ACTION: Item 2 (Approve June Assembly topics) was removed from the consent calendar and discussed under New Business. The remainder of the consent calendar was unanimously approved.**

#### **IV. Executive Session**

#### **V. UCAP Request to Form Work Groups on Open Source Publication Venues in Merit Reviews**

**ISSUE:** UCAP submitted a request that the Senate form two working groups to make recommendations on considering open source publication venues in faculty merit reviews.

**DISCUSSION:** UCAP Chair Katja Lindenberg stated that publication venues are rapidly changing, but the merit review process has not accommodated to this new reality. UCAP suggests establishing two working groups—one in the sciences and one in the humanities—to examine the issue. Members suggested, instead, organizing the working groups along types of scholarly products. For example, in some fields faculty publish articles and books, which are very different endeavors; in others, multiple authors collaborate on research products, but junior faculty do not get credit. A member suggested broadening the charge to include preparation of online courses, which take a lot of time and often are a hybrid of teaching and research. Members emphasized that is important to have broad disciplinary representation on the working group in order to capture the gamut of scholarly activity. It was suggested that members of UCAP, UCOLASC, and UCORP should be represented and UCOC should appoint the remainder of the working group, and that one large working group with multiple subgroups may be more desirable than parallel groups. A member commented that the working group should consult with department chairs.

**ACTION: Council approved the formation of a working group to discuss the changing context of scholarly activity and its evaluation in merit reviews. Council authorized Chair Anderson to summarize its discussion in a request to UCOC to constitute the working group.**

#### **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers**

President Yudof stated that the state budget process is stalled; however the legislature intends to comply with the June 15 constitutional deadline for submitting a budget to the governor. The Chair of the Board of Regents and student groups are advocating for a tuition buy-out by the legislature, which would cost \$125M. Unless the Legislature approves a buy-out in advance of the July Regents meeting, the University will propose raising tuition by 6% in order to ensure enough funds to operate next year. The University also is proposing restructuring the debt on capital projects, which would free up \$100M annually over the next several years. The governor supports this idea, but the legislature is less sanguine about it. If the governor's ballot measure does not pass and the University's budget is cut by \$250M in January, there will be huge tuition increases and draconian cuts. EVP Brostrom noted that the University is comparatively successful in achieving access and affordability, but the greatest threat is to quality.

**Q:** If there is no tuition buyout, what are the prospects for the Regents supporting a tuition increase?

**A:** President Yudof responded that he has organized visits between individual Chancellors and Regents to discuss this, and to explain the impact of the cuts on their campuses.

**Q:** What are the prospects for the UCR medical school?

**A:** President Yudof stated that he is committing \$2M toward it in the budget so that it can continue its planning and development, but that is not sufficient to begin operations. He commented that he cannot support particular earmarks at the expense of funds that would support the entire University.

**Q:** Can you comment on the proposed constitutional amendment that would limit non-resident enrollment? We need to be able to explain how non-residents at campus A benefit residents at campus B and we need to be clear about the average cost of educating a student and that a UC quality education requires more than state funds.

**A:** President Yudof stated that the University will oppose the bill vigorously, but if it gets on the ballot, he believes it will be very difficult to defeat it. EVP Brostrom added that the cost of education diverges significantly across disciplines.

**Comment:** If the University explained rebenching and publicized the enrollment management aspects of the plan, it would help to answer critics and defeat the bill. EVP Brostrom agreed that it would be beneficial if the rebenching plan is implemented and the University can tell legislators that every undergraduate gets the same amount of funding, regardless of the campus they attend.

## **VII. Consultation with Regent Fred Ruiz**

**DISCUSSION:** Regent Ruiz thanked Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Powell and the Academic Council for their leadership at UC. He is especially pleased about the launch of UC Merced, which will provide a new economic engine to complement agriculture in the Central Valley and will serve a more diverse population of students. He thanked Council for authoring the very powerful UC Diversity statement. It describes why UC is important to the state and resonates with the population of California. He stated that the University has made progress in serving minority students, but now needs to remove barriers to recruitment, retention and advancement of diverse faculty. According to the October 2011 faculty diversity accountability report, only 5.6% of the faculty are Chicano. Regent Ruiz commented that he attended a roundtable on faculty gender diversity at UC last month, and was impressed with the plan laid out for achieving better results; the University should do the same for ethnic diversity. It is important to UC, the state and to a large segment of the population. He noted that the president has made diversity part of the performance evaluation process for the Chancellors. Projected faculty retirements will provide an opportunity to improve. He commented that he was disappointed that at the recent legislative advocacy meetings, members of the Hispanic Caucus indicated that they do not feel a connection with UC; we need to bridge this relationship gap and demonstrate the progress UC has made in recruiting and supporting Latino students, as well as make clear its commitment to do even better.

Vice Chair Powell described the faculty hiring process and the steps to ensure a diverse pool. He noted that the Senate plays a formal role only after a final candidate is selected. The campus Senate's Committee on Academic Personnel reviews the documentation and evaluates the proposed rank and step at which to hire. The important decisions are made at the level of deans and department chairs. Deans should take the lead in communicating the importance of hiring a diverse faculty. While Senate faculty members may serve on search committees, the Senate as an institution has no influence over who is in the pool and which candidates are selected for serious consideration. However, the Senate can encourage the administration to adopt policies to increase attention to diversity.

Regent Ruiz emphasized that the University must find solutions to the lack of faculty diversity. He noted that funding may be a critical requirement. He stated that if the University were to launch an initiative in this area and make a sustained effort, he is sure we would find the money to support it. He commented that California's Indian tribes may support such an effort.

Vice Provost Carlson said that the University's NSF-funded ADVANCE program began as a way to recruit women into STEM fields, but has expanded to include under-represented minorities. UC received four grants, out of only 13 awarded nationally. UCOP's grant is called "Meeting the California Challenge." One of its goals is to evaluate the recruitment and hiring methods that we use and to identify best practices for achieving diversity. She noted that UC has made slow progress in diversifying faculty. The project is collecting data on the search process across the campuses, which will be deposited into a single database. It aims to identify where the pools were rich, and which departments are succeeding. In addition, within two years, all campuses will use a web-based hiring system so that we can consistently collect data. This will enable us to do research on the recruiting process.

A member stated that the President's Post-doctoral Fellowship Program has been the most successful single effort to increase faculty diversity. In the past twelve years, there were 259 fellows: 66% are female, 38% are Hispanic, 23% are African-American, and 6% are American Indian. 106 of them, with a similar demographic mix, have been hired into tenure-track positions at UC. Unfortunately, the budget for this program was recently reduced. Since 2008, it has been cut by 50%. President Yudof responded that he will examine the funding of the President's Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program, noting that he is receptive to the idea of raising money for it.

Members suggested establishing mentorship programs, which is an effective part of the President's Post-doctoral Fellowship Program, and educating newly appointed department chairs on the importance of increasing diversity.

It was noted that UC's undergraduate body is diverse and faculty should encourage undergraduates to go to graduate school. Regent Ruiz added that outreach to the high schools is critical. Some members countered that students from poor families who go to college often choose more remunerative careers than graduate school.

A member noted that at their recent meeting, some Regents suggested that campuses should specialize. That would have adverse affects on Merced, which needs to grow, and Riverside, because it is working hard to become part of the American Association of Universities, a mark of achievement in research that requires comprehensive excellence. Those two campuses serve the largest proportion of Latinos in the UC system; Santa Cruz is about to be designated a Hispanic-serving institution as well. Regent Ruiz responded that it is important for all campuses to be the best they can be.

Regent Ruiz thanked Council for the informative discussion and said he looks forward to increasing diversity efforts.

## **VIII. BOARS' Transfer Proposal**

**ISSUE:** The Senate office received responses to BOARS' transfer proposal from six divisions. Council discussed next steps.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS' chair Bill Jacob noted that the transfer landscape is changing dramatically. He also stated that SB 1440 has been implemented by CSU and the CCCs. This bill required the CCCs to create Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees for transfer, specifying major-based transfer paths. It also requires CSU to admit and guarantee a 60-unit bachelor's degree completion plan at some campus. Last year BOARS reviewed policies on transfer and how campuses evaluate transfer applications with extensive consultation with campus admissions officers. BOARS then developed a draft proposal, which it submitted to a targeted review and then revised according to the feedback it received; it then asked Council to submit the revised proposal to a full review. BOARS made further revisions in response to comments and now requests that Council forward to Assembly a revision to SR 476 which adds two new pathways for transfer in addition to the existing pathway. The two new paths are recognition of SB 1440 AA/AS degrees, and a UC transfer curriculum. Applicants would be guaranteed a review, though not admission, if they complete any of the three pathways. Chair Jacob stated that some have expressed concern that the emphasis on major preparation will disadvantage under-represented minorities. He noted that SB 1440 will push some students to pursue major-based transfer preparation. Moreover, the Campaign for College Opportunity supported SB 1440. He also commented that the original path to admission will be retained, which will ensure that campuses meet their targets.

He noted that UCSB opposed the proposal because faculty in the sciences think major preparation is critical for success, while those in the humanities think a strong general education curriculum is necessary. BOARS worked with its UCSB member to reformulate the regulation. UCSD also expressed concern that diverting energy from general preparation to major preparation will make students' already inadequate preparation worse. A member asked how students can prepare for admission to multiple campuses if each campus can specify its requirements. Chair Jacob responded that faculty in selected disciplines will develop uniform UC Transfer Curricula in those fields. But individual departments can post particular emphases they want students to complete on the UC transfer pathway website, and they can communicate how much GE breadth is required. He noted that departments also can simply require IGETC, and that there is a strong emphasis on general education in the new pathway that recognizes SB 1440 degrees.

Chair Jacob stated that the proposal allows a high degree of autonomy; it will be implemented by each campus department working with admissions to communicate their expectations. Chair Anderson suggested including in the Assembly agenda a statement that clarifies the intent of the revision as part of the legislative history. In particular, members wanted to ensure that every department and every campus will have the opportunity to work with their admissions staff and committee to make sure students are judged by the criteria they deem are appropriate.

**ACTION:** Council voted to forward the revision of SR 476 to the Assembly for ratification (18 in favor, 1 abstention).

## **IX. Dissolution of the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC)**

**ISSUE:** UCOC recommended that the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) be disbanded, provided that Council establish a work group to assign the parts of UCCC's

charge to other standing committees. At its April 2012 meeting, Council voted to recommend to the Assembly that the University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) be disbanded. Since the Bylaw changes affect many standing committees of the Assembly, the Chair recommended that Council constitute itself as a committee of the whole to recommend such changes. Recommended changes were considered by Council functioning as a committee of the whole.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Anderson noted that UCR&J's chair reviewed the proposed amendments and opined that they are consistent with the Manual of the Academic Senate. Council can forward the proposed revisions to the Assembly or send them for systemwide review.

**ACTION: Council voted unanimously to forward the proposed revisions to the Bylaws to the Assembly for consideration at its June 2012 meeting.**

#### **X. Proposed Revisions to SR 610**

**ISSUE:** In 2010-11, at the request of UCEP, UCR&J ruled on a close vote that "in residence" in SR 610 refers to courses approved by the relevant UC Senate bodies, rather than physical presence on campus. UCEP concurred with this interpretation, and submitted a proposed revision for systemwide review in the Fall of 2011 to clarify the intent of the regulation. In January 2012, Council discussed the responses to the review, a number of which raised objections, and suggested that UCEP redraft the revisions. UCEP submitted a new revision, taking into account the decisions from R&J, as well as the desire of several campuses to maintain physical presence as a requirement.

**DISCUSSION:** UCEP Chair Wudka submitted a proposed revision to SR 610 for systemwide review in the fall. The campuses responded that physical presence should be a requirement to qualify for residency. UCEP has responded with a new revision that attempts to give campuses flexibility to clarify physical presence rules and to accommodate online courses. A member suggested changing the term "residency" in the regulation, as it causes confusion. It refers to matriculation or registration, rather than state residency. A member suggested that since the proposed amendments will not be sent for systemwide review until the fall, UCEP should consider this suggestion and propose alternate terminology to Council in June.

**ACTION: Council referred the proposed amendment back to UCEP to consider changing the term "residency." (9 in favor, 7 opposed).**

#### **XI. Response to National Association of Scholars**

**ISSUE:** UCEP and UCAF submitted responses to the report, "A Crisis of Competence," by the National Association of Scholars for discussion.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Anderson said that UCAP is drafting a letter in addition to the ones received by UCAF and UCEP. Both letters take issue with the study's lack of evidence. He suggested developing a single letter from Council to the Regents. A member suggested that the letter emphasize that we have an appropriate set of policies to safeguard the academic freedom of all members of the community. Faculty searches are scrutinized at multiple levels. In addition, Committees on Academic Personnel take student evaluations very seriously and processes exist for filing complaints. A member pointed out that students may be intimidated by the process required to file a grievance. A member countered that the processes deal with systemic issues. The

University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey, as well as surveys on campus climate, are performed regularly. In the recent UCUES survey, 83% of respondents said that they feel respected regardless of their political beliefs. A member noted that UCAF's letter expressed some sympathy for the position, but not the methodology.

**ACTION: Council asked that a single letter be drafted for its consideration in June.**

## **XII. Governor's Ballot Measure**

**ISSUE:** Council discussed whether to endorse the governor's ballot measure.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Anderson summarized the provisions of the governor's ballot measure. He noted that while the measure does not include a specific provision for higher education in the Governor's ballot measure, the additional revenues generated will free up general funds that would otherwise be dedicated to public safety and Proposition 98 commitments to K-14. The Governor's budget and May revision propose that UC and CSU would each be cut by \$250 million if the ballot measure fails. A \$250M cut would translate into a \$2K tuition increase per student. He noted that the Senate overwhelmingly approved a Memorial to the Regents to support ballot measures that increase revenues and/or prioritize higher education. The Regents have not yet endorsed the governor's ballot measure. It is important that we convey Senate support for this measure, in accordance with the Memorial. Several members spoke in support of this.

**ACTION: Council unanimously approved asking the president to convey to the Regents that the Senate urges them to endorse the governor's ballot measure.**

## **XIII. Executive Session**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed UCEP's guidelines for systemwide courses, contingent on some revisions for clarity.**

## **XIV. Rebenching**

**ISSUE:** Council was provided with an update on the progress of the rebenching task force.

**DISCUSSION:** UCPB Chair Jim Chalfant said the report is still in draft form, but the plan is to allocate augmentations or cuts based on the rebenching recommendation beginning in 2012-13. This does not include off-the-top allocations, which the task force did not address. Off-the-top funds reduce the amount of money that goes to the campuses. The remaining unresolved issues are: 1) enrollment management, whether there will be a penalty for displacing undergraduates and how much it should be, and 2) how to weight doctoral students. Several members expressed frustration with the protracted process. It is now the end of the academic year and the report has not been distributed or reviewed, and yet UCOP plans to implement it beginning 2012. A member of the task force suggested that the Senate members who serve on it should prepare a status report on the process so that their expertise and historical memory are not lost as they transition out of their Senate roles. It should document the details and unresolved issues. Several members spoke in support of drafting such a document. Chair Anderson commented that the concept underlying rebenching was laid out by the Senate last year. While the details may vary, the aim of the Senate has been captured.

## **XV. New Business**

Assembly agenda topics. The following topics were added to the list of topics on the June Academic Assembly agenda: (1) Discussion item on graduate student support; (2) Discussion item on the Robinson/Edley report on policies for responding to protests; (3) Discussion item on University budget, with a presentation by Vice President Patrick Lenz.

**ACTION: Council unanimously approved the Assembly agenda topics, including the additions listed above.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst