

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, June 22, 2011****I. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers**

- **Lawrence Pitts, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**
- **Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources**

Vice President Lenz. Vice President Lenz reported that the state Senate passed a budget with an additional \$150 M cut to UC. In addition, that budget entails a cash deferral from June to August of 2012 of \$540 M, which shifts the revenue from one fiscal year to another. The University strongly objects to this tactic. The state has done this to the K-12 budget, but the K-12 system has a funding protection guarantee via Proposition 98 that prioritizes the system for repayment. Sometimes, two or three years fiscal years passed before they were reimbursed. This is unacceptable. The University sent a letter to the governor detailing its concerns about this issue. However, the Controller has said the Senate's budget is not balanced, and is short by \$1.85 B. In the meantime, the governor is developing a "Plan B" based on the legislature's plan. Approximately \$600 M of this plan is based on an increase in the vehicle license fee and a tax on Amazon, both of which are likely to face legal challenges. So the University could face even further cuts.

VP Lenz also reported that the Regents will consider the budget and a possible tuition increase at their July meeting. A \$150 M reduction translates into a 9.6% fee increase (net of financial aid), on top of the 8% that already was approved by the Regents. If the fee increase is less than 10%, then it may be acceptable to institute it in the fall. If the additional budget cut is greater, the Regents may wish to delay a tuition increase to mid-year so that students and their parents can plan for it. An all-cuts budget and additional \$500 M cut to UC would necessitate a 32% fee increase, which would generate a \$238 M in revenue, but leave a gap of \$262 M. Therefore, the University is considering bridging strategies to manage the cuts in the first half of the year on a one-time basis. CSU is planning a fee increase of whatever magnitude necessary immediately in the fall because they have no ability to implement the type of bridging strategies that UC is considering. The Regents may not support a dollar for dollar fee increase, whatever the amount of the cut is. It would provide some political leverage if UC joins CSU in making the case that if the state does not provide adequate funding then the students (their constituents) must. There is some concern that the state may suspend or limit Cal Grant funding to meet higher tuition costs.

**Q:** Could you describe the bridging mechanisms?

**A:** VP Lenz stated that the bridging mechanisms are financial strategies such as restructuring the University's debt and instituting a 3% payout on funds functioning as endowments and a 1% payout on true endowments. While we do not want to resort to these tactics, any fee increase net of financial aid will not cover the budget gap, which includes \$362 M in mandatory costs.

Provost Pitts. Provost Pitts reported that the budget office has been preparing short papers on all possible budgetary solutions for the Regents to assure them that the University has done due diligence and has evaluated all options.

Provost Pitts stated that he has invited Senate participation in the online pilot project over the summer. They will be conducting a market research study over the summer. The vendor has been selected, but the nature of the data to be collected is yet to be determined and needs faculty input. He stated that they hope to have the survey completed by September 1. Issues regarding course articulation, eligibility requirements for non-UC students, and the distribution of costs and revenues need to be resolved. Any proposals developed over summer will be distributed in the fall for systemwide review. Campus chief information technology officers are working with registrars to resolve transcript issues. Finally, a vendor will be selected to develop a common platform for online courses. Until a common platform is developed, the vendor selected will be expected to provide ways to integrate the existing platforms.

**Comment:** If you do not model the consequences of differential fees, this strategy will sound like a good idea. However, the reality is that demand elasticity does not exist on all campuses.

**A:** Provost Pitts responded that while this statement is true, we know that we can get revenue from raising fees. One idea is to provide allowable tuition bands and allow campuses to choose what they will charge within that range. Eventually, a campus may determine that there is not enough demand for higher tuition. There are concerns about assigning an upper limit on one campus that is different from another campus.

**Comment:** Under the funding streams policy, if campuses are allowed to charge higher tuition, they would get to keep that revenue. This could have unintended consequences and could be the beginning of the end of the system.

**A:** There is a reluctance to socialize revenues, but this is a justified fear. We need to think about the potential reputational damage to any given campus and if we proceeded with differential fees, we would try to mitigate it.

## **II. Announcements**

### **▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair**

#### **1. Upcoming Regents meeting items**

Chair Simmons stated that there will be reports on undergraduate admissions outcomes, accountability, and administrative efficiencies (“Working Smarter”) at the Regents’ meeting. The president will ask the Regents to clarify the use of the revenues from the University’s management of the national laboratories, consistent with Council’s recommendation that the fees be used for research. The president also will seek approval of UCOP’s budget. The Regents also will consider a recommendation that they approve a memorandum of understanding with the state to construct eight buildings that have been approved by the legislature, but can not be funded due to the state’s poor bond rating and inability to raise revenue. This would cost the University \$450 M over a four year period with a promise that the state will issue bonds to reimburse the cost once the buildings are finished.

#### **2. Online Education Project**

Academic Affairs is establishing groups to consider vendor proposals for a common platform for online courses, and invited Senate to participate in the groups to resolve the issues. One group will examine the development of a market research survey. The Senate will name a representative to this group from UCPB who is familiar with marketing. An RFP for a common platform has been issued and interviews will be held in July. UCEP will name a representative to this group, and the meetings are open to all Council members who wish to participate. The platform will be used system wide, and not just for online courses, so we need broader faculty participation. He noted that BOARS and UCEP should begin to think about eligibility requirements for non-UC students who register for UC online courses.

### **3. Interim Council iLinc Meetings in 2011-12**

Vice Chair Anderson stated that he wished to schedule iLinc meetings on the Wednesday following most Council meetings to provide time to discuss unfinished items. He would convene them only as necessary. Council members concurred with this idea.

### **4. Report of Joint Senate-Administrative Salary Task Force**

Chair Simmons reported that there is significant disagreement between faculty and administration on this issue. The EVCs assert that under the funding streams policy, they should be allowed to allocate funds as they see fit. Council's November letter on the subject advocated either providing 3% across the board increases to both the scales and the off-scale increment or to augment the scales, only. The president will make final decision. Chair Simmons stated that according to the APM, it is inappropriate to draw distinctions between professors based on recent merit reviews.

### **5. Rebenching Task Force meeting**

Vice Chair Anderson stated that the Rebenching Task Force has met twice and will not meet again until September. A request has gone to the campuses to identify money they would like to take off the top before the rebenching is done. Senate members on the task force are urging the members to think about systemwide priorities.

## **III. Approval of the Agenda**

A member made a motion to discuss item VII prior to item VI.

**ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed (18 in favor, 1 opposed).**

## **IV. Consent Calendar**

- 1. Approve May draft Council minutes**
- 2. Endorse UCFW letter on Working Smarter; forward to President Yudof and CFO Taylor**

**ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.**

## **V. Reports from Standing Committees**

**BOARS.** BOARS issued a clarification of Principle #6 of its Principles on Non-Resident Admission, which were endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009 and forwarded to the campuses as guidelines for admitting non-resident students. The revision stipulates that students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed BOARS' proposed revision of Principle #6 and agreed to forward it to the president and provost with a request that they disseminate it to campus admissions offices, EVCs, and the Enrollment Management Council.**

**CCGA.** Based on discussion at the April Council meeting, CCGA revised its letter on conversions of state-supported academic graduate programs to self-supporting status, and has added language on the conversion of SSPs to state-supported status. CCGA has the authority to deny approval of any new program.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed CCGA's guidelines for conversions of state-supported programs to self-supporting status and self-supporting to state-supported status. It approved forwarding the guidelines to divisions and requesting that the provost disseminate them to the Graduate Deans and EVCs.**

**UCAP.** UCAP's chair stated that he wished to table to the July Council meeting UCAP's proposal to replace the "above scale" title with "distinguished professor" in all relevant APM sections.

**UCEP. (A) UCEP draft revision of SR 610 on residency.** In response to a legislative ruling by UCR&J, UCEP drafted a revision of SR 610 that clarifies that its definition of residency is based on enrollment in courses offered and approved by a UC campus regardless of whether the student is physically present on the campus, and that "residence" in SR 610 is not related to the California Residency Requirement for purposes of determining tuition. Rather, it is about the program requirements for campus presence. UCEP's chair noted that Council's discussion today is not about the substance of the proposed revision, but is simply whether to circulate it for systemwide review.

**ACTION: Council unanimously approved the distribution of the proposed revision for systemwide review in the fall.**

**(B) Systemwide Course Approval Process.** UCEP revised its internal policy for the approval and listing of systemwide courses to explicitly include online courses available for the enrollment of UC students across campuses. It provided the revised document for Council's information. UCEP's chair noted that the policy preserves the systemwide Senate's role in approving courses that have been approved on a campus and are offered for enrollment to students from all campuses. He requested that the policy be forwarded to divisional chairs with a request that they circulate it to Committees on Educational Policy and Committees on Courses of Instruction. Second, he asked Chair Simmons to send it to the provost with a request to distribute it to the EVCs.

**(C) Evaluation of Online Education Pilot Project.** UCEP recommended (a) that the evaluation team for the Online Education Pilot Project provide details of the evaluation plan to UCEP by early July and (b) that Council appoint an independent "blue-ribbon panel" of experts to review and report periodically to the Senate on the progress and results of the evaluation. Council raised many questions about the quality and independence of evaluation of an online project.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed UCEP's request that the administration be asked to provide details of the UCOE evaluation plan and its recommendation that Council**

**establish a panel of independent experts to review the progress and results of the evaluation and report to Council.**

**UCAAD.** In the fall of 2007, UCAAD discussed the value of a UC pay equity study in regard to sex and ethnicity to determine if UC practices comply with Title IX and other civil rights legislation. In 2008, Vice Provost Nick Jewell reported that UCOP would do such a study. The project did not proceed after VP Jewell's departure. At UCAAD's request, Academic Council appointed former UCAAD chair Pauline Yahr (UCI) to complete the study. She has now done so, and UCAAD has forwarded it to Council. Vice Chair Anderson said that he has invited Professor Emerita Yahr to attend the September Council meeting to explain the study, which will help inform the systemwide review. He stated that the study has significant explanatory power for white male faculty, and it uses those parameters (e.g., highest degree, decanal unit, years since degree, and years at UC) to predict what female faculty ought to be paid. While this does not provide evidence of deliberate discrimination, it does indicate that there are factors influencing wages, and these factors are correlated with gender. A member stated that the report excludes faculty in the health sciences, who constitute 1/3 of the faculty in the University. It would be possible to do the same analysis on the X and Y salary components, only. He stated that he expects gender differences in the health sciences to be profound and asked whether the report could be supplemented with information about the health sciences. UCAAD's chair replied that he will ask Professor Yahr if she can expand the study in the next few months. A member stated that review of the report should not be delayed, however. Another member stated that UCLA did a series of gender equity studies a few years ago and was unable to procure data from the Health Sciences.

**ACTION: Council unanimously approved forwarding the salary equity study to the provost and to Senate agencies for systemwide review and comment by December.**

**UCORP.** UCORP submitted a letter expressing concern about recent administrative decisions regarding issues related to the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). Specifically, UCORP requested that compliance with of NAGPRA requirements defer as much as is permitted to research and academic freedom and advocates that such decisions be made centrally, rather than being left to local campus discretion. UCORP also called for a scientific finding of fact to determine the status of the remains in question. The issue is that faculty want to study the remains, but a local tribe is making a claim on them. Given their age (approximately 9000 years old), there is debate over whether they are related to existing Native American groups. UCORP's representative noted that the Kennewick Man case was similar and the courts determined that the remains did not fall under NAGPRA and did not have to be returned to any tribe. Recently, the president delegated the authority for the decision to UCSD's Chancellor. UCORP believes it is inappropriate to delegate such decisions to the Chancellor of any one campus since it may affect researchers at several campuses. It is an issue of academic freedom to pursue research. A member stated that the faculty needs to be sensitive to community concerns. UCSD's divisional chair objected to the suggestion in UCORP's letter that the Chancellor's decision would be influenced by construction at the University house. On the contrary, because of soil instability, the Chancellor has never lived there and will not be able to during her tenure. He also stated that the divisional Senate has been involved in consultation regarding this issue. He agreed with UCORP's approach, but asked that Council's letter to the president emphasize the good faith efforts of the campus to deal with the issue.

**ACTION: Council agreed to transmit UCORP's concerns to the President and urge him to reconsider his decision and to initiate a scientific finding of fact.**

**UCPB.** UCPB's chair reported that his committee has offered to work more closely with the CFO's office on the finance model for the online education project. It will also preview documents produced by the budget office for the rebenching meeting in early September. Finally, it will examine the proposed financing for the second campus of LBNL, which may be considered by the Regents at their September meeting. For both of the latter efforts, UCPB will try to ensure that a representative from each campus participates in the conversations.

## **VI. Implementation Task Force Report**

**DISCUSSION:** ITF Chair Jim Chalfant asked Council to approve circulating the document to the Rebenching Task Force. He stated that such consultation is consistent with the principle of shared governance. A member stated that if the report is sent to the Task Force, it must be made clear that it is a work in progress and is for informational purposes, only. Chair Chalfant suggested that a cover letter could emphasize that it has not been endorsed or fully considered by Council yet. A member advocated waiting until the section on Ph.D.s is discussed and revised and Council receives the data it has requested on Ph.D.s from the budget office, since the Rebenching Task Force will not meet until September. Members made suggestions for improving the clarity of the report, such as including an Executive Summary and moving the equations to an appendix. Chair Chalfant noted that an executive summary and a document describing the issues the Implementation Task Force is trying to resolve were both distributed with the May Council agenda and that they can be appended to the report. A member commented that the motion on the table does not imply that Council has reached consensus; rather, it asks whether to forward the document to the Rebenching Task Force. Another member opined that forwarding it to the Rebenching Task Force would give the Senate the opportunity to direct the debate on rebenching.

**ACTION: Council approved forwarding the latest draft of the Implementation Task Force recommendations, without endorsement, to the full Rebenching Task Force (16 in favor, 3 opposed).**

Chair Chalfant suggested discussing the recommendations by group, beginning with the first seven general principles. A member made a motion to remove the reference to the Powell Committee report since Council has not yet endorsed the Powell report and events have bypassed some of its recommendations.

**ACTION: Council approved the removal of the reference in principle #2 to the Powell Committee report (14 in favor, 4 opposed).**

Discussion returned to the main motion to adopt principles 1-7, as amended. A Council member asked how the penalty for under-enrolling state residents would work. For instance, a campus with the capacity to over-enroll could prevent another campus from reaching its enrollment target. Another member commented that if fees rise by 32%, the amount students will pay is going to be substantially higher than the state subsidy, so having no penalty for over-enrolling could make it attractive to increase the number of non-residents. Chair Simmons stated that the document's

approach to managing enrollment is to allocate state funding to the campuses based on student enrollments and some yet-to-be-determined notion of the average cost of instruction. The campus gets two sources of revenue with each student—tuition and state funding. To the extent that they are funded by the state, if a campus takes more students than its state funding, it keeps the tuition. No penalty is assessed for taking unfunded students. To the extent that a campus decides to take fewer than their target number of funded California students, it loses the student’s share of the state subsidy. Members made several suggestions clarifying the language of the principles, which were accepted by Chair Chalfant.

**ACTION: Council unanimously adopted the first seven principles, as amended.**

- 1. Rebenching is urgently needed as the second phase of UC’s budget reforms, and should proceed as soon as possible.**
- 2. The fundamental objective in evaluating budget reform, enrollment plans, and other policies should be to preserve UC’s excellence in research; the Academic Council explicitly puts quality before access and affordability, if necessary.**
- 3. State funding allocated to campuses based on undergraduate and graduate instruction must support the research enterprise, not just podium time|| for instruction.**
- 4. The state subsidy per student should not depend on the campus the student attends; this recommendation follows from our core value that UC is one university with one standard of excellence at its ten campuses. The cost of a UC-quality education is the same on every campus, and the campuses should be funded accordingly.**
- 5. It is essential that the University enroll the number of California residents that the state considers funded.**
- 6. The Academic Council favors reducing the incentive for campuses to over-enroll unfunded, resident undergraduates. For campuses that over-enroll resident undergraduates, there should be no state subsidy provided for students above targeted enrollments.**
- 7. The University should establish a transparent basis for allocating state funding that is also adjustable as campuses evolve; particularly, as campuses differ in the extent to which residents are replaced by non-residents.**

Council then discussed items 8-12 on allocating state funding for undergraduate enrollments. Chair Chalfant asked Council to approve the approach outlined in the document, rather than debate a specific number for the average cost figure. He stated that the budget office has suggested that it may not be possible to determine separate average cost figures for academic graduate students and undergraduates. Instead, the budget office suggested using a blended average cost figure, which encompasses both types of students. A member asked why health sciences graduate students are excluded from the blended average cost. Chair Chalfant responded that it seemed feasible to separate expenditures on health sciences (or most professional programs), but that in principle, they could be blended. A member commented that the principle of using a constant state subsidy per category of student does not require assigning specific “weights” to different categories of students. The appropriate weights can be determined later. This document only asks that students

of a particular type are treated similarly across the campuses. Another member noted that concerns about medical students are addressed in item 14.

**ACTION: Council adopted items 8-12 as follows (18 in favor, 1 opposed).**

**8. The President and the state shall negotiate a UC budget and the undergraduate resident enrollment target (TE1). The President allocates funding to--**

- a. Earmarks, or off the top|| items,**
- b. Undergraduate and graduate education on the general campuses,**
- c. Medical students' education,**
- d. Other professional students' education.**

**9. The President assigns resident undergraduate enrollment targets to the nine undergraduate campuses—te1(1) through te1(9)—to sum to TE1.1**

**10. The President determines a *funding ratio*  $f = TE2/TE1$ , where TE2 denotes the number of resident undergraduate students the University considers funded.**

**AC = average cost of a UC-quality education, to be defined by the UCOP Budget Office, in consultation with the Academic Senate. The Academic Council recommends using a “Blended Average Cost” spanning general-campus undergraduates and Ph.D. students. The substantive point is to cover average cost, however defined, with the sum of net tuition and the state subsidy.**

**SS = Required State Subsidy (per student) = AC – tuition net of return to aid (t)**

**SS and AC are independent of any particular campus. It follows that TE2 = total state support for undergraduates/SS.**

**11. State funds shall be allocated to the campuses based on their actual enrollments, relative to targets.**

**If the campuses all meet their targets, total funding will be**

$$\text{SS} * \text{TE2} + t * \text{TE1} + t * (\text{over-enrollment}) = \text{SS} * f * \text{TE1} + t * \text{TE1} + t * \text{OE}$$

**A campus *i* that falls short of its target by *n* students shall receive**

$$\text{SS} * (\text{te2}(i) - n) + t * (\text{te1}(i) - n).$$

**12. Targets must be flexible. A campus seeking to reduce its target can do so if another campus is willing to increase its target. Targets also will evolve as the President's negotiations lead to different outcomes for TE1.**

Council then discussed enrollment targets and the state subsidy for Ph.D. students. The Task Force suggests following the model funding model as it recommended for undergraduate enrollment.



That is, the average cost of a Ph.D. student comprises net tuition plus the state subsidy. Chair Chalfant noted that in May, Council endorsed the principle that state subsidies should be similar for students of a similar type, but did not address the comparative weights between student types. Chair Chalfant emphasized that the suggestion in the document that there be an enrollment ratio of 10 Ph.D. students per 100 undergraduates is a target (a plausible floor), rather than representing actual enrollment. Furthermore, the 10% figure is a suggestion and the Task Force is open to a different figure. The Task Force chose that figure because it mirrors current Ph.D. enrollments at most of the campuses (one campus has a 20% ratio and two are below 10%) and it does not want to diminish the size of existing Ph.D. programs. If the principle that the state subsidy should be the same for all Ph.D. students is applied, those campuses with greater numbers of Ph.D. students will get more money. Targets should recognize the current distribution of Ph.D. students, but the distribution of Ph.D. students across the campuses should be adjustable over time so all campuses can expand their Ph.D. programs and aspire to a higher level of research excellence. The criteria for determining targets will be developed in the future. While there will be difficult negotiations about setting the targets, the University does that now on an ad-hoc basis with no principle to guide the decisions. A member inquired where the money to subsidize Ph.D. students at campuses that want to expand their doctoral programs would come from. Another member responded that at the numbers of undergraduates at the two campuses with a graduate/undergraduate ratio of less than 10% are quite small, so the total number of additional doctoral students would not be great.

**ACTION: Council unanimously adopted item 13 as follows.**

**13. Targets for Ph.D. students should be established, with funding provided to every campus to allow a minimum ratio of Ph.D. students to funded undergraduate resident students of 0.10. Targets above the 10% figure should be set, for campuses that can currently sustain enrollment of additional Ph.D. students, to allocate state funding on the same principle as for undergraduates: all (targeted) Ph.D. students should receive the same state subsidy.**

Council turned to a discussion of the allocation of state funds for professional school students. It was clarified that the reference to tuition includes professional degree fees. The item takes no position on the relative weight of a professional school student vis-à-vis an undergraduate or doctoral student. The president and Regents will have to decide what share the student should pay and how much will be subsidized by the state. The next task will be to determine programs' average cost. An amendment clarifying the wording of the item was made and accepted.

**ACTION: Council unanimously adopted item 14 on professional school students as follows.**

**14. As with Ph.D. students, medical and other professional students should be allocated state funding once a determination is made concerning the desired ratio of tuition (net of financial aid) to the program's Average Cost. For the professional schools that are given funding autonomy, whereby no state funds are allocated, it should not be required that they charge a premium for non-resident tuition.**

Council discussed items 15-17, which pertain to academic doctoral students, and #18, which asks CCGA and UCPB to make a recommendation to Council regarding whether a separate process is needed for academic Master's students, or whether they can be pooled with undergraduates for funding purposes. CCGA's chair argued that the excellence of UC's graduate programs relies on the

elimination of the practice of charging academic doctoral students non-resident tuition. He asserted that the University is losing top graduate students to other institutions, which will have an impact on the quality of research and faculty recruitment and retention. This issue is critical to protecting UC quality.

**ACTION: Council unanimously adopted items 15-18, as follows.**

**15. The Academic Council recommends that the Academic Senate oppose charging non-resident tuition (NRT) for Ph.D. students; while it is charged, the Senate should oppose policies that require that NRT be paid by the funding source for employment of the Ph.D. student; and the Academic Council requests that the administration work with CCGA, UCORP, and UCPB to study these two policies and to model their effects.**

**16. Until such time as the practice of charging NRT for Ph.D. students is ended, the required state subsidy for Ph.D. students shall be calculated as a weight average of the separate figures required to cover Average Cost (or Blended AC, if that approach is adopted) for California resident Ph.D. students and non-resident Ph.D. students.**

**17. Targets for Ph.D. students must be adjustable over time. The Academic Council asks that CCGA and UCPB develop a framework for setting targets for graduate enrollments.**

**18. CCGA and UCPB shall take up the question of whether a separate process is needed for academic Master's students or whether they can be pooled with undergraduates for funding purposes. The two committees shall report their recommendations to the Academic Council no later than the November meeting.**

Council then addressed items #19-20, pertaining to instructional titles. A member of the Task Force stated that these recommendations are a response to suggestions by the administration. The Task Force felt it necessary to respond to these ideas. A member noted that while a salary structure like that in the health sciences could be developed for the general campuses, it is complex and would take several years to develop. A member pointed out an unintended consequence of the recommendation on increasing lecturers could be reducing the number of jobs available to UC doctoral students. Chair Chalfant clarified that the Task Force does not view this as a wise, long-term strategy, but as a tactical solution to the current budgetary crisis. Members suggested alternative wording to clarify this. Another member pointed out that Lecturers with Security of Employment are not temporary employees. A Task Force member responded that there is a more nuanced discussion of this topic in the document and that all of the recommendations should be read in the broader context of the report.

**ACTION: Council unanimously adopted items #19 and #20, as amended.**

**19. In the context of the current financial exigencies, the Academic Council recommends maintaining, and expanding where appropriate, the University's use of lecturers (both Unit 18 and Lecturers with Security of Employment).**

**20. The Academic Council recommends against creating a new job title in the Academic Senate with increased teaching expectations and reduced research expectations, in a manner analogous to the Clinical X title in the Medical Schools.**

## **VII. Report of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC**

**ISSUE:** Council considered the recommendations of the Special Committee to decide which, if any, to endorse.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Simmons reminded Council members that in January, they chose to defer formal review of the report until the completion of the Implementation Task Force report, which they established at that meeting to provide advice on how to implement the Powell report recommendations. UCLA's divisional chair objected to the composition of the Powell Committee, which lacked representation from UCLA. She stated that due to this omission, she can not support the report. Instead, she suggested voting to simply receive the report. Chair Simmons responded that all of the faculty who served on the Commission on the Future or on one of its Working Groups were invited to participate in the deliberations of the Special Committee. Unfortunately, none of the faculty from UCLA did so. A member spoke favorably about the articulate, aspirational statements in the Powell Committee report, noting that Council could endorse the principles and choose to reject certain recommendations. A member stated that the recommendation about sharing revenues from non-resident tuition is moot, since funding streams is going into effect. CCGA's chair stated that recommendation 20 is antithetical to actions recently taken by CCGA regarding self-supporting programs.

**ACTION: Council voted to forward the Special Committee ("Powell") Report to the president without endorsement (15 in favor, 3 opposed).**

**ACTION: Council voted to endorse all of the recommendations in the Special Committee report, with the following exceptions:**

- On a vote of 15 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention
  - Council rejected recommendation #15 (consider sharing revenues derived from nonresident students).
  - Council declined to comment on recommendations #16 (raise tuition only as a last resort), #17 (assess the impact on student fees of revising or reducing return-to-aid), and #22 (examine the growth of administrative FTE vis-à-vis faculty FTE and student enrollment).
- On a vote of 16 in favor and 3 abstentions, Council voted to reject recommendation #20 (expand and market self-supporting instructional courses and programs to subsidize core functions).

## **VIII. New Business**

*Council did not discuss any new business.*

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst