

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, December 12, 2012**I. Senate Officers' Announcements****▪ Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair**

1. **Report on November 27 Regents meeting.** Governor Brown attended the special Regents' meeting to appoint Nicholas Dirks as UC Berkeley's Chancellor and Jane Close Conoley as Interim Chancellor at UC Riverside. The governor objected to the salary approved for Dirks.
2. **Update on composite benefits rate project.** Faculty are concerned about plans to charge composite benefit rates to summer salary. Senate leadership has been discussing this issue with AVP Arrivas. Chair Powell reported that he was invited to a meeting between UC and the federal government's Division of Cost Allocation, which negotiates indirect cost rate proposals and cost allocation plans for federal grants and contracts. Another area of concern is campuses with medical centers. Currently, the proposed benefit rate for professors is approximately 30% and the rate for "other academics" is approximately 40%. Many employees at the medical schools are included in the latter category and would be charged in excess of actual benefits. In addition, it is unclear if emeriti who have grants, but who no longer contribute to UCRP, will have to pay a composite benefit rate on their grants. A member asked if the rates go into effect when a campus is phased in to UC Path or immediately. A report with revised models, including one that addresses health sciences faculty, is supposed to be issued this week, with comments due in early January. A member questioned the practice of hiring external consultants at a time of budgetary stress.
3. **Nominations for 2013-14 Vice Chair.** Chair Powell will issue a formal solicitation of nominations for the 2013-14 vice chair in January; please begin thinking of candidates. The vote will occur in March.
4. **Campus leadership in long-range enrollment planning.** A draft template for enrollment planning has been sent to the campus administrations for comment. Chair Powell urged divisional chairs to make sure that the divisional Senates comment on the template and are consulted on long-range enrollment planning.
5. **Meeting with Governor Brown.** Governor Brown asked to meet with the Senate leadership, and his staff subsequently requested information on faculty workload. In consultation with the Administration, Vice Chair Jacob and Chair Powell drafted a white paper on the subject and sent it to him. The governor is very concerned about student debt and salary increases. He is supportive of the University and wants to better understand the issues.
6. **Meeting with Senate President Pro Tem Steinberg.** Along with ICAS leadership, Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob also met with Senate President Pro Tem Steinberg. Among other things, they discussed the implementation of SB 1052 and 1053, which became law last year.
7. **SB 1052 and 1053 update.** These bills mandated the creation of 50 low-cost textbooks for high-enrollment courses and named ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates) as the body to coordinate the effort. A panel of nine faculty (three from each

segment), will form a governing body. \$5M in funding will be allocated when matched by private funds and Senator Steinberg is involved in raising the matching funds. ICAS will probably be staffed via the CCC Senate, and the CSU Chancellor's office will administer the repository, as provided in the legislation. CSU administers an existing archive of online resources with over 2000 open-source instructional materials.

8. **Joint meeting with COVC.** Council will meet with the Council of Vice Chancellors in January.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved.

III. Consent Calendar

1. **Approve draft minutes of the November 19 Council minutes**
2. **Adopt procedures for vice chair election**

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.

IV. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

V. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VI. Consultation with Senior Mangers – Provost and Executive Vice President Dorr

Provost Dorr said she recently visited UCSC, UCI, and UCSF. She enjoyed the opportunity to hear from various constituencies, and plans to visit the other campuses. She noted that the UCR chancellor search committee will be announced soon.

Q: What are the plans for the presentation to the Regents in January on online education?

A: Provost Dorr responded that the goal is to share information about online courses available on the campuses, as well as through UCOE, focusing on credit-bearing, undergraduate courses. She will discuss the current uses of technology in classroom, plans for expanding online courses, and the resources needed to achieve that. She also will provide an overview of graduate online degree programs, non-credit courses through UC Extension, and campus involvement in MOOCs.

Comments: Hybrid courses are a significant aspect of campus instruction. In economically depressed regions, however, many students do not have the appropriate infrastructure to successfully complete online courses. In addition, campus bandwidth and access to “smart” classrooms can be a problem.

A: Provost Dorr responded that online courses are an opportunity, not a requirement. The benefits of a residential campus and face-to-face teaching environment are great. The University will have to invest in infrastructure to expand access to online courses.

Comment: The focus of the conversation on online education should be how it enhances student success, outcomes, and course completion. This is far more significant than any potential for revenue generation.

A: Provost Dorr agreed that increasing academic efficiency and enhancing the educational experience should be the primary goals. She noted that making it easier for students to progress in a timely way enables departments to make more seats available, and therefore creates revenue.

Q: How will UC interact with Coursera?

A: Provost Dorr said that the University will evaluate the ability of campuses and the system to offer high-quality, UC credit bearing courses, both on its own and in collaboration with Coursera.

VII. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VIII. Review of the Rebenching Report

ISSUE: Council discussed responses to the review of the report of the Rebenching Budget Committee.

DISCUSSION: Chair Powell stated that rebenching is already being implemented—the president has allocated \$16 M across five of the campuses. Council’s discussion, therefore, should focus on identifying concerns that should be monitored for possible correction as the process continues and as its interaction with Funding Streams becomes clear. The Senate supports rebenching principles, and should advise the president on how to implement it in future years, assuming new state money becomes available. Responses indicate significant disagreement with the rebenching model, however; at least one division opposes it while three call for complete implementation. Many respondents expressed concern about the appropriateness of the weights for each class of student and the goal of each campus having 12% of its student population be doctoral students. Chair Powell stated that the rebenching report is a result of many compromises over a year and a half of discussions. The rebenching committee discussed making the weights more granular (e.g., assigning different weights to upper and lower division students), but decided on simplicity. In addition, questions were raised about why UCSF is exempted. He noted that this was a pragmatic decision; the alternative was prolonged discussion. Another issue raised in the responses was whether health science programs on the general campuses should also be exempted. A member commented that in addition, the undergraduate nursing major should be treated differently because it is intensively clinical.

A member noted that all of the responses begin by affirming the principles underlying rebenching and that the administration has agreed that there will be ongoing evaluation. Several members supported the idea of creating some benchmarks or way of measuring what rebenching aims to achieve. It would be useful to specify the ways in which UCOP should provide feedback, such as revisiting the weights at particular times. A member stated that rebenching explicitly recognizes that graduate and professional students need more financing and affirms that this is one of UC’s priorities. Also, the proposed weights are not very different from the ones used in the late ‘80s and early ‘90s. However, the assumptions behind the weights should be explicitly stated.

A member commented that summer instruction should be counted. Several years ago, UCOP directed the campuses to offer more courses during the summer in order to improve academic

efficiency. In response, some campuses have restructured courses and course sequences. This effort should not be penalized. Chair Powell said he would include this point in the letter to the provost.

A member said that some campuses adhered to enrollment targets assigned to them by UCOP, while other campuses did not. Will campuses that went beyond their targets be rewarded? A member countered that his campus has a large number of over-enrolled students because they do not have other funding sources and therefore are vulnerable to changes in state funding. They need student tuition to fund basic operations. A member commented that this is why campuses have been asking for stability from UCOP and UCOP has been requesting stable budgets from the state. Chair Powell responded that this issue is important as UCOP develops an enrollment management plan and a plan for annual feedback and evaluation. Ideally, a rebenching plan would span two years, so if mid-course corrections are needed, there will be one year's advance notice. A member stated that there must be firm targets with incentives for hitting the targets; we must be able to show the state that we are fulfilling our obligations to state residents. As long as we are doing that, there is no reason to limit non-resident over-enrollment. Another member expressed strong disagreement with the idea of penalties for campuses that do not hit their targets for resident enrollment.

A member questioned whether current augmentations from the state constitute "new money," since these funds do not even restore UC to 2007-08 funding levels. Additionally, will the \$125M for tuition buyout be counted as new money?

A member commented that it is important to recognize that the rebenching report is not a finished product; the University must develop an enrollment management plan as soon as possible in order to make rebenching meaningful. If enrollment targets are not set until March, it will be the fall 2014 admissions cycle before an enrollment management plan can be implemented. A member emphasized that setting enrollment targets should be a collaborative, consultative process between UCOP and campus administrations and Senates.

ACTION: Chair Powell will revise the draft letter, incorporating points from Council's discussion. Council will discuss the revised letter at its January meeting.

IX. UCOE Copyright Issues

ISSUE: In July, the San Diego division raised questions about the copyright and licensing agreements that faculty who develop courses for UC's online education program are required to sign. Relevant committees were asked to comment in a targeted review, and a letter from Berkeley's Committee on Courses and Instruction was received.

DISCUSSION: Chair Powell stated that UCOE's copyright agreement is between the Regents and the individual faculty member. Some faculty are concerned that the agreement weakens Senate control of the curriculum, which must be protected. In reality, faculty teaching is embedded in departments, which determine what courses one teaches. A potential solution would be to require UCOE to return to the course author if it determines that a course needs revision. If that faculty member is no longer at the University, then UCOE should consult with the department chair. If the department no longer wants to offer the course and UCOE wants to continue it, UCOE must find a department within the University to offer it. A member emphasized that a faculty member who

chooses not to continue teaching the course should be allowed to remove their name from it; this should be part of the contract with UCOE. A member noted that a report on copyright by a UCLA Senate-administrative task force is about to be issued. A member requested more time to consider the draft revisions to the copyright agreement. Chair Powell also will request input from UCFW and Council will revisit this topic after the divisions have reviewed suggested changes.

X. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

XI. Review of APM 430

ISSUE: Council considered responses to the systemwide review of proposed revisions to APM 430, which would create a new title for short-term student or faculty visitors to the University.

DISCUSSION: Council members discussed the proposed revisions. In general, respondents were supportive, although several divisions noted that many campuses already have titles that accommodate such visitors. Chair Powell proposed drafting a letter highlighting some points made in the written responses and in discussion.

ACTION: Chair Powell will send a letter to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing the responses.

XII. Review of APM 700

ISSUE: The proposed revisions to APM 700 on Leaves of Absence would establish a presumptive resignation policy. Council will consider responses to the review.

DISCUSSION: Council members questioned the need for the proposed language, given that other sections of the APM can be used to handle such rare cases. They critiqued the proposed timeline as too short, as well as the lack of definition of the phrase “absence from duty.” A member suggested that APM 075 could be revised to incorporate procedures for presumptive resignation.

ACTION: Council unanimously supported a motion to recommend that UC abandon the proposed APM 700 and instead modify APM 075 to incorporate a process that addresses presumptive resignation.

XIII. New Business

UCFW Chair Hare informed Council that UCFW and its Health Care Task Force will discuss the potential elimination of Health Care Facilitators on the campuses and will forward a recommendation to Council.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst