

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Teleconference
Monday, November 19, 2012****I. Senate Officers' Announcements****▪ Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair**

- 1. Report on November Regents meeting.** At the request of Governor Brown in the aftermath of Proposition 30's passage, the Regents did not consider a proposed agenda item to set Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition levels. The Governor attended the meeting and made comments that were not very positive about the possibility for a buyout of next year's planned 6% tuition increase (\$150M). He said he needs to hold the line on requests for budget increases, and made clear, along with several Regents, his opposition to a tuition increase. This would put a substantial hole in the proposed budget. At the governor's urging, the Regents requested a report on online education at the January Regents meeting. In particular, they want to hear from the faculty about online courses at the campuses. We have sent a request to the divisions to provide feedback. The Regents also discussed non-resident enrollment; they understand that it funds residents. Finally, there will be a special meeting of the Regents on November 27 to appoint Berkeley's chancellor.
- 2. Report on Academic Planning Council meeting.** Provost Dorr has reconstituted the APC, which met in November. It is reviewing the Self-Supporting Program policy to identify areas in need of updating. It also will consider updates to the Compendium, including discontinuances of undergraduate programs that are the last of their kind systemwide, as well as governance issues involving Multi-Campus Research Units. A potential future focus of discussion could be developing measurement of quality.
- 3. Report on production of plutonium pits at Los Alamos National Laboratory.** The president has provided his annual report on the production of plutonium pits at Los Alamos National Laboratory.
- 4. Update on faculty salaries.** Provost Dorr will discuss this later in the meeting.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved.

III. Consent Calendar

- 1. Approve draft minutes of the October 24 Council meeting.**
- 2. Cancel December 19 Academic Assembly meeting.**

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.

IV. Negotiated Salary Trial Program

ISSUE: Council discussed responses from the review of the proposal for a negotiated salary trial plan.

DISCUSSION: Chair Powell stated that responses to the review were negative on the whole because the concerns expressed about the proposed APM 668 were not adequately addressed. However, despite reservations, several opined that the trial program should go forward. So far, UCSD is the only campus that has drafted an implementation plan. It is unclear whether UCLA or UCI will opt to participate. Several respondents expressed concern that a four-year trial is not long enough to produce the data needed to realistically evaluate the trial. Most respondents raised doubts that the conditions for declaring the trial a success or failure were not defined, and adequate metrics were not identified. Also, some commented that the experience of campuses with health sciences programs may not be generalizable to the other campuses. Furthermore, there is no evidence that such a program will work as a retention mechanism as it is a temporary increase in salary at the cost of monies that the faculty member might otherwise use for his or her own research. It will harm the morale of faculty who are unable to participate and could even harm retention because it suggests that one can only increase one's salary by getting grants. A member asked if participation is an administrative decision and another stated that divisions must be able to opt out if it becomes a systemwide policy. Chair Powell replied that the divisional Senates must endorse their campus' participation. A member stated that if a division wishes to participate, other divisions should not oppose its participation. One member disagreed, as it privatizes salary negotiations and undermines the more transparent merit and promotion system, and the notion that we are one university. A member responded that while there are problems with the trial program, we continue to wrestle with recruitment and retention issues and no one has proposed a better way to improve retention. However, it would be better if it were focused on the biological sciences. Members discussed whether local Committees on Academic Personnel should review the salary increases, and came to the consensus that CAPs function differently, so divisional Senate concurrence should be sufficient. Council passed the following motion (16 in favor, 2 opposed).

ACTION: The Council endorses individual campus participation in the trial program if and only if the Senate division approves of their participation with a formal letter to their EVC, with a copy to the chair of the Academic Council and the UC Provost and Executive Vice President. Council requires that the chairs of the divisions that participate report to the Council on an annual basis the lessons learned.

V. Composite Benefit Rates update

ISSUE: UCFW Chair Daniel Hare and Academic Council Vice Chair Bill Jacob briefed Council on the latest developments in the composite benefit rate project.

DISCUSSION: Council Vice Chair Jacob thanked Council members for their input to the letter sent to Associate Vice President and Controller Peggy Arrivas last week. The Senate is pushing for a delay so that benefit rates for additional employee groups can be modeled, issues about non-covered compensation can be resolved, and negotiations for additional rates can be held with the federal government. Council members praised Vice Chair Jacob for his leadership in this area.

VI. Recommendation regarding definition of unit credit

ISSUE: Council discussed [Senate Regulation 760](#), which describes how credits are awarded. It is too broad to meet new requirements mandated by the Department of Education and implemented by WASC. UCEP requested that divisions be instructed to adopt regulations that will meet the WASC requirements.

DISCUSSION: UCEP Chair John Yoder stated that SR 760 defines the value of a unit as 3 hours of work per week per term. WASC and Department of Education now require that unit credit definitions specify class contact. UCEP considered two options: revising SR 760 or asking the divisions to set their own definitions prior to their next WASC review. Three divisions responded to UCEP that they would prefer to define units in their divisional regulations. UCEP recommends Berkeley's guidelines as a model endorsed by WASC. The Berkeley guidelines specify the number of hours of class time to be included in the student's three hours of work per unit. A motion was made to recommend that the divisions define unit credit, and amended to delete the reference to Berkeley's definition (members did not object to mentioning Berkeley's approach as a model in a cover letter, however). A member objected that a uniform definition is necessary for systemwide courses and for articulation. UCEP should set a definition of units for systemwide courses. A member inquired whether the existing systemwide regulation would be retained and whether the divisional definitions should be consistent with SR 760. A member asked if there is a need to revise the definition of a graduate unit since graduate programs are approved on the systemwide level. CCGA Chair Ruth Mulnard replied that WASC has not expressed any concerns about the graduate unit definition. A member asked if the discussion could be tabled and addressed at a future meeting in order for divisional chairs to consult with their local Committees on Educational Policy. The members agreed to this plan.

ACTION: Divisional chairs will consult with their Committees on Educational Policy; Council will reconsider the issue at a future meeting.

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

Provost Dorr stated that the governor wants to see a plan for improving academic efficiency, such as reducing time to degree and reducing bottlenecks to courses. We have done a lot in this regard already, but will respond to the request for a plan, tentatively scheduled for the March Regents meeting.

Q: The postponement of consideration of Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition was a surprise. Will it be considered later in the year?

A: Provost Dorr responded that the administration believes that the fee increases are justified and necessary and plans to resubmit the request at a future Regents meeting. She noted that the governor merely asked for time to better understand the request.

Q: The 2013-14 budget includes funds for salary increases for non-represented staff and faculty. What is the process for implementing this? How should we engage with you on this?

A: Provost Dorr stated that the administration is committed to providing salary increases. The question is when, how much, and how. Campus administrators are concerned that there is no new funding for raises in this year's budget, so it would require cuts in other places. Staff raises are easier to implement because they are across the board, while faculty raises could be implemented in a variety of ways. It would be helpful to have a recommendation from the Senate.

Comment: We know that faculty salaries are at least 12% below market, so it is disconcerting to hear that it is necessary to maintain competitive salaries, but we do not have the political will to do anything about it until next year; the moment hasn't been right for the past five years.

Comment: The Academic Council has consistently been in favor of augmenting the salary scales in a robust way.

Comment: There are disparities among the divisions. Some administrations have increased faculty salaries and some have not.

A: Provost Dorr stated that the money in the 2013-14 budget for quality initiatives will not be distributed across the board precisely because campus face different challenges and quality enhancements need to be tailored to campus needs. Campuses should decide which of the quality initiatives they need to engage with. We will develop a process for Senate involvement to get faculty input.

VIII. Discussion of Quality Initiatives in 2012-13 University Budget

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

IX. New Business

Council did not have any new business to discuss.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm

Attest: Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst