

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**Wednesday, December 11, 2013**

**I. Senate Officers' Announcements**

1. Academic Planning Council. APC met by phone on December 10. Its major agenda items were: (1) progress in drafting an Open Access presidential policy; (2) developing appropriate performance indicators to meet state reporting requirements established in this year's budget bill; (3) developing a methodology for calculating "cost of instruction," which was also required by the state; and (4) enrollment management.

**II. Approval of the agenda**

**ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed.**

**III. Consent Calendar**

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

**IV. Moreno Report**

**DISCUSSION:** The Moreno Work Group has 8 members, including Chair Jacob, UCAP chair Harry Green, UCAAD member Amani Nuru-Jeter, and UCP&T chair Jeff Lansman and Vice Chair Gilly (ex officio) representing the Senate; Administration members are Provost Dorr, Vice Provost Carlson, UC Davis Law Dean Kevin Johnson, UCI Title IX/Discrimination Officer Kirsten Quanbeck. Staff consultants include Senate Director Winnacker and OGC attorney and advisor to Privilege and Tenure committees Cynthia Vroom, UCR Assistant EVC William Kidder, and UCOP Academic Personnel Director of Diversity, Labor and Employee Relations Amy K. Lee. The Work Group has drafted initial recommendations, which were distributed for Council feedback. Work Group members Nuru-Jeter and Lansman participated in Council's discussion. Chair Jacob thanked the UCSD, UCM and UCI divisions for their written comments.

The draft recommendations call for increased record keeping and reporting, including the establishment of a central office as a single first point of contact for complaints about any kind of discrimination or harassment with primary responsibility for investigation in that office. Staff in such a central office should report directly to the Chancellor. Council agreed with the recommendation, but felt that an independent ombuds office should exist on each campus in order to provide confidential advice about options and that the ombuds office should report general statistics about types of complaints. Council members also recommended that Chancellors and deans should be held accountable for compliance with APM 240 and 245, which require department chairs to report annually on diversity and for deans to be evaluated on their efforts to promote diversity. Other ideas included requiring that external faculty sit on hiring committees, making evaluation of diversity a significant part of program reviews, and naming equity officers in every unit.

Council also discussed the Work Group's call for an annual review of data by UCP&T and for updating P&T bylaws to clarify how it would coordinate its work with a central anti-discrimination office.

In addition, Council members noted that there often is administrative pressure to resolve complaints informally. The Office of General Counsel is designed to minimize liability to the University and makes deals to avoid litigation. Settlements with nondisclosure agreements are a challenge for transparency. Council also discussed whether the Senate should consider changing provisions in Bylaws 335 and 336, adopted by the Assembly in 2004 that establish a three year statute of limitations for initiating grievance and discipline proceedings.

## **V. Consultation with Senior Managers**

Provost Dorr. Provost Dorr participated by phone in part of the discussion of the Moreno report. Regarding other items, she stated that a group under her purview is reviewing the second round of course proposals through ILTI (the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative). Another group is discussing what performance indicators are appropriate to comply with the language required in the budget bill. These could include persistence rates from one year to another and accrual of units. She said that the indicators should reflect UC's research and graduate education missions, as well as its undergraduate education mission. Finally, the group will determine a set of comparators and use them to benchmark UC's efforts.

## **VI. Moreno Report**

**ISSUE:** Council continued its discussion of the Moreno report, summarized in item IV, above.

## **VII. Executive Session**

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

## **VIII. Executive Session**

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

## **IX. President's Transfer Initiative**

**ISSUE:** Council was briefed on the joint Senate-administrative group convened to develop recommendations for the president's transfer initiative.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS Chair George Johnson is co-chairing the Transfer Action Team with Student Affairs Vice President Judy Sakaki. The action team is charged with developing proposed plans for the President's Transfer initiative and will meet next week for the first time. A final report is due in late February and will be circulated for discussion at the March Council meeting. The president wants the group to develop strategies to increase numbers of transfers, streamline the transfer process, and improve transfer graduation rates without decreasing access for high school graduates. Subcommittees will address outreach and preparation; admission, diversity and

articulation; student orientation and transition; and enrollment growth. UCEP Chair Tim Labor and UCOPE Chair Ross Frank also serve on the work group.

Chair Johnson said that the divisional Senates should consider whether the CCC/CSU Transfer Model Curricula would adequately prepare students for entry to UC. In addition, the other segments have developed a Course Identification Number system (C-ID) in which faculty discipline groups with representation from each segment evaluates individual course outlines of record from CCC and CSU institutions against standardized course descriptors created by faculty. Courses that conform to the descriptor receive an inter-segmental course number in addition to their home-campus course number. Courses from any segment that have been assigned the same C-ID course number are treated as interchangeable by CCC and CSU for purposes of articulation. UC has been peripherally involved in the project and may want to piggyback on these efforts. BOARS vice chair Ralph Aldredge represents UC on the C-ID policy committee. The Transfer Action Team will also discuss better outreach and models that serve transfers who are place-bound due to family or job considerations. An example is UCSD's Universitylink, which guarantees admission from a local community college if a student meets certain requirements. This initiative has resulted in a more diverse transfer pool, including more veterans. Finally, the action team will consider how to streamline the transfer process.

#### **X. APM 600**

**ISSUE:** Council discussed the responses to the systemwide review of proposed changes in the APM 600 series and related sections of the APM.

**DISCUSSION:** Council members emphasized their desire for a reconsideration of APM 510, which prevents campuses from offering more than a one-step salary increase to a faculty member who is recruited from another UC campus. This restrains competition, encourages faculty to seek outside offers, undermines the step system by forcing the recruiting campus to offer an off-scale salary and may reinforce existing salary inequities.

**ACTION:** Chair Jacob will draft a letter based on the systemwide responses and circulate it to Council for final approval.

#### **XI. CITRIS Review**

**ACTION:** Council approved forwarding division responses to the CITRIS review to the Provost and Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

#### **XII. UC's Capital Outlay Program**

**DISCUSSION:** UCPB Chair Don Senear said that the state currently is not funding general obligation bonds, but AB 94 allows UC to use up to 15% of its state general fund allocation to fund debt service for capital projects. In response to a tight deadline, UC proposed previously identified seismic safety and renewal projects for 2013-14 and allocated \$15 million for debt service in the 2014-15 budget. However, this will fund only a small percentage of the University's capital needs. UCPB is drafting a letter outlining principles for use of this interim funding mechanism and for deciding on future priorities. Its recommendations include:

1. Emphasize that it is an interim, stop-gap program to address UC's most urgent capital needs until the state returns to funding capital projects via general obligation bonds. UCPB strongly argues that UC should not take capital projects on as an obligation. If the practice continues past 2014-15, there should be a full discussion about University needs for funding capital projects.
2. The funds should be managed at UCOP as an off-the-top program and should not left to the campuses to decide how they are used. Funds allocated to the smaller campuses would not be sufficient to launch a building, and the funds should not be diverted to other purposes.
3. UCOP should provide a transparent and equitable plan for allocating capital funding. It should prioritize renewal rather than new construction. Systemwide priorities may be different from campus priorities.
4. UCOP should develop a set of principles to guide the selection of projects, and there should be a role for the Senate. The projects selected this year were based on the campus five year plans, but may not have been the campus' highest priorities for this particular funding mechanism.

A member commented that the University should think about capital investment in the context of academic planning. In what fields will there be growth and change and significant infrastructure needs (e.g., psychology now needs wet labs)?

### **XIII. UCEP Items**

#### **(A) SR 760**

**ISSUE:** Council was briefed on UCEP's revised proposal for amending SR 760.

**DISCUSSION:** In November 2012, 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 proposes minor changes in SR 760 that acknowledge concerns about online education, but treat format as one aspect of evaluation and allows the details to be resolved at the divisional level.

**ACTION:** Council approved sending the proposed revisions to SR 760 for systemwide review.

#### **(B) UCEP Guidelines for Systemwide Course Approvals**

**ISSUE:** Council was briefed on UCEP's draft guidelines for determining whether a course should receive a systemwide designation.

**DISCUSSION:** UCEP Chair Tim Labor stated that UCEP made the guidelines flexible to accommodate different circumstances. Any regular campus course can be designated as a systemwide course. If it has been approved by a campus Committee on Courses, then UCEP will not reevaluate it on its merits. He noted that he is presenting the guidelines as an informational item; they do not require approval.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst