

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11

**TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:** The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.

During the 2010-11 year, the Academic Council considered multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#). Matters of particular import for the year include:

### RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FUTURE OF UC

This year, the Academic Council expended a great deal of effort discussing and formulating long-term, strategic responses to the ongoing budgetary challenges facing the University, including advising on major changes in post-employment benefits. Building on its commentary on recommendations emerging from the Commission on the Future throughout 2009-10, in July 2010, Council created a Special Committee on a Plan for UC (the “Powell Committee”) to develop a comprehensive plan for the University of California that would address ongoing revenue shortfalls due to reductions in state funding. All of the faculty who participated on the Commission on the Future Workgroups, plus the two faculty who served as members of the Commission, were invited to participate in the work of the committee, and 24 of those invited joined in the effort. Upon receiving the [Powell Committee report](#) in January 2011, Council formed an Implementation Task Force to provide advice on how to implement the Powell report recommendations. The [Implementation Task Force](#) issued its final report in July 2011. Council endorsed 23 recommendations that constitute a plan for managing the size of the University while leaving campuses with flexibility to manage their enrollments.

### BUDGETARY ISSUES

As noted above, budgetary matters predominated this year. In the early fall, the provost hosted a budgetary summit to familiarize all Senate committee and divisional chairs with the fiscal challenges facing the University. The Senate began the year by endorsing an administration proposal to [rename](#) “fees” as “tuition,” which was recommended by the Commission of the Future, and was subsequently approved by the Regents. The Senate also reviewed and commented on the administration’s [Funding Streams](#) proposal. While Council was supportive of the principles of Funding Streams, it expressed several concerns, chief among them that the “rebenching” of state general funds—the second phase of budget reform—should occur as soon as possible, and that an enrollment management system should be devised to counter certain incentives of Funding Streams. In June, Council issued a [resolution](#) advising the President to request that the Regents increase mandatory systemwide charges effective in fall 2011 in an amount sufficient to offset a new reduction of \$150 million in State funding in the state’s final 2011-2012 budget. In July, Council adopted a [resolution](#) advising the President that the total reduction for 2011-12 of \$650 million in state funding should be allocated among the campuses under the methodology for allocating reductions laid out in the Funding Streams proposal. The Funding Streams proposal had recommended different formulas for allocating state funding augmentations and

reductions to the campuses based on the campuses' differential abilities to make up reductions with other revenue sources such as nonresident tuition and professional degree supplemental tuition.

Several Council members also participated on a joint Senate-administrative committee to discuss rebenching the allocation of state general funds per student. The report of the Implementation Task Force provides one approach to rebenching and was distributed to the Rebenching Committee for consideration. A subset of Council members also participated in regular teleconferences held by Provost Pitts to brief them on budget issues.

## **FACULTY WELFARE**

In 2010-11, the Senate played a significant role in shaping a change in post-employment benefits. In 2009-10, Senate members served on the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits, which issued a recommendation for restructuring pension and retiree health benefits at the end of August. The faculty and staff members issued a dissenting statement and requested that the president also consider "Option C," an alternative proposal that the Task Force discussed, but did not include as an option in its recommendation. The president agreed to consider this alternative, and Senate Divisions and committees provided [comment](#), favoring the option put forward by the faculty and staff. President Yudof recommended a modified version of Option C to the Regents, and in November Council [endorsed](#) this recommendation and also adopted a resolution calling for funding the employer contributions to UCRP on the state funded compensation base by borrowing from the Short Term Investment Pool.

In 2010-11 a joint UCAP-UCFW-UCPB committee developed three recommendations to restore competitiveness to UC's salary scales, which Council adopted in November 2010. However, in December, the Assembly of the Academic Senate asked Council to continue its deliberations as new information about budget scenarios became available, and because President Yudof indicated that he preferred that increases be linked to individual merit. Council revisited its recommendations at its meeting on December 15 and [recommended](#) to the president an increment for faculty who received a favorable merit review sometime in the past five years, as well as those at the Step V and IX barrier steps; the recommendation called for the increment to be applied to the salary scales but not to the off-scale increment. Although Council's first choice was to apply increases to the salary scales across the board based on the individual's rank and step, it lent its reluctant support for the plan's restricted eligibility, based on the urgent need to address non-competitive salaries in the context of abnormal budgetary constraints. In August, President Yudof authorized a 3% merit-based salary increase for UC faculty effective October 1, 2011. The increase will apply to the base and off-scale components of salary and to Above-Scale salaries and will be awarded to all ladder-rank faculty who received a positive merit review in the past four years, those at the Professor V and IX "barrier" steps who had a satisfactory five year review, and those receiving satisfactory "no advancement" reviews at Associate and Full Professor ranks. However, the Senate maintains its position that the salary scales themselves reflect merit and that restoration of their competitiveness is critical to UC's continued excellence and its identity as one university with ten campuses.

## ADMISSIONS

In December, Council endorsed a draft administration [resolution on admissions](#) which was subsequently approved by the Regents in January. The resolution advocated expanding the use of single score holistic review to all of the campuses, but allowed for other methods to be used as long as they produce similar results.

In May, Council endorsed a [metric](#) developed by BOARS to determine the staffing required to complete review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts to implement the new freshman eligibility policy in order to ensure that application review under the new policy is done fairly and transparently.

## GRADUATE EDUCATION

In January Council considered revisions to the existing [policy on self-supporting graduate degree programs](#) proposed by the administration. Responses to the review of the policy raised broad concerns about the impact of self-supporting programs on the University's core educational mission. Concerns included the need for stricter criteria for the establishment of SSPs, issues of faculty workload and fiscal viability, program quality, and the potential of new self supporting programs to drain resources from existing state-supported programs. In March, Council unanimously endorsed guidelines that CCGA developed for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in [reviewing proposals](#) for new Self-Supporting Programs. In June it endorsed CCGA's guidelines for the [conversion](#) of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported to self-supported status and from self-supported to state-supported status.

In July, at the request of the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents, the Academic Council established a Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support. The Task Force will work with the administration to prepare a report to the Board of Regents on that subject.

## UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

At the direction of the UC Commission on the Future, in February, Chair Simmons reported to the President on the Senate's efforts to [facilitate transfer](#). In conjunction with the Provost's office, the Senate convened faculty and department chairs from all nine general campuses in seven of the most popular majors to discuss commonalities in the requirements for major preparation. In addition, Senate leadership continued to [coordinate](#) with its CSU and CCC counterparts through the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to share understandings of the documentation required to support articulation of Community College courses for transfer to UC.

In April, Council learned that the administration planned to borrow money to fund the UC Online Pilot Project. Council issued a [letter](#) to the president requesting that the pilot not be expanded beyond the initially approved 29 pilot courses pending evaluation of the pilot. Subsequently, Senate divisions and committees raised significant concerns upon [reviewing](#) the Project Plan for UC Online Education, particularly regarding oversight, implementation, and the feasibility of the financial model for recovering UCOP's investment in the project. Thereafter, Senate leadership was invited to join with a small group of project proponents to monitor the progress of the project and explore implementation issues related to awarding credit across campuses, enrolling non-UC students, and ensuring that

courses are approved according to Senate policies and procedures. Senate representatives also participated in the evaluation of proposals for a common technology platform, and monitoring a market study. In addition, UCEP revised its policy on the approval for [systemwide courses](#) to encompass online courses.

## **RESEARCH ISSUES**

In 2009-10, the Compendium was updated, with the exception of the section on MRUs. In July 2010, Council asked UCORP to develop a set of guidelines to address the governance of multicampus research entities. Working closely with staff from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, UCORP addressed the range of multicampus research entities and recommended categorizing multicampus research entities in two ways: Multicampus Research Units, with long-term research horizons, and Multicampus Research Programs, which are shorter-term research projects fully or partially funded by UCOP and limited to two funding cycles. In April 2011, Council [endorsed](#) UCORP's recommendations and referred them to the Academic Planning Council as a basis for rewriting that section of the Compendium.

In July, Council asked President Yudof to reconsider his decision to delegate authority to the San Diego Chancellor to determine whether to make [human remains](#) discovered on UCSD property available to researchers for study. Council maintained that for the determination would affect research throughout the University, and thus the decision should appropriately be made by UCOP, rather than being left to the discretion of a single campus. The President declined Council's request and affirmed the delegation of authority.

## **GOVERNANCE**

In November, Council endorsed a [white paper](#) written by the Senate Directors describing the functions of divisional Senate offices and the resources necessary to carry out those functions. The President declined to instruct the Chancellors in this regard.

In January, Council requested that ANR [halt the redirection of endowment funds](#) that previously were used to support graduate students and faculty research pending full consultation with the relevant committees of the Academic Senate. In February Council [approved a charge](#) and membership guidelines for a new Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR) to review the mission and strategic objectives of the Division, and to consider issues related to the ANR budget, the Division's academic and capital planning, and the intersection of its academic and outreach missions. ACSCANR's first meeting was held in July 2011.

## **SENATE TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Senate members participated on the following task forces and special committees:

- Joint Senate/Administrative Work Group on Rebenching
- UC Online Education Advisory Committee and Work Groups
- Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Salary Scales
- UC Merced Chancellor Search Committee

- Los Alamos National Laboratory Director Search Committee

## **REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS AND INITIATIVES**

In addition to the proposals noted above (e.g., Funding Streams), the Senate conducted a systemwide review of the Library Planning Task Force Report. Divisional and committee responses emphasized: 1) greater consultation with faculty and faculty involvement in decisions regarding how best to use library resources is needed; and 2) the call for boycotting high-priced publications and publishing in open access journals can only be effected with institutional support and a change in the culture of the peer review system.

Council also wrote three letters ([March 8](#), [June 24](#) and [August 15](#)) to the administration regarding Working Smarter projects, all of which called for including faculty in developing and evaluating the projects. As a result, a Senate representative was named to the Working Smarter steering committee, Senate standing committees were invited to appoint participants to the Work Groups, and the administration plans to regularly report to the relevant standing committees on specific efficiency projects. Council also urged that Working Smarter projects be evaluated to ensure that they enhance productivity and save money without merely shifting administrative burden to faculty and other staff.

## **REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)**

Council reviewed and commented on proposed technical revisions to APM -075, Part III. C. 1; 110-4; 140-33-b.; 230-4; 230-17; 240-18; 240-20; 240-60; 246-18; 246-20; 246-60; 500-16. Council had no objections, but did make two suggestions to clarify the proposed language.

In addition, certain standing committees provided feedback on several targeted reviews (limiting feedback to relevant committees), and management reviews, which are initial reviews of draft language to be proposed, circulated for feedback prior to a full systemwide review. These included proposed revisions to APM 670 (Health Science Compensation Plan) and a proposed new APM 668 which would enable general campus faculty to negotiate part of their salary, similar to the provision in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan.

In January, Council adopted a resolution requesting administrative review of a revision to [APM 010 and 015](#) (academic freedom). This revision was proposed by UCAF in response to court decisions that narrowed the scope of academic freedom by threatening the freedom of faculty to express opinions on institutional policy, which could in turn limit the effectiveness of shared governance. The proposed language was reviewed and endorsed by the Senate but has not yet been accepted by the Administration.

On the advice of UCAP, Council recommended to the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel that “above scale” be replaced by “[distinguished professor](#)” in the APM. Council also endorsed UCFW’s request for a review of APM 510 on [intercampus transfers](#).

## **RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES**

Joint Administrative/Senate Retreat

The Academic Council meets in alternate years with the Chancellors and with the Executive Vice Chancellors to discuss matters of joint concern. This year, Council members met with the Executive Vice Chancellors in October to discuss: 1) salary scales; 2) post-employment benefits; and 3) funding of the 2012 admissions process under the new eligibility policy.

### The Regents

The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. In addition, Regent Reiss attended the May Council meeting.

### ICAS

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates is a group representing the faculty Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California. The group was particularly active in advocacy efforts in the state capitol and made multiple visits to legislators and other policymakers. It also cooperated in ongoing efforts to ease transfer between the CCCs and CSU or UC, including development of a CCC Associate Degree for Transfer.

## **SENATE POSITIONS ON STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION**

- The Senate opposed AB 7 (Portantino), which would prohibit a person employed by the state whose base salary is greater than \$150,000 per year from receiving a salary increase or bonus while employed in the same position.
- The Senate opposed AB 620 (Block), which requested that the Regents adopt policies on harassment, intimidation, and bullying because a) the University already has policies and programs to ensure diversity; b) the bill stipulates training faculty to generate inclusive curricula, which violates principles of academic freedom; and c) it could impose unnecessary and costly compliance burdens.
- The Senate opposed AB 661 (Block) which would authorize the San Diego Community College District to establish a baccalaureate degree pilot program because it would violate the fundamental principles of California's Master Plan for Higher Education.
- The Senate opposed on the grounds of academic freedom AB 675 (Hagman), which would prevent state licensing boards from approving continuing education courses with "pro-labor" course content.
- The Senate urged the University to remain neutral on SB 185 (Hernandez) due to significant implementation difficulties, although it supports the bill's intent to provide campuses more flexibility to increase the diversity of their student bodies. SB 185 would authorize UC and CSU to "... consider race, gender, ethnicity, and national origin, along with other relevant factors, in undergraduate and graduate admissions."
- Deferring to what it believed was the University position, the Senate took a neutral position on SB 259 (Hancock), which would classify student workers whose work is related to their educational experience as "employees." Such a classification would make GSRs eligible for unionization. The Senate expressed concern about the educational effects of such a move on this class of graduate student worker.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our sincere gratitude to all members of the University of California Office of the President for their hard work and productive collaboration with the Academic Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank these senior UC managers who, as consultants to the Academic Council, were vital to our meetings: Mark G. Yudof, President; Provost and Executive Vice President Lawrence Pitts; Executive Vice President-Business Operations Nathan Brostrom; Associate Vice President-Policy and Analysis Marsha Kelman; and Vice President-Budget and Capital Resources Patrick Lenz.

Daniel Simmons, Chair  
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair

### **Divisional Chairs:**

Fiona Doyle, Berkeley  
Robert Powell, Davis  
Alan Barbour, Irvine  
Ann Karagozian, Los Angeles  
Evan Heit, Merced  
Mary Gauvain, Riverside  
Frank Powell, San Diego  
Elena Fuentes-Afflick, San Francisco  
Henning Bohn, Santa Barbara  
Susan Gillman, Santa Cruz

### **Senate Committee Chairs:**

William Jacob, BOARS  
James Carmody, CCGA  
Francis Lu, UCAAD  
Ahmet Palazoglu, UCAP  
David Kay, UCEP  
Joel Dimsdale, UCFW  
Phokion Kolaitis, UCORP  
James Chalfant, UCPB

### **Council Staff:**

Martha Winnacker, Executive Director  
Todd Giedt, Associate Director  
Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst