

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, April 24, 2013**

I. Senate Officers' Announcements

- 1. Report on online education meeting.** This will be discussed under Item IV.
- 2. Composite benefit update.** Vice Chair Jacob said that a new option to include up to 9 different rates may be explored. There has been no progress on excluding summer salaries.
- 3. Parliamentarian for June Assembly meeting and for 2013-16.** Chair Powell requested that divisions consider nominating candidates for parliamentarian for the 2013-16 term and to identify former parliamentarians who could serve at the June 12 Assembly meeting in case it is needed.
- 4. BOARS Statement on High School Mathematics Curriculum Development under the Common Core State Standards.** BOARS Chair Johnson said that a statement from BOARS on the Common Core math curriculum was requested by the people developing the state math curriculum to affirm that UC would approve of an integrated curriculum. A member suggested a modification in the final paragraph.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved.

III. Consent Calendar

- 1. Approve draft March Council minutes**
- 2. Approve appointment of former Assembly Parliamentarian Peter Berck (UCB) as Secretary/Parliamentarian pro tem for the June 12 Academic Assembly meeting**
- 3. Endorse BOARS' recommendation to adjust the statewide admissions index**

ACTION: The consent calendar was approved.

IV. Online Education

DISCUSSION: Council discussed the April 13 meetings on online education held at UCOP and UCI. A follow-up meeting will be held on May 4 for those who attended one of the earlier meetings. The details of the RFP will be discussed.

V. Campus Salary Equity Plans

ISSUE: In response to a request by Vice Provost Carlson, Chair Powell asked UCAAD, UCAP, and UCFW, as well as the divisional Senates to review the salary equity plans submitted by all of the campuses.

DISCUSSION: The responses of the three committees to the plans were critical. UCFW thinks the plans were too vague to properly evaluate, UCAAD would like the majority of them to be

resubmitted and while UCAP's letter said the plans met the requirements, UCAP Chair Harry Green reported that the committee did not find them to be satisfactory. Members said they were hoping to see best practices. UCAAD Chair Manuela Martins-Green noted that some did not even list which committees would be consulted. At one campus, an assistant provost wrote the plan without review by the Provost, Chancellor or Senate. Several members noted that their campus administrations are waiting for direction from UCOP and expect feedback on the plans. The next step is to form a task force to determine common metrics. Chair Powell said he would write a letter to Vice Provost Carlson discussing next steps and also asked the three committees to respond to the plan. He urged divisional Senate chairs to ensure that their Senates are engaged in the process. A member suggested stipulating in the letter to Vice Provost Carlson that the local Diversity, Academic Personnel, and Faculty Welfare committees be consulted on the development of the studies.

ACTION: Council authorized Chair Powell to write a letter to Vice Provost Carlson reflecting the discussion, above.

VI. UCFW Letter on Proposed Increases to UCRP Employer/Employee Contributions

ISSUE: UCFW submitted a letter supporting UCOP's plans for increasing employer and employee contributions to UCRP conditional on a corresponding salary increase of at least 3% for faculty and non-represented staff.

DISCUSSION: UCFW Chair Dan Hare said that UCOP is proposing an increase to UCRP contributions to 14% by the employer and 8% by the employee beginning on July 1, 2014. He stated that while UCFW places a high premium on the health of UCRP, it is concerned about total remuneration. UCFW decided to support the administration's proposal provided that an across the board cost of living increase for faculty and non-represented staff of at least 3% is provided to compensate for the two 1.5% increases in July 2013 and 2014 and to keep salaries from eroding further. He particularly noted the need to retain younger faculty with lower salaries who are mobile and more likely than older faculty to leave the University. A member commented that Council's previous position was that employee contributions should be no more than 7% and there should be a 2:1 employer/employee ratio for contributions. Chair Hare replied that the governor's pension reform holds that the employer and employee should contribute equally to retirement plans, so Council's previous position is now politically untenable.

Chair Hare stated that normal cost, the amount of funding needed to cover the cost of withdrawals, currently is 17.8%. The modified Annual Required Contribution (ARC), which also covers the debt and interest on the debt, is about 26%. By 2018 we will pay 30% of employee salaries to cover the ARC. UC has not contributed Modified ARC for the current year. The most up-to-date projections show that a 14% employer contribution results in UCRP being only 75% funded for many decades.

Two members expressed serious reservations about linking support for UCRP contribution increases with salary increases, noting that this is not the right time politically to propose salary increases. To explicitly link employee contributions to salary increases circumvents the will of legislators. Other members expressed support for the link, noting that it is never a good time politically to ask for increases, and that this would merely keep take-home pay constant. A member stated concern that young faculty will leave the University and it will become harder to attract the

best faculty if total remuneration is further eroded. Faculty will go on the market, get an offer, and use it to get an off-scale salary increment or leave. This is not an efficient way to do business--it takes time and effort and the best outcome is a retention fight. A member said the Senate's role is to advocate for the faculty.

A member asked whether UCFW's Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) or its Health Care Task Force has discussed the possibility of not providing retirees with cost of living increases, which are not funded. Chair Hare replied that funds for retiree health benefits do not come out of UCRP. The retiree health benefit is a relatively rare benefit for employers to provide. They may be smaller and less common in the future. However, that would require the Regents to modify the Post-Employment Benefits agreement. A member inquired about the status of the proposal to invest \$2B in STIP funds into UCRP. Chair Powell replied that leadership on the campuses has opposed investing the funds in UCRP and prefers investing them in L-TRIP, a new, longer term fund in riskier investments with the possibility of a greater return in order to use the proceeds to fund campus operations. TFIR thinks it is risky to count on a 4% return for operational costs that must be paid, and thinks it is wiser to invest the funds in UCRP. They are developing an alternate proposal for the use of STIP funds.

ACTION: Council voted unanimously to support the administration's proposal to increase UCRP contributions to 8% (employee) and 14% (employer) in July 2014.

ACTION: Council voted to endorse UCFW's letter proposing a salary increase of at least 3% for faculty and non-represented staff to off-set the increase in contributions to UCRP (14 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention).

VII. SR 478

ISSUE: In February, Council discussed BOARS' proposal to amend SR 478 to accommodate IGETC for STEM majors, which Council previously approved in concept as part of the new transfer admissions policy (SR 476) approved by the Assembly in June 2012. BOARS has also proposed additional technical revisions and changes for clarity. Divisional chairs requested time for their campus committees to review the proposal.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Johnson reviewed the changes made to the draft in response to the systemwide review.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the proposed revisions for forwarding to the Assembly for consideration.

VIII. UCOE Copyright Agreement

ISSUE: Council revisited the issues surrounding the UCOE copyright agreement.

DISCUSSION: A member stated that it is important for the Senate to provide information to faculty about the implications of the copyright agreement. Will faculty be required to sign a similar agreement for courses developed through the RFP process? UC has a policy that states if a faculty member creates something using extra resources, they must sign an individual contract. What kind of contracts are in use at other institutions or through University Extension? A member commented that faculty should not rely on the OP Office of General Counsel for an opinion; we should instead

get independent opinions from specialists in the law schools. Please refer any faculty who are willing to help to the Senate office. A member stated that many campuses have developed contracts for online courses. How will the central UCOP contract relate to the campus contracts? A member suggested that the appropriate model may be a work for hire model. A course is not like a textbook--it's an educational product and process. It includes not just content, but decisions like how to teach, how to use Teaching Assistants, etc. How can faculty retain oversight? A member expressed discomfort with the concept of losing ownership over a course. It was clarified that under the University policy on ownership of course materials, the course outline belongs to the University, but lecture notes belong to the faculty member. Senate Executive Director Winnacker noted that a work group that includes Senate representatives has been formed at UCOP to examine issues of copyright. She is also serving as a consultant to the committee.

IX. APM 430 Final Review

ISSUE: APM 430 would create a new title for short-term student or faculty visitors to the University. The Senate reviewed the proposal in the fall; Vice Provost Carlson has requested final review of the amended language.

DISCUSSION: Several Council members questioned whether accommodating short-term visitors requires a change to the APM, whether it is appropriate to add titles of non-employees to the APM, and why so much effort is being expended on reviewing policies applying to a few people.

ACTION: Chair Powell will draft a letter synthesizing Council's concerns.

X. New Business: National Science Foundation Survey on Investigators' Administrative Workload. UCORP Chair Mike Kleeman noted that the NSF is distributing an important survey on administrative overhead on faculty time and asked how UC can respond to it without too much faculty effort.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm

Attest: Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst