

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

## Minutes of Meeting

February 26, 2014

**I. Consent Calendar**

1. February 26, 2014 Academic Council Agenda
2. January 29, 2014 Academic Council Meeting Minutes
3. UCEP letter to WASC re: Role of WASC at UC Irvine

**Action:** Council approved the February 2014 agenda and the January 2014 minutes. Council agreed to remove the UCEP letter from the consent calendar and discuss it later in the meeting as new business.

**II. Senate Officers' Announcements**

- o Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair
- o Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Vice Chair
- o Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Next Assembly and Council Meetings: The Assembly of the Academic Assembly will hold a teleconference meeting on April 16 to ratify Council's election of the 2014-15 Council vice chair. Council will elect a vice chair at its April 2 meeting.

Academic Planning Council: At its February meeting, the Academic Planning Council discussed the Senate's [comments](#) about the proposed revised policy for Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP), revisions to the Compendium, a "presidential policy" for open access, and a draft enrollment planning document.

ACSCOLI Annual Report: Council received the 2012-13 annual report of the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues as information.

Composite Benefit Rates: Chair Jacob has made a new request to UCOP for information about the financial effect of the proposed Composite Benefit Rate (CBR) models on each campus, including information about which employee groups and benefits are covered under each model, the combined benefit expense for each group, and other data. Chair Jacob will circulate a summary of what he has learned about the current models and their projected impact on faculty contracts and grants, which could total between \$40 million and \$45 million for faculty with summer salary and those with a "y" salary component. Chair Jacob will also ask that the CBR models and their effect on graduate student funding be discussed at a future Regents meeting. UCOP says CBRs are required to align with the UC Path project, which is projected to be implemented at UCOP on January 1 and at UC Merced on April 1, 2015.

**III. Systemwide Review of APM 035**

**Issue:** Council reviewed a draft memo to the vice provost for academic personnel commenting on proposed revisions to APM 035 and the President’s Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence. Prior to the meeting, Chair Jacob received Council’s consent to send the vice provost a memo stating that Council did not object to the removal of the Presidential Policy from the Appendices of APM 035 and that Council understood that the policy would issue in February to meet the requirements of the federal 2013 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act but that revisions would continue. The vice provost acknowledged that she would be recommending further revisions to the policy in the coming months based on the substantial input from the Senate and others.

Eight Senate divisions and three systemwide committees submitted comments. Most reviewers expressed general support for the specific policy revisions, but reviewers also highlighted vague and confusing language, inconsistencies in style and tone, and other problematic areas. The memo notes that the revisions need clarification in the areas of 1) definitions; 2) consistency across the policy; 3) training; and 4) applicability to off-campus locations, before Council can fully support them.

**Action:** Council voted unanimously to forward the memo to the vice provost as written.

#### **IV. Systemwide Review of Senate Bylaw 55**

**Issue:** The Academic Council asked the San Diego division to revise its proposed [amendment to Bylaw 55](#) to address concerns raised in the fall 2013 systemwide Senate review, and to resubmit the revision to Council for its consideration and a second review. San Diego has proposed a rewording of the amendment, which would allow a department or school in the Health Sciences to extend voting privileges on personnel matters, including rank and step, to non-Senate members upon a two-thirds vote of the department’s faculty, and require reconsideration of the privilege after a year if requested by a Senate member of the department. San Diego’s rewording maintains those basic provisions, but clarifies that the vote to extend privileges would be limited to faculty with the rank of Associate Professor and higher, and that the votes of Senate and non-Senate faculty would be reported separately. The revised proposal would also require prior approval by the divisions or their legislative assemblies before departments or schools could consider extending the vote.

UCSD Chair Pogliano noted that San Diego views the Bylaw amendment as a way to address the disenfranchisement felt by a large and growing number of contingent faculty who are an important part of the academic community and support UC’s teaching mission substantially, but lack the privileges and protections of Senate membership. This issue is particularly acute in the Health Sciences where a large proportion of faculty are non-Senate members. Other Council members agreed, and one noted that additional voting rights could help with recruitment and retention. Other members, however, noted that contingent faculty are not engaged in UC’s scholarly research mission and are held to different academic standards from Senate faculty. As such, they should not be able to influence personnel decisions related to Senate faculty.

It was noted that the possibility of reporting a separate non-Senate member “advisory vote” to CAP is already available and is used on some campuses. The proposed revision would not change the ability of campuses to take separate votes, or force them to do so, but it would

increase the recognition of non-Senate faculty and the advisory vote mechanism in Senate bylaws. It was noted that voting is a matter of local discretion, and campuses generally prefer discretion. Systemwide policy should, as a rule, enable rather than restrict. It was noted that the growth of contingent faculty is not limited to the Health Sciences but extends throughout UC's academic enterprise; therefore, it may be logical to broaden the proposed voting extension provision to all non-Senate members.

**Motion:** A motion was made and seconded to remove the phrase "in Health Sciences" from San Diego's revision and to send the amended revision for a 60-day Senate review in time for discussion at the April 30 meeting.

A friendly amendment to the motion was made and seconded to send two versions of the revised amendment for Senate review, the first as proposed by San Diego, and the second with the phrase "in Health Sciences" removed.

**Action:** The motion passed 13 to 1 with one abstention. It was also agreed that the Senate office would ask UCRJ to review the amendment.

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

- Janet Napolitano, President
- Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President (phone)

**President Napolitano:** The President and her CSU and California Community College counterparts recently testified before the state Assembly Appropriations Committee about the need to invigorate the Master Plan for Education to ensure it remains strong and relevant. The President is moving forward with a Food Initiative, a Challenge Grant initiative, and her UC-Mexico initiative, focusing on issues such as student and faculty exchanges, certification, and the role of Casa de California, UC's property in Mexico City. UCOP will present systemwide results of the UC Campus Climate Survey at the March Regents meeting; that 2012 survey of UC faculty, staff, and students was the most comprehensive of its kind conducted by an American university. The Transfer Action Team report will be discussed at the May Regents meeting in Sacramento. Many of the recommendations will involve relatively simple administrative fixes; however, the harder work—marking the transfer requirements simpler and more transparent—will require Senate involvement. UC is negotiating with AFSCME to prevent a potential strike by UC service workers.

**Q:** It would be useful to compare the Climate Survey results across campuses. What is the mechanism for interested parties on one campus to obtain the results from other UC locations? Also, is there a plan to solicit feedback from faculty about the results?

**A:** First, the reports are not "University of California" reports, but the product of an independent outside consultant. The consultant's survey results for all campuses will be posted on a central website with identical formatting, making it easy to compare the results for each location. The raw data for each campus will remain restricted to each campus; although researchers who wish to conduct scholarly research using the results may request data from the campus. Campuses have been allowed to provide limited feedback to the consultant, and leaders at each location have been encouraged to brief the Senate. Each campus has an engagement plan to address issues raised in the report.

**Q:** Can you tell us more about your new Food Initiative and President's Challenge Grant Initiative?

**A:** The Food Initiative is intended to organize, enhance, and leverage UC's far-reaching expertise and research activity around food, health, economics, agriculture, and food security, to make UC a national and international leader on the wide range of issues related to food. I have asked each chancellor to appoint a faculty representative to a systemwide Working Group who can bring forward information about the efforts already underway. The Challenge Grant is designed to provide funding for mostly junior faculty members who are having difficulty breaking into the NIH or NSF system. I envision it as a peer reviewed competition with 4 to 6 annual awards with final selections made by UC's Nobel Prize winners.

**Q:** How does the UC-Mexico Initiative differ from UC MEXUS?

**A:** We are taking an inventory of all existing Mexico programs to understand how they relate to each other and their effectiveness. California and Mexico have a unique relationship, and we have an opportunity to "up our game" by, for example, increasing the number of student exchanges and increasing collaborations in engineering, law, and other areas.

**Q:** How do you plan to involve the Senate in the further development of these and other initiatives?

**A:** I am open to Senate ideas and input on these and other initiatives to the extent that they impact the academic enterprise. That is part of why I attend Council meeting, to let you know what is going on and to get advice. But I am not sure the formal, rules-driven Senate process is the best place for them to be vetted. There has already been a lot of faculty input into the Challenge Grant Initiative, and we will also be briefing the UC Committee on Research Policy about the Challenge Grant and Food initiatives.

**Comment:** The University is a process-driven, thought-driven institution, and these initiatives relate closely to the academic mission. To the extent that you can engage and consult the Senate before the announcement of the initiatives and subject them to additional, substantive faculty input, it would help us move forward as a whole university. Also, the Senate has broad expertise and can help you meet your goal of reducing outside consultant costs. Moreover, consulting only administrators, who may not understand the full picture, can sometimes be a fast way to go slow.

**Q:** Have you settled on an investment level for your technology transfer initiative and a team to lead it? There might be ways to stimulate technology transfer and eliminate administrative barriers that can help support faculty on the campuses.

**A:** I am meeting with Silicon Valley leaders about how to increase and enhance linkages with investors and other issues later this week. I am also talking with UC's Office of General Counsel about how to streamline processes. I want to get beyond the notion that entrepreneurship conflicts with the teaching and research mission.

**Q:** The California Budget Project pointed out that the Governor's UC budget is 25% below what the university needs. Can you discuss UC's advocacy efforts in Sacramento?

**A:** We consider the Governor's budget a good start, but only a start. We know that it does not meet all our needs, and we are clear about that in our negotiations with him and with the Legislature. We also need to demonstrate to the Governor that we are working to meet the cost

curve, including the pension deficit. There are several key moments in the process we will be watching closely, including the updated state revenue estimate and the May budget revision.

**Q:** Can you verify that UC has offered to freeze health care rates for AFSCME workers?

**A:** This offer would apply to the Kaiser rates for the lowest two pay bands of AFSCME workers and is the result of a negotiation with Kaiser.

**Q:** We are concerned about new anti-gay legislation in Uganda and its effect on some of UCSF's health sciences programs, students, and faculty. Will you make a statement about this?

**A:** Thank you for raising this issue. It is a terrible law. We will look into it.

Provost Dorr: The Provost joined the meeting by phone from Sacramento, where she had just testified at a CA Senate joint Education-Budget Committee Hearing on Accountability for Postsecondary Education Performance. The hearing covered goal-setting around the broad topics of workforce needs; equity, access, and success; and cost, affordability and efficiency. Policymakers are concerned that California will not produce enough college-educated people to meet its future workforce needs, and some have suggested that the community colleges should offer bachelor's degrees. At the hearing, the Provost discussed UC's outcomes and improvements over time in time-to-degree, transfer, access to underrepresented groups and other performance areas, and stressed that high quality undergraduate and graduate education prepares students for changing workforce needs.

**Q:** Do you get a sense that the Legislature understands that California cannot have a one-size-fits-all accountability system for the three higher education segments?

**A:** Yes, I think they recognize that the three segments have different goals and missions that should be respected. We also need to take into account different emphases or foci within each segment.

The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative is currently funding a total of about 30 online courses that will be available systemwide for cross-campus enrollment. Some campus administrators are concerned that the UCOP will not provide enough ILTI funding to meet the full campus costs associated with offering the courses to students on more than one campus. ILTI funds will be distributed to the campuses for to support the creation of online courses available for cross-campus enrollment, with the agreement that additional funding can be requested if needed to achieve the ILTI goals.

## **VI. General Discussion**

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

## **VII. Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policies and Protocols**

**Issue:** Council reviewed a draft memo summarizing responses from Senate divisions and committees to the revised policy for proposing and approving Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) and changes to PDST levels (Regents Policy 3103), and the accompanying set of Presidential Implementation Protocols for PDSTs. The memo reflects substantial concerns about

onerous reporting requirements, confusion about how to differentiate self-supporting graduate professional degree (SSGPDP) programs from programs eligible to charge PDST, and concerns about the impact of high-fee professional and self-supporting programs on access, diversity, and UC's public mission.

It was noted that the comments reflect a tension between sectors of the university that want to open up the academic enterprise to more high-fee professional degree programs and eliminate administrative barriers to them, and sectors that are concerned about the impact of those programs on access and the public mission of the university. In addition, the policy could encourage state-supported professional degree programs to convert to self-supporting status in order to avoid the complex approval process required for PDST. It was noted this tension highlights the lack of principles that would distinguish PDST-eligible programs from SSGPDPs. It will not be possible to completely resolve these issues because the rapidly changing academic landscape turns policies into moving targets. UCOP should not treat the two policies in isolation from each other, but should reconsider them together with the potential goal of developing an integrated Fee-Based Professional Degree Program Policy.

**Action:** Council agreed to send forward a memo that is revised with the new commentary.

### **VIII. Proposed Revisions to APM 025 and 670, and proposed new APM 671**

Council reviewed a draft memo summarizing responses from Senate committees and divisions to the proposed revisions to APM 025 (Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities of Faculty Members) and APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan); and the proposed new APM 671 (Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities of HSCP Participants). Most Senate reviewers supported the revisions as written but they also identified a few specific issues that require clarification.

Council members suggested a number of minor changes to the memo and noted that it should express appreciation for the vice provost's responsiveness to the comments and concerns Senate reviewers expressed during the management review.

**Action:** Council agreed to send forward the memo with minor editorial changes.

### **IX. Metrics and the Academic Senate**

- Peter Krapp, Chair, Irvine Division

UCI Division Chair Krapp noted that the university spends a great deal of time and effort designing and reporting data in response to external political requests, but less on internal questions. He noted that to the extent the Senate has access to data, its interpretation may differ from the administration. He asked Council members to consider the role of the Senate in data collection, analysis, and stewardship, especially concerning faculty effort and performance. It would behoove the Senate to be more involved in the governance of data production by UC and by outside firms like Academic Analytics that provide powerful tools that are used for peer and institutional benchmarking in some contexts. Council might also consider forming a special ad hoc committee on faculty metrics and data to advise Council and track trends over time.

Members noted that there are growing amounts of comparative data related to faculty productivity, but less about administrative productivity; and the Senate can help data designers understand limitations—for example, with regard to longitudinal pay equity data.

## **X. Graduation Indicators**

- Pamela Brown, Vice President for Institutional Research and Academic Planning

**Issue:** After UCOP's May 2013 presentation to the Regents on academic indicators, the Governor and Chair Lansing asked for more analysis into the factors associated with bachelor degree completion rates and time-to-degree. Vice President Brown presented an overview of the analyses completed so far in preparation for the March 2014 Regent's presentation.

The new analysis focuses on effective strategies for improving “normative” graduation rates (4 years for freshmen; 2 years for transfers) and retention rates by reducing drop-outs, and the factors associated with outcomes. The Governor was specifically interested in how part-time work, disciplinary differences, and a student's “sense of belonging” affect outcomes.

The study found that most freshmen graduate in 4 years; most transfers graduate in 2 years; and only a very small proportion of freshmen remains enrolled after 6 years. About 14% of freshmen and 8% of transfers leave their original campus without a degree within 4 years and 2 years respectively, and about 2.8% of freshmen graduate outside the UC system. The first year or two is critical; transfers and freshmen who leave tend to do so within the first one or two years respectively. The study also found that engineering, computer science, and physical science majors take slightly longer to graduate and accumulate slightly more units; however, most students do not accumulate UC units significantly in excess of those required for graduation. The study also found that the summer term following the fourth year for freshmen and second year for transfers (the “summer bump”), is a significant contributor (an average of 9 and 12 points respectively) to normative graduation rates. It was noted that campuses are encouraging faculty to consider streamlining “high unit” majors in ways that do not degrade quality.

The study found that a negative answer to the UCUES survey question “I feel like I belong on this campus” correlates with lower completion rates, and a student's sense of belonging may be affected by their background and academic preparation.

Pell grant status, first-generation status, and the Academic Performance Index ranking of the high school are three key background factors that affect normative graduation rates. Each of the factors has a roughly equivalent impact, but they are also additive, and students from underrepresented backgrounds are more likely to have one or more of the factors. Students with higher incoming GPAs tend to graduate earlier, and students with one or more of the key factors tend to have lower incoming GPAs.

The average completed units per term rose from 13.1 to 13.9 between 1999-00 and 2012-13; however, students need to complete 15 units per term to be on-track to graduate in normative time. The number of units taken per term varies by discipline and is affected by the three key background factors. Working up to 15 hours per week does not significantly affect graduation rates or academic performance, but there are few UC students who work more than 15 hours.

Changing majors and having multiple majors may increase units or delay graduation slightly, but these factors also increase the overall likelihood of graduation.

There are significant efforts on campuses to understand and address the challenges facing underrepresented and at risk populations, including summer bridge programs, advising support, campus climate initiatives, tracking progression to degree, support for students working 20+ hours, and cohort or learning communities. But campuses are in different places and need to apply different strategies.

Members noted that it would be useful for UCOP to examine the correlation of part-time work with the three risk factors; to undertake a sensitivity analysis regarding the risk factors; and to gather data on the number of lower division courses transfer students take after they arrive at UC to address a concern that transfers repeat classes at UC.

## **XI. New Business**

1. UCAAD Chair Roxworthy introduced an item of new business, UCAAD's request that Council ask Senate divisions to review UCAAD's May 2005 best practice [recommendations](#) for increasing the visibility, authority, and status of local diversity committees. UCAAD is concerned that the recommendations have not been implemented to a sufficient degree on some campuses, and that diversity committees and concerns continue to be marginalized. UCAAD wants divisions to review the recommendations and discuss the extent to which they might be implemented.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to send the divisions a letter that attaches the UCAAD request. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Senate Director Winnacker noted that campus administrators have assembled a list of concerns about UCOP processes they find unnecessary or burdensome. She asked Council members to review the list and send comments to the Senate leadership.
3. Letter to WASC: UCEP has asked Council to forward to WASC a memo from the Irvine division's Assessment Committee expressing concerns about new mandated measures in the WASC accreditation process. The letter notes that some of the new reporting requirements around retention and graduation rates, and the "public good" are redundant with the information the university already compiles and submits through existing mechanisms. The letter also expresses concerns about encroachments onto the faculty's prerogative to determine what constitutes "quality" in a degree and urges against a "one size fits all approach" to reporting for for-profit institutions and institutions like UC. It was agreed that the Council cover memo should reference the two documents on accreditation issues that UCEP produced in 2012.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst