

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, January 29, 2014****I. Senate Officers' Announcements**

1. Report on January Regents meeting. Chair Jacob summarized highlights of the Regents meeting.
2. Conversation with the President. Chair Jacob reported that he and Vice Chair Gilly have regular meetings with the president and her chief of staff.
3. UCEP letter to divisions on SR 760. UCEP sent a letter stating that each division should determine whether their definition of unit credit is sufficiently clear to comply with the new WASC regulation. Divisions should review and revise their regulations on what constitutes a credit hour, if necessary. Chair Jacob asked divisions to submit their definitions to UCEP for discussion.
4. UCPB letter on Composite Benefit Rates. UCPB has written supporting the position that benefits should be charged only to salaries that accrue benefits. CFO Taylor will provide members of UCFW and UCPB with the composite benefit rate models in a teleconference on Friday.
5. Academic Planning Council. The APC met yesterday. It received an update on the development of a Presidential policy on Open Access. Former UCOLASC chair Chris Kelty is leading the effort and expects to have a draft ready for review this spring. The APC finished working on revisions to the Compendium sections that govern MRUs and MRPs. They will go out for systemwide review. APC engaged in a preliminary discussion of principles to guide enrollment planning. It also established a task force to work on a policy framework for international activities, chaired by Santa Cruz division chair Joe Konopelski.

II. Approval of the agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved with following changes—the Assembly agenda was discussed under New Business, and BOARS proposal to revise SR 465 was withdrawn at the request of the BOARS chair.

III. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved as noticed.

IV. Moreno Report

DISCUSSION: Chair Jacob reported that he presented the report of the joint Senate-Administration Work Group on the Moreno report to the Chancellors and the Vice Chancellors. The president's response is posted on UC's website. Her letter gives the Chancellors latitude to create their own campus structures for responding to reports of harassment and discrimination. She also has asked the Senate, the provost and the Chancellors to form a work group to specify a common set of data on discrimination that all campuses should collect and analyze while

protecting privacy and confidentiality. The provost plans to hire a systemwide anti-discrimination officer who could convene the counterparts on the campuses to discuss best practices and who would also serve UCOP.

V. Update on Pension and Health Benefits Issues

DISCUSSION: UCFW Chair Dan Hare provided a primer on UCRP and possible future contribution scenarios. He stated that UCFW's Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) has been working on a funding proposal that he hopes to present to Council soon.

VI. UCPB Letter on UC Capital Outlay Program

Council did not have time for a full discussion of this issue.

VII. Consultation with Senior Managers

Provost Dorr. Provost Dorr said that the final report of the climate survey for every campus will be released after they are presented to the Regents in March. Subsequently, campuses will be expected to identify any problems and create a plan to address them. UCOP will convene meetings to share ideas about how campuses can address such issues. The Provost noted that a number of policies are being developed or reviewed under her auspices. These include the Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program policy, the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition policy, and the Open Access policy. She also plans to convene an advisory group to combine ILTI and UCOE into one organization and decide what is appropriately done at UCOP and what should be done at the campuses.

President Napolitano. President Napolitano said she and the heads of the CSU and CCC systems made a presentation to the Regents on the Master Plan. The three system heads plan to collaborate on improving student transfer rates and success. The transfer initiative is focused on "operations issues," e.g., establishing a web portal that tracks student progress and prompts them to take courses tailored to their major interest, and that provides accurate financial aid information. While we are not currently increasing the number of transfer students we accept, if we are successful in streamlining the transfer process, we need plan for greater capacity in the long term. She also noted that at the Regents meeting she announced a flat budget for UCOP, which means that units must absorb mandatory cost increases, a cap on the number of UCOP employees, a 10% travel reduction, and approval for the use of consultants.

President Napolitano stated that she is exploring a new initiative that aims to coordinate and strengthen UC's partnership with Mexican institutions. An initial meeting took place yesterday; Provost Dorr and UC Riverside Chancellor Wilcox are coordinating.

President Napolitano thanked the faculty for their work on the response to the Moreno report. It was real, substantive, and valuable. She discussed the report of the joint work group with the Chancellors and issued a letter outlining next steps.

Finally, she noted that she had a discussion with students via Google Hangout and wants to consider doing a similar chat with faculty.

Q: What is the goal of the transfer initiative?

A: Provost Dorr noted that the initiative addresses broad goals for the system. The data show that UC is doing a good job with graduation rates and time-to-degree of students who transfer, but application rates and transfer student preparation are challenges. So the initiative will likely focus on easier transfer pathways, helping students make informed choices early in their CCC careers to be prepared for all UCs, providing accurate financial information about the cost of a UC education, and broader outreach.

Q: What was the Governor's reaction to your presentation on the Master Plan?

A: President Napolitano replied that the governor appreciated that the three segments are working together. I will be part of a joint presentation to each of their boards this spring. Together, we aim to revitalize the system of higher education in California and secure greater public support.

EVP Brostrom. Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President of Business Operations, reported that the governor's budget provided no surprises. It includes an expected 5% increase in UC's base budget and no extra funds for capital projects or UCRP, even though the general fund has increased by 8.5%. He noted that the Speaker of the Assembly issued a "blueprint" which implied that higher education could receive additional funding. If revenues are greater than anticipated, UC will ask for one-time monies for UCRP (which impacts our operating budget), enrollment growth and the capital infrastructure to support growth, and deferred maintenance. UC continues to ask for parity with CSU in terms of pension funds. We will also compete for cap and trade funds from the Air Resources Board and ask for Proposition 39 funds for "shovel ready projects."

Q: Will any one-time funds for construction at Merced?

A: EVP Brostrom replied that UC would prefer a block grant that is not tied to specific projects, but that UC Merced's capital needs are one of the University's highest priorities.

Comment: When you talk to legislators, please emphasize the unique mission of UC as a research university and how it differs from the other segments of higher education in California.

A: EVP Brostrom said that legislators are very responsive when we talk about the medical enterprise, job creation and how UC leverages other dollars for research. At this point, UC receives twice as much in federal dollars as we do in state appropriations. President Napolitano noted that there also is a clear relationship between UC's research mission and its capital needs.

Q: It is clear that the governor is not interested in long term funding commitments, yet you are asking for funding for student growth. How do you square that?

A: EVP Brostrom said that while the governor is not interested in enrollment growth, legislators are. Also, the governor is interested in increasing the number of transfer students, which implies enrollment growth.

Q: Who decides on the allocation of funds for capital projects among the campuses?

A: EVP Brostrom said that UC's highest priorities are facilities to accommodate enrollment growth, particularly at Merced, and seismic remediation. He noted that given the system's substantial capital needs, UC may advocate for a general obligation bond ballot issue in 2016.

Q: My faculty colleagues are expressing concerns about the long-term viability of UCRP, which is an issue when we recruit new faculty. A few years ago, the Regents approved a funding plan to achieve a healthy pension system, but UC has deviated from it.

A: EVP Brostrom stated that UC has not deviated from the plan. All of the labor unions have the same normal cost as non-represented employees (some unions are paying 9%, not 8%, in order to provide the same level of benefits for all its members, obviating the “new tier”). On its current path, UCRP will be 90% funded by 2042.

Comment: The plan specified that UC would reach the full Annual Required Contribution by 2018, which will require an 18% employer contribution. The employer contribution is now 14%.

A: If we raise it to 18%, UCRP will be overfunded. We have used conservative assumptions on payroll, returns and headcount, which makes the system look underfunded.

Comment: Because the state is not paying into UCRP, the funds come out of the operating budget, which affects faculty and the University’s core mission. Next year the employer contribution will cost UC \$1.35B, an expense that campuses did not even have several years ago.

AVP Debora Obley. Debbie Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources, said that SB 195 outlined goals for California higher education, and requires reporting on certain performance outcomes. Most of the requested data is in the Annual Accountability Report. We will challenge some requests, providing a rationale for why the data requested do serve as meaningful indicators.

AVP Obley also reported that UCOP is undertaking a long-range enrollment plan to 2020. This includes developing projections of eligible graduating seniors in order to better understand the magnitude of our obligation under the Master Plan in the coming years. If this requires growth, the campus plans will have to be changed because they currently do not anticipate much growth.

Finally, she reported that UCOP is developing an interactive model that we will estimate cost of instruction. It is based on Campus Financial Schedules and allows one to change variables, such as weights for different types of students. They have examined various methodologies for estimating cost of instruction. Issue to consider in choosing a methodology include whether to calculate the true cost of a high quality education or expenditures on instruction after an era of cuts, and the costs of different types of instruction, such as graduate vs. undergraduate and instruction in the health sciences versus on the general campuses. We need an intellectually plausible and defensible explanation that reflects the cost of education at a research university.

VIII. General Discussion

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

IX. Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Program Policy Review

ISSUE: Council discussed responses to the review of the proposed changes to the SSGPDP policy.

DISCUSSION: Chair Jacob stated that the Academic Planning Council will hold a dedicated teleconference to reach conclusions about this policy next month. Senate comments will be considered together with comments from the EVCs. Council members critiqued the proposal for lacking criteria for determining whether a program is eligible for self-supporting status and asked how to distinguish between a SSGPDP and a state-supported program that charges Professional

Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). Criteria for conversions also should be defined. Council also discussed the role of the faculty in ensuring the quality of all programs, and its concern about the potential of SSGPDPs to divert resources from departments' core academic mission. Conversely, Council members expressed concern regarding how to maintain quality in self-supporting programs, particularly the need to have the same proportion of Senate faculty teaching in SSGPDPs as in state-supported programs, and for Senate faculty to direct the SSGPDPs. Council members discussed their desire for the language in the policy on financial accessibility to be strengthened. Additionally, the policy is silent on diversity. Given UC's public mission, the policy should require that diversity goals are articulated. There should be accountability goals for access and diversity. Members agreed that the policy is not ready to go forward without further revision and review.

ACTION: Council asked Chair Jacob to draft a letter reflecting its discussion, which will be reviewed at Council's teleconference on February 5.

X. Systemwide Review of Senate Bylaw 55

ISSUE: Council discussed the responses to the review of the proposal to amend SB 55.

DISCUSSION: Chair Jacob noted that the San Diego division's proposal to amend Bylaw 55 is the latest in a series of efforts to address equity issues that arise from the increasing number of non-Senate faculty, especially in our medical centers. The responses indicate continuing division. They include concern about diluting the authority of the Senate, especially in reviewing the Senate member's duties that are not shared by non-Senate faculty and the opportunity or threat of expanding privileges to additional non-Senate titles. Members also objected to a change in a systemwide bylaw to address a local issue. A division chair noted that some Faculty Executive Committees of medical schools at other campuses did not support the proposal. Members raised the objections that it is inappropriate for people ineligible to sit on CAP to be able to vote, and that the proposal could cause greater morale problems if implemented by some departments but not others. A member suggested that the responses to the review mean that Council can not approve the proposal as written, but several alternatives were posited, e.g., allowing departments to consider non-Senate advisory votes, which would not require a change to SB 55. A member countered that while advisory votes are widely used across the system, they are not a grant of voting rights to non-Senate faculty, which the proposal seeks. A member argued that some non-medical titles in the University perform research and teaching and that if the bylaw is changed, it should encompass those titles, as well. Two members declined to support the proposal as a systemwide change, but spoke in favor of campus flexibility to implement it. A counterproposal was suggested that would grant divisional Senates the right to decide whether the proposal is an appropriate choice for the division as a whole; this would require a change in the bylaw.

ACTION: A motion was made to withdraw the proposal. An amendment to the motion was made to request that the San Diego division revise the proposal in accordance with Council's discussion and resubmit it for Council's consideration and systemwide review. The amendment was accepted and the revised motion was unanimously approved.

XI. APM 035

Council did not have time to discuss this item.

XII. BOARS Proposal to Amend Senate Regulation 465

This item was withdrawn at the request of BOARS' Chair.

XIII. Update on Transfer Action Team

ISSUE: Council received an update on the progress of the Transfer Action Team, which is charged with developing plans for the President's transfer initiative and is co-chaired by BOARS Chair George Johnson and SVP Judy Sakaki.

DISCUSSION: Chair Johnson reported that the Transfer Action Team will hold its final in-person meeting to discuss its draft report. The draft recommendations include: providing consistent pre-major pathways with transfer model curricula; adopting the CCC/CSU's course identification (C-ID) system for articulation, where appropriate; standardizing individual course articulation for similar UC requirements across UC campuses; implementing holistic review for CCC transfer applicants; establishing Transfer Success Institutes; hiring an outreach coordinator at UCOP; visiting every CCC in the state at least once; initiating partnerships with 30 low-sending CCCs; developing technical improvements such as a student-centered web portal to push customized course requirement and financial aid information to the student, a prospect database, and an integrated set of tools for counselors (counselor focus groups, improving ASSIST and the UC Transfer Academic Planner); and expanding proven effective services such as guaranteed housing.

Chair Johnson noted that the Senate must be deeply involved in these efforts, noting that some divisions have examined their major preparation paths and evaluated available transfer model curricula, while other campuses have not.

XIV. New Business

Assembly Agenda. Council discussed the format of the Assembly meeting on February 12.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Attest: Bill Jacob, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Principal Committee Analyst