

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, July 28, 2010****I. Announcements**

- 1. Letters from President Yudof requesting Senate action.** The Senate office received two letters from President Yudof—one requesting clarification of issues raised by the Academic Council’s downsizing recommendation to the Commission on the Future, and one requesting that the Senate work to streamline the transfer process by adopting uniform lower division major requirements. A member noted that the Commission did not discuss developing uniform requirements, rather, the Size and Shape Working Group recommended identifying commonalities. Vice Chair Simmons responded that he and Chair Powell have written a letter to President Yudof noting this and seeking a change in the language of the recommendation. A member commented on the risk for the Senate of creating its own plan for downsizing. Chair Powell stated that he sees an opportunity in the crisis to shape recommendations. A member noted that budget analysis should be framed in faculty-friendly language. Also, Senate leaders have worked with State Governmental Relations Director Steve Juarez to craft substitute language for AB2302. The revised language would ask UC to continue its work to facilitate transfer and to design transfer requirements at designated UC campuses in collaboration with CCC faculty. A member noted that there is no data showing that there is a problem with transferring to UC, and questioned how many more transfer students UC can accommodate. A member noted that the real problem is access to the state’s universities due to curtailing enrollment and fewer seats in classes. A member commented that the Senate should implement the Commission recommendations in a thoughtful and deliberative way and resist pressure to accelerate the process.
- 2. Letter co-signed by UCOLASC chair regarding possible boycott of Nature.** A member noted that in some fields, scholarly societies have created alternatives to for-profit journals; UC should aggressively move in that direction.
- 3. Update on Post-Employment Benefits.** Chair Powell stated that this topic will be addressed in Executive Session.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved with minor revisions to the minutes.

III. Approval of the Agenda.

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved with the addition of two items of New Business.

IV. Appointment of ACSCOLI Members

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the reappointment of Eugene Haller (UCB), Clare Yu (UCI), and Michael Colvin (UCM) to ACSCOLI as at-large members for three-year terms (expiring in 2012-13).

V. BOARS' Response to EESS Request

ISSUE: BOARS submitted a response to Council's request to consider an expansion of area 'd' language in the Senate Regulations to include a description of alternatives to meeting the laboratory science requirement.

DISCUSSION: BOARS' chair explained that the A-G Guide is the primary policy document used by schools and counselors and it is regularly reviewed. Throughout the document there is mention of integrative courses. BOARS agreed to make changes to the language on the A-G Guide website. BOARS also is discussing with OP creating a curriculum institute to help design integrative sciences courses, including EESS courses. A member commented that she was impressed with the thoughtful way that BOARS has addressed the community's concerns. UCEP's chair stated that his committee did not recommend increasing the number of integrative courses, but clarifying how courses should be approved to improve the process. He suggested that providing templates could help teachers design courses at a level at which they could be approved. A member suggested that BOARS should involve some of the concerned faculty in the efforts at OP.

VI. Systemwide Review of Compendium Revisions

ISSUE: Council was asked to approve the Compendium, which was revised based on comments received through the systemwide review.

DISCUSSION: The Chair of the Compendium subcommittee stated that two questions remain unresolved: whether guidelines for hybrid programs should be included in the Compendium and whether it is appropriate to codify divisional Senate processes in the Compendium. A member commented that hybrid programs will entail major changes, e.g., how would admissions be handled? Would upper division courses be used to satisfy graduate requirements? A member suggested that such programs should be sent to the CCGA chair as an informational item under the current Compendium rules for modifying graduate programs via name changes. A member suggested that the Compendium should explicitly reference the requirement that CCGA re-review professional degree programs. A member suggested including a paragraph stating that if a program is the last program of its kind systemwide, its discontinuance should be reviewed by UCEP. Council unanimously approved this change. Members also made suggestions for clarifying the flowcharts, including adding a notation indicating when program changes require WASC pre-approval. Such changes include degrees with online instruction or instruction at remote locations.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the revisions to the Compendium.

VII. Consultation with Office of the President Senior Managers

President Yudof stated that the Post-Employment Benefits Steering Committee is developing a two-part plan, noting that he has not yet seen it and that he will release it to the entire community as soon as he receives it.

He reported that there has been no action on the budget in Sacramento, noting that it is unlikely that there will be a budget agreement by September. However, there have been some positive

indications that the legislature will adopt language acknowledging that the state is obligated to pay into UCRP.

Q&A

Q: Has the Obama administration indicated a willingness to provide greater support for research universities, as you proposed earlier this year?

A: President Yudof commented that while the administration seemed receptive to the proposal, it is preoccupied with many major issues. He noted that discussions have been initiated with the AAU to support bringing indirect cost recovery rates closer to actual costs. Finally, President Yudof remarked on Congress' negative reaction to the University's contract discussions with post-doctoral fellows, acknowledging that the University was slow in providing Congress with the data they requested. However, he noted that the issues are complex and the UAW's model may not be appropriate for university labor relations.

Q: Last Sunday's *Los Angeles Times* contained an article stating that \$24 billion in federal financial aid funds go to for-profit colleges with very little accountability. Are public university leaders coordinating to ask legislators to require the same level of accountability for for-profit educational institutions as they do for public universities?

A: President Yudof remarked that the public universities have not developed a coordinated approach, but that it is a good idea; Congressional demand for accountability of the for-profit sector has been episodic. For some for-profit institutions, 90% of their funding comes from the government. The top Pell-granting institutions are mostly for-profit, which has obvious implications for the indebtedness of the most disadvantaged students. He noted that consumer protection legislation is being developed by the Department of Education and Congress. However, some approaches could infringe on academic freedom. For instance, rules have been proposed to define credit hours and the number of times per week classes must meet.

Q: Could you comment on your view of transfer issues?

A: President Yudof stated that UC had a banner year in enrolling transfer students. He added that the legislative bill on improving transfer rates requests that UC study the issue and noted that there is a great deal of legislative pressure for UC to define a common curriculum. However, he stated that UC will never agree to an entitlement to acceptance at the university or to privileging students with a "transfer degree" over others. These decisions appropriately are part of the admissions process overseen by faculty.

Q: Regarding the contract issues with post-doctoral fellows, has the University examined the contracts at other institutions around the country?

A: President Yudof responded that there are only three other recognized unions representing post-doctoral fellows. He noted that some issues, such as annual reappointment and layoffs, have been resolved, but issues of compensation and contributions for health benefits remain.

Comment: One-size-fits-all requirements for transfer are not appropriate for some fields. For example, engineering is accredited by an outside body and requires a prescribed curriculum that is not adequately provided by community colleges, particularly because of the great variability in preparation of students coming from different community colleges.

A: President Yudof responded that this is why requirements for transfer must to be controlled by the faculty, not by the legislature. While the University must make progress on this issue, it also must maintain its control over admissions and curriculum.

Q: Can you give an update on the admission of African Americans?

A: President Yudof reported that the initial meeting of his advisory group on minorities has taken place and that he expects to receive reports from all of the campuses. He also received reports from UCSD and BOARS on this issue.

Q: What will be addressed at the August meeting of the Commission on the Future?

A: President Yudof stated that the agenda will include three year degrees, differential fees, student financial aid, supporting access, financial aid for undocumented students, commitment to the Master Plan ratios, and research items. Many of these issues, such as three year degrees, will be referred to the faculty; only the faculty can decide if a three year degree is appropriate in particular disciplines. He noted that he was impressed with UCLA's Challenge 45 initiative to reduce degree requirements for majors. EVP Brostrom commented that his office has been moving ahead on administrative efficiencies such as e-procurement using strategic sourcing contracts, and noted that UCOP is developing new investment vehicles. For instance, the Graduate Student Health Insurance Program is funded by reserves from a 0% loan program for campus efforts on administrative restructuring. He stated that there are many advantages to using common systems, noting that six campuses are now using same Human Resources system, but that no campus will be required to migrate to a particular system. Provost Pitts noted that UCOP is still pursuing external funding for the online pilot program.

Q: What is the progress on the funding streams project?

A: EVP Brostrom stated that beginning in 2011-12, campuses will retain all funds generated on their individual campuses and UCOP and central funding priorities will be supported with a 1.5% or 1.6% tax on all revenues. President Yudof added that UCOP needs to develop a list of what OP does so that we can decide whether it is valuable. How is OP useful and how does it hinder campuses? The aim is greater transparency so that rational decisions can be made.

VIII. Senate Special Committee on Future of the University

ISSUE: Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons proposed forming a Senate Special Committee on the Future of the University to consider broadly the issues that are shaping the University and to make specific recommendations that will maintain its preeminence and its mission.

DISCUSSION: Chair Powell stated that the aim of this group will be to continue the work of the Working Group faculty, leveraging their considerable expertise, and to provide advice to Council by November on the future of the University. The group will author a position paper that will go to the Academic Assembly at its meeting on December 1, and then, if approved, to the president. The paper will be an attempt to take a comprehensive view of the future of the University and to make recommendations regarding how to sustain quality and UC's public mission in an era of continued state disinvestment. A member expressed concern that an advisory committee would undermine the authority of the standing committees and that many of the Working Group members were not recommended by UCOC, so they were not necessarily representing the Senate. A member countered that while the standing committees produce good work, it appropriately represents a particular perspective and does not take a broad view. Members suggested populating the

committee with Council members, therefore integrating it into regular Senate business. A member spoke in favor of convening the special committee using the Working Group members. He noted that Council would retain the decision to endorse the report. Another member objected to bypassing normal divisional review. A member expressed concern about the timing of the special committee's recommendation. At the same meeting in November, Council will be considering the Council downsizing recommendation and the UCLA statement that have gone out for systemwide review. A member asked how this effort would relate to President Yudof's request to Council to flesh out the downsizing proposal. A member stated that although he shares these concerns, downsizing already is occurring on the campuses, so the Senate has no choice but to accelerate feedback to the president. A member echoed this sentiment, stating that if the Senate does not take the lead, downsizing will occur on an *ad-hoc* basis. He also commented that the Senate should prepare clearly articulated positions on major issues and that the review of the Council and UCLA statements is not likely to produce that outcome. Vice Chair Simmons stated that he intends to bring together the results of the systemwide review with the advice of the special committee in November. Chair Powell stated that the aim is to harness all of the efforts of faculty in a comprehensive manner and to ensure that the Senate takes leadership. Members debated the best way to make use of the work that has been done already. A member suggested making the chair and vice chair of the Council *ex officio*, rather than voting, members. Chair Powell accepted that friendly amendment. A member who participated on one of the Working Groups stated that it would provide the faculty who served on the Working Groups with an opportunity to present their vision of the alternatives discussed, noting that the Commission process was frustrating to many faculty participants. A member proposed creating two subcommittees, one to synthesize the Working Group discussions and produce faculty recommendations, and one to address downsizing. A member requested striking some language in the resolution. A motion was made to accept the resolution, with some language changes and the addition of a provision that the chair and vice chair be non-voting, *ex officio* members of the committee.

ACTION: The resolution passed, with some amendments and with a provision that the chair and vice chair of the Council be *ex-officio* members (13 in favor, 4 opposed).

IX. Response to Second Round of Recommendations to the Commission on the Future

ISSUE: The Senate office received responses from divisions and committees to the systemwide review of the second round of recommendations to the Commission on the Future, as well as from a subset of the faculty who served on the Working Groups.

DISCUSSION: Council briefly reviewed the recommendations upon which there was consensus and then focused its discussion on the recommendations upon which there was no consensus or no clear view expressed in the reviews.

Council discussed Expanded Recommendation 3, which proposes increasing the income derived from self-supporting and part-time programs. A member noted that the recommendation anticipated revenues of \$1 billion, which is infeasible. He noted that as with the proposal on online education, resources would be funneled into areas that are outside of the core university mission based on dubious speculation that it will be profitable. He further noted that most University Extension programs either just break even or lose money. A member questioned the notion that a population of undergraduate students exists who would be willing to pay the tuition required to sustain self-supporting programs and forego state-subsidized educational opportunities. A member opposed the idea of Extension playing a predominant academic role in degree programs, although

it could play an administrative role. Another member noted that in Masters in Advanced Studies programs, Extension is influential in admission decisions. A member expressed concern that these programs would privatize graduate education, since there is no return-to-aid from the fees they charge. A member noted that the Commission already discussed and approved a recommendation on self-supporting programs with Extension playing only an administrative role, and stated that in comparison, this recommendation is not reasonable and is redundant. A member emphasized that what distinguishes UC from other state-supported institutions is that it is a research university. Members agreed that pursuing an expansion of self-supporting programs at the Master's level is appropriate, but opposed expanding them to bachelor and doctoral degree programs. Council unanimously declined to support Expanded Recommendation 3.

Expanded Recommendation 5 concerns increasing successful community college transfers. Council members agreed that the Size and Shape recommendations on this topic treat it more thoughtfully. While members conditionally agreed with some points in the Expanded Recommendation, the details are unaddressed and therefore Council can not support it.

Expanded Recommendation 8 proposes augmenting faculty salaries from non-state sources, where possible. A member noted that at medical schools, there is a tremendous push for clinical faculty to generate their own salaries and that this distorts faculty incentives. Members criticized the recommendation as unclear and lacking in implementation detail. A member commented that if implemented, it would affect a very small number of faculty, and some faculty may decide that it is not in their best interest. For example, faculty may not want to use grant money to fund their own salaries because it decreases the amount available for research and could make the grant application less competitive. A member commented that this system would be extremely onerous for department chairs because each salary must be individually negotiated on an annual basis. A member commented that charging grants for state-funded time that is devoted to the grant work may be appropriate, but he opposed creating a separate salary device. A member noted that in some fields such as the life sciences, funding salaries this way can help to retain faculty who would pursue other opportunities. She noted that the Senate must recognize that different segments of the university have different needs, and advocated remaining open to the idea until a formal proposal is made and can be fully evaluated. Council agreed with this approach.

ACTION: Council concurred on the positions to be taken regarding the second round of recommendations to the Commission on the Future; a draft response will be circulated for review and final approval.

X. Principles for Allocation of General Funds to Campuses

ISSUE: In the fall, Provost Pitts will convene a group to discuss equitable ways to allocate general funds to the campuses. UCPB drafted a document outlining principles to guide that discussion.

DISCUSSION: UCPB's chair asked Council to endorse a set of principles to guide next year's discussions of how to reallocate general funds to the campuses. He suggested that the document could be made available to the Senate participants in the discussions who have yet to be appointed. An alternative is to refer the document to the Size and Shape Working Group, who have considered similar questions. A motion was made to send the document for systemwide review and comment. A member expressed concern about protecting return-to-aid provisions. UCPB's chair responded that the administration has committed to protecting the current return-to-aid system. He spoke against sending the document for review as premature.

ACTION: Council voted unanimously to submit UCPB's statement of principles for allocation of general funds to the joint Senate-administrative group appointed to address this issue when it is convened next fall.

XI. New Business

- A. Approval for the addition of a new degree title.** CCGA's chair requested Council's approval of the addition to the UC system of the degree title Masters of Professional Accountancy. The degree is aimed at CPAs and CCGA endorsed it.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved the addition of the Masters of Professional Accountancy as a degree title.

- B. Update on salary equity study.** UCAAD's chair stated that a former UCAAD chair is working to update the salary equity study. She hopes to present the new data to Council in the fall. UCAAD's chair also noted that UCOP has hired a new Vice Provost of Academic Personnel, Susan Carlson.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Henry Powell, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst