

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Approved Minutes of the Meeting
Wednesday, September 29, 2004

I. Chair's Announcements

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

1. Welcome and Introductions

Academic Council Chair George Blumenthal welcomed members of the 2004-05 Academic Council. Following introductions, Chair Blumenthal gave an overview of the day's meeting agenda and made the following announcements.

2. General Announcements

- The Senate leadership has scheduled a joint meeting of the division chairs and division executive directors for Wednesday, October 6.
- A bill recently signed by the governor requests that faculty work with campus bookstores to get the least expensive textbooks for students. Chair Blumenthal will include a statement in the upcoming issue of the *Senate Source* encouraging faculty to use cost as one criterion when making textbook decisions.
- Office of the President (OP) Administration has responded to the Academic Council's letter of August 24 expressing its concern about the impact on many grant holders of UC's policy change on definition of equipment. OP has no plans to modify the policy at this time. The new policy, which will become effective in 2006, will raise the dollar threshold from \$1500 to \$5000.

Action: The administration's response letter will be forwarded to Council members and also posted on the systemwide senate's website.

Action: Chair asked Council members to think about what actions the Senate could take to help mitigate the effects of this policy, especially on small grant holders.

3. Update from the Committee Chairs' Retreat

Chair Blumenthal reported that the state of graduate education at UC emerged as the chief concern of those who participated in the committee chairs' retreat held the previous day. Everyone agreed that this issue should be a top priority for the university. This will be a major focus area for the Senate this academic year. Chair noted that an important first step would be to help state legislators understand the value of graduate education to the state's economy.

II. Academic Council Overview

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

1. Procedures and Logistics

Chair Blumenthal explained how meetings of the Academic Council are conducted, the document review procedure and the agenda distribution process. He suggested that Council members submit their questions for the President and Senior Management in advance of a scheduled meeting.

Action: Questions for the President and Senior Management should be sent to Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo by no later than the Thursday before a scheduled meeting.

Action: Chair reminded Council members that the Executive Director should be copied on all of their Council-related Email messages to him. She will flag them for his attention.

Action: Chair reminded division chairs to submit a letter that represents their division's response to documents they have been asked to review and not send individual letters from their campus committees.

Action: At the request of one member, the Council Chair agreed to indicate, to the extent possible, the relative importance of a document that is sent out for review by the systemwide senate.

Action: At the request of members, the acronym list that is posted on the systemwide senate's website will be updated and the URL circulated to members.

2. Ongoing Agenda Item - "Senate Issues/Topics of Concern"

This regular agenda item gives Council members an opportunity to be proactive regarding university affairs. Chair encouraged members to take advantage of this opportunity.

3. Invited Guests (Regents, Office of the President Administrators, Senate Directors, etc.)

Regent Parsky, the new Chair of the Board of Regents, is among those guests whom the Council Chair has invited to attend a meeting of the Academic Council in the coming year.

Action: Chair encouraged members to send him their suggestions for possible Council guests.

Action: One member suggested that the Student Regent be invited.

4. Senate Website Policy

Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo gave an overview of the senate's new website policy. She noted that beginning this academic year the committees' meeting agendas and approved minutes would be posted on the systemwide senate's website.

5. Chair's Objectives for 2004-05

Among the Chair's objectives for the 2004-05 Council is for the Council to be proactive on issues and, to the extent possible, complete all its business by the end of the year.

6. Old and New Business that will be on Council's Agenda for 2004-05

Chair provided an overview of some of the upcoming agenda items listed on pages iii and iv of the agenda.

- Budget and long-term planning. The President and Provost are in the process of holding a number of long-range planning sessions with senior administrators, faculty, students, alumni and regents on what the University of California should look like in 15 to 20 years, and what decisions should be made now to achieve that goal.
- Operating budget and review process for the California Institutes of Science and Innovation (CAL ISIs). A major question to be resolved with the OP Administration is the nature and extent of Senate oversight and review of the CAL ISIs.
- Course major articulation process. Council will be asked to review a draft proposal to streamline the course major articulation process between UC campuses and the California Community Colleges.
- Implementation of the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC). IMPAC. This is a project involving statewide faculty disciplinary and interdisciplinary discussions to address prerequisite and lower division courses students must complete prior to transfer to either CSU or UC. The project needs UC faculty volunteers in the following disciplines: Art, Drama/Theater Arts, Earth Science, Economics, History, Philosophy, and Sociology.
- Enrolled students on probation. Last year, division chairs were asked to collect information about the number and length of time students are on academic probation. A template designed by the Davis Division to collect this information will be distributed to division chairs.
- Faculty advocacy. Faculty are encouraged to advocate for the University with their local legislators.

Action: IMPAC needs one or more UC faculty members from each of the disciplines listed on a handout distributed by Council Vice Chair Brunk. Division chairs were asked to contact the heads of those departments and ask for volunteers. Names of volunteers should be sent to Vice

Chair Brunk. In a joint letter, the Council Chair and Provost plan to ask the undergraduate deans for their help in this effort.

Action: At the request of the division chairs, Vice Chair Brunk agreed to provide them with a description of IMPAC and explain what is needed from faculty.

Action: Executive Director will distribute to division chairs the UC Davis probation template as soon as she receives it.

III. Consent Calendar

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

Action: 1. Approved as amended – July 21, 2004 minutes

Action: 2. Approved – Appointment of a Chair and reappointment of members to the Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)

Action: 3. Approved – Cancellation of the October Assembly Meeting

IV. Agenda for November 10, 2004 Meeting of the Assembly

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

Issue: The Academic Council was asked to approve the agenda for the November meeting of the Assembly.

Chair Blumenthal summarized the issues related to each of the agenda items. He noted that item 3 – the adoption of “Sturgis Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure” arose from changes that were made to the bylaws last year that require the Assembly to make a decision on which parliamentary rules of order it may wish to adopt. The two standard ones are Sturgis and Roberts. Chair will explain the differences at the next meeting of Council. Chair Blumenthal announced that he planned to call a Special Meeting of the Assembly in January to update members on Senate issues and activities. This meeting will be held by teleconference.

Action: The Academic Council approved the agenda for the November Assembly meeting.

Action: Council members gave their pre-approval for any additional items that the Senate leadership may need to add to the November agenda.

Action: Chair, in consultation with the Secretary/Parliamentarian, will place a proposed set of parliamentary rules of order on the Assembly's November meeting agenda.

Action: Chair announced that a Special Meeting of the Assembly would be scheduled for January. It will be held by teleconference.

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Management

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost & Senior Vice President-Academic Affairs**
- **Bruce Darling, Senior Vice President-University Affairs**
- **Lawrence C. Hershman, Vice President for Budget**

President Dynes

-President Dynes just returned from a visit with UC's alumni, friends, and representatives in Washington, D.C., as a part of his inaugural tour. During his visit, he met with the Secretary of Energy to talk about laboratory issues, including how employee morale at Los Alamos might be improved. He also had positive conversations with Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein.

-At their September meeting the Regents approved, by a 2 to 1 margin, the President's recommendation to reset the GPA eligibility requirement to 3.0 to be instituted in 2007 but to be reviewed in 2006, after the results of the new SAT I are assessed. He noted that the Senate's role in this effort was instrumental to achieving this successful outcome.

-At the same meeting, the Regents approved the 2004/05 budget. The 2005/06 budget will be proposed to the Regents during the November meeting. It will be based largely on the compact that UC negotiated with the governor. That compact provides for an enrollment growth of about 5000 students per year.

-The first Regents' Retreat is scheduled for the end of September. One of the discussion items will be long term planning for the university. The goal will be to think about what the University of California should look like in future years and how that might be achieved.

-The Department of Energy just announced seven E.O. Lawrence Awards. Six of the seven awards went to the University of California.

Provost Greenwood

-If the stem cell initiative passes in November, UC should develop a strategy for how to compete for the funding. Provost Greenwood will consult further with the Senate on this issue after the election.

-The Provost will also be seeking the Senate's help on reviewing the National Research Council's proposed protocol for its survey of research doctorates, which will take place early next year. UC has some serious concerns related to the taxonomy, particularly in the biology fields. Campuses need to develop a strategy for how to respond to these taxonomies in a way that best reflects the university's actual capacity in these areas. It is important that each campus understands the methodology and responds to it systematically so that UC's ratings are not adversely affected.

-The Provost reminded Council that faculty members are free to accept any legal source of funding, as a matter of academic freedom, independent of petitions signed by faculty groups opposing specified funding sources. The Regents will receive clarification of this policy.

-The Planning and Analysis group in Academic Affairs has been updating the Commission's Report on Graduate Education to facilitate upcoming discussions on the issues facing graduate education. UC needs to begin helping legislators understand the critical role graduate education plays in the state's economy and the need for UC to be able to provide competitive financial aid packages in order to attract the best students and faculty to UC.

Senior Vice President Darling

-To date, four of the five bills that UC asked the governor to veto were vetoed. These included a long-term fee policy bill, which the governor vetoed because it was his position that the compact he had with the university would be the basis for fee setting.

-The governor signed the common course numbering bill, put forward by Senator Brulte and substantially amended by the Senate leadership and Academic Affairs.

-The Congress will be introducing its budget for the next fiscal year. Increases in the research budget are likely to remain at last year's levels.

Vice President Hershman

Vice President Hershman provided an overview of budget priorities for UC. Those include salaries for faculty and staff, increases in graduate student support, basic funding for instructional programs, and maintenance.

Areas of concentration for future budgets will be:

-salaries and health benefits.

-student-faculty ratio

-graduate student support

-building maintenance

-phasing money for Merced

For professional schools, at the present time there is a graduated fee policy whereby those campuses that have some discretion to go higher may do so up to 10% over the minimum fee, with the approval of the President. The fees are capped at 10% this year, but in future years this cap is likely to be raised.

Following their reports, the President and Senior Management took a number of questions from Council members on UC's management of the National Laboratories, the stem cell ballot initiative, and student fees, to name a few.

VI. Development of Policy on Administrative Structures for Interdisciplinary Activities

• Cliff Brunk, Academic Council Vice Chair

Issue: Council was asked to review the draft document, "Interdisciplinary Activities at UC," and establish a timeline for completing the process of gathering campus information on administrative and policy problem areas as a first step in developing processes for shared governance in interdisciplinary activities.

Overview: Last year the Academic Council appointed a subcommittee chaired by UCB Division Chair Gronsky to identify issues and develop a set of questions that would help division chairs collect information from their campuses on administrative and policy problems associated with interdisciplinary activities. Council Vice Chair Brunk asked for comment on the subcommittee's proposed set of questions listed on agenda page 26.

Comments: To ensure that responses are consistent, a definition of terms should be included.

Action: UCB Division Chair Knapp agreed to work with Council Vice Chair Brunk on developing appropriate definitions and modifying the questions.

Action: When the revisions are completed, the questions will be sent to the divisions with a December 1 response date.

VII. Academic Council's Special Committee on the National Labs (ACSCONL)

• Cliff Brunk, Academic Council Vice Chair

Issue: 1) The Academic Council was asked to review and approve ACSCONL's Statement on Competing for the NNSA Laboratories; and 2) Division Chairs were asked to consider whether visits to their campuses from Lab Management personnel would be worthwhile.

ACSCONL Statement. ACSCONL Chair Brunk introduced ACSCONL's Statement on Competing for the NNSA Laboratories. The statement contains a set of principles that reflect what many faculty believe should be included in a new bid. He asked the Academic Council to approve the Statement. A motion to approve the Statement was made and seconded. Chair Blumenthal called for a discussion.

Discussion: Members noted that there was nothing in the principles concerning UC's proposed partnership. A statement should be included to the effect that a potential partner must be compatible with the academic mission of the University of California. In addition, there was a strong consensus among members that any partnership agreement must coordinate the safety and security missions with the scientific mission of the laboratories. At least one member questioned the actual desirability of UC's partnering and whether ACSCONL should support this idea in principle, since this would not be an equal partnership, there are no defined parameters and UC would not be free to dissolve the relationship, should problems arise, without the approval of the DOE. The next logical question is why not a subcontractor instead of a partnership?

Action: Academic Council members were in unanimous agreement not to endorse the ACSCONL Statement until it was revised to address their concerns about UC's proposed

partnership arrangement. They recommended the following additions, which would satisfy their concerns:

- Include a statement to the effect that a potential partner must be compatible with the academic mission of the University of California.
- Include, in the third bullet on the first page, a statement recognizing that in order to protect intellectual and scientific freedom, the organizational structure and culture of the laboratories must integrate the safety and security missions with the scientific mission.
- Include, as a first bullet on page 2, a statement that any partnership agreement must coordinate the safety and security missions with the scientific mission of the laboratories.

Campus Visits by Lab Management: Chair Blumenthal gave an overview of the discussion that took place at the September meeting of the Regents on the question of whether UC should compete for the DOE Labs, and updated Council on the activities of ACSCONL. Chair asked division chairs if they thought it would be worthwhile for members from Lab Management to visit their campuses in an effort to improve campus-lab relations.

Action: The consensus among division chairs was that a more appropriate time for a campus visit from Lab Management would be when UC has a contract with the Labs.

VIII. Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Formal Review of Proposed Amendments

1. Proposed Amendment to APM 120- Emeritus Titles
2. Proposed Amendment to APM 200-22–Recall Appointments for Academic Appointees
 - **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**
 - **John Oakley, UCFW Chair**

Issue: At the May meeting, the Academic Council approved revisions to APM 120 and APM 200-22, as proposed by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). In August, the OP Administration sent modified versions of both proposed amendments to the campuses for review. Council was asked to determine if the proposed OP drafts were consistent with the language approved by Council in May, and if the formal review process should include a formal review by the Academic Senate.

Overview. UCFW Chair Oakley noted that he was in the process of working with the OP Administration to modify both drafts so that they would be more consistent with UCFW's original proposals. Once those modifications are reviewed and approved by the full UCFW committee, he will send the revised versions to the Council Chair. Oakley recommended that the proposals be sent to the committees and divisions for a fast-tracked review.

Action: As soon as the draft revisions are approved by UCFW, the UCFW Chair will send them to the Council Chair for further action.

IX. Update from BOARS

- **George Blumenthal, Regents' Faculty Representative**
- **Michael Brown, BOARS Chair**

BOARS Chair Brown noted that since all of the BOARS issues were covered during the President's item, there was nothing further to report.

Action: BOARS Chair will update Council at November's meeting.

X. Joint Senate/Executive Vice Chancellor Meeting

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**
- **Academic Council Members**

Issue: The Academic Council and the Executive Vice Chancellors (EVCs) held their first joint meeting in AY 2002-2003, when they agreed to meet bi-annually. Council was asked to consider possible agenda items for the meeting this year (date to be determined), and to report back at the October meeting. The three discussion items on the 2002-03 agenda were: Ethics and Integrity-Faculty-Student Relations; Phased Employment/Phased Retirement; and Shared Governance-Model of Effective Academic Senate-Administration Interactions.

Action: Council members were asked to bring to the October meeting their suggested agenda items for the joint meeting with the EVCs.

XI. Proposed University Code of Ethics

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

Issue: The Regents have expressed an interest in the development of a University-wide Statement of Core Values. The Senate has been assured that this is not an effort to modify the Faculty Code of Conduct. Council was asked to discuss the concept of such a Statement and an approval process. Administration has asked for Council's comments by October 15 so that the document can be modified, as necessary, and brought to the November Regents' meeting.

Overview: Chair Blumenthal noted that part of the university's motivation for developing a statement of core values has to do with concerns about compliance with federal regulations and granting agencies. From the faculty perspective, the major concern will be that this universitywide policy is not seen as a modification of the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Discussion:

- If a university-wide code were to be issued by the University, it would have to be made clear in the release statement that the new code would in no way modify the provisions of the Faculty Code of Conduct.
- The Academic Council was fully supportive of the notion that a core set of values should be articulated for the general university community.
- Care will have to be taken to ensure that the proposed statement of values intersects well with existing university policy.
- The current draft falls far short of what the members of the Academic Council would find to be acceptable as a Code of Ethics for the University of California
- A policy of this importance deserves a thoughtful and thorough review, which is not possible given the short response time.

Action: The Academic Council recommended that the Council Chair advise OP Administration that, due to the importance of this document, the Senate needs more time for review and comment and will, therefore, be unable to meet the October 15 response date.

Action: UCFW Chair agreed that his committee would take the lead in formulating Council's recommendation on this issue.

XII. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

Issue: Council Chair gave a brief summary of the justification for this proposed amendment.

Action: The proposal will be sent out for review to all Systemwide Committees and Divisions, with a timeline that will enable it to be brought before the March Assembly for approval.

XIII. The Academic Senate's Task Force on UC Merced (UCM-TF)

- **Sam Traina, UCM-TF Chair**

Issue: The Academic Council was provided with an update on the activities of the UCM Task Force and on UCM's progress towards becoming a Division of the Academic Senate.

Report: UCM-TF Chair Traina reported that there were 34 Senate members with an academic affiliation at Merced. Thirty-three additional faculty will need to be hired between now and August 2005 in order to open with the targeted number of 60 faculty. There are ten graduate students currently in residence with five more coming at the beginning of the second semester. UCM is making progress in preparing to become a division. It is anticipated that the UCM faculty will be asked to vote on a draft set of bylaws by Thanksgiving, and those should be ready for the Academic Council's review and approval after the first of the year. In the next several weeks, elections will be held to select three additional Task Force members. Following the UCM-TF Chair's report, Council Chair Blumenthal noted that the Academic Council would only recommend divisional status for UC Merced when it has the proven necessary resources to support a senate office structure. An executive director at an appropriate classification would be the minimum staff required.

Action: UCM-TF Chair will provide an update at the November meeting of Council.

XIV. Board of Regents – Faculty Regent vs. Faculty Representative

- **George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair**

Issue: At its July meeting, the Academic Council in a vote of 7 in favor, 8 opposed and 3 abstentions opposed making the Faculty Representatives voting members of The Board of Regents. Chair reviewed the issues related to faculty being voting vs. non-voting members of The Regents.

Overview. In 1974, the state constitution was amended to provide that the Regents may appoint either or both a faculty and a student member of the Board. At some point after the amendment was approved, the Regents did add a voting student member to the Board and a non-voting Student Regent Designate. The Regents also added two non-voting Faculty Representatives. At that time, there was considerable discussion within the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly about whether the faculty representatives should be voting members. The Assembly felt that the faculty should be voting members, but the Academic Council did not pursue voting status, for a variety of reasons. More recent history on the pros and cons of this issue can be found in agenda enclosure 14.

Action: The Academic Council will be asked to vote on the question of whether faculty should be voting members of the Board of Regents by no later than the March meeting of Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Distributions:

- 1) IMPAC – Faculty volunteers needed in listed disciplines
- 2) Systemwide Website Policy and Clarification on Public Records Act

Attest:

George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Betty Marton, Policy Analyst