

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, October 31, 2007**

I. Announcements

▪ **Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair**

- Nominations for the 2008-09 Senate Vice Chair are due by January 4, 2008.
- The draft report on campus security will be discussed at a future Council meeting;
- Within the week, the proposed rules and regulations governing the conduct of non-affiliates on campuses will be sent out for senate wide review.
- A workgroup on student affordability has been established.
- WASC has initiated a system-wide review of UC with specific attention being paid to compensation, accountability, and governance.

▪ **Mary Croughan, Academic Council Vice Chair** reported that:

- She recently visited UC Riverside; there is a clear consensus on behalf of the faculty, staff, and students that the next new chancellor should be a champion of diversity.
- ASCOLI is concerned with pit production at Los Alamos Nation Security lab (LANS).

▪ **Executive Director Bertero-Barceló** noted that effective with this meeting, a list of all (non-confidential) correspondence received since the preceding Council meeting will be included as part of the regular Council Agenda. Copies of specific correspondence are available upon request.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the September 26, 2007, Minutes

2. The December 12, 2007, Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

4. The Academic Council's Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles

5. Education Abroad Travel Policy Restrictions and the Study Abroad Industry

6. "Collegiality" In the Review of Faculty for Merits and Promotions

ACTION: Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 were approved as submitted. Items 3 and 7 were pulled and discussed under New Business and the relevant action summarized below .

3. California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2) Five-Year Review Comments

DISCUSSION: One member opined that the transmittal letter is too long; it should simply state that Council finds that the Cal ISIs have a number of problems that are in need of correction. Members also noted that a lack of clarity still exists regarding the Senate's role in the review of the Cal ISIs. For example, how would the Senate force major changes within the Cal ISIs, or even disestablish one, if they were found to be dysfunctional? The transmittal letter should also include a statement about possible future actions. A broader discussion on the Cal ISI review process is also warranted.

ACTION: 1) Chair Brown will redraft the transmittal letter; 2) the broader issue of the Cal ISI reviews will be on a future Council meeting agenda.

7. Towards A UC Undergraduate Mission Statement

DISCUSSION: UCEP Chair Williams clarified that this is going to the campuses for informal comments

ACTION: Item 7 was approved.

III. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Agenda approved.

IV. Executive Session

V. Faculty Salary Plan

ISSUE: Nick Jewell, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel at UCOP, briefed members on faculty salary plan, which is designed to bring faculty salaries up to market within four years. Towards that end, a joint Senate-Administration task force had been working to move the four-year plan forward. The Regents approved the principles behind this plan at their September 2007 meeting. There are three components to the first year of the plan: 1) The standard faculty merit program; (2) a 2.5% range adjustment, which is applied to all faculty; and 3) an average market adjustment of 4-8% to on-scale and some off-scale faculty whose salaries are below the new scales. Over 70% of faculty salaries are off-scale; above-scale salaries constitute approximately 9% of faculty salaries system-wide. For these faculty, an additional sum to cover a 3.9% increase to these salaries (includes the 2.5% range adjustment) is being provided to the campuses. In total, these salary increases represent a 5.9% increase to the faculty salary budget.

DISCUSSION: Members commented that the second-year funding of the salary plan is key in bringing off-scale faculty salaries back onto scale. Vice Provost Jewell responded that most off-scale faculty will receive an increase in the second year. He added that department deans can still use small off-scale adjustments on a case-by-case basis to correct individual salaries in certain egregious cases. Council also expressed its concern that the market continues to move ahead of the adjusted scales. Vice Provost Jewell remarked that the range adjustments in years two, three, and four are much more aggressive to keep pace with these market increases. Vice Provost Jewell also said that while the projected impact on the retirement system has not been fully determined yet, the biggest impact of the new salary scales for health sciences faculty will be on their retirement plans.

ACTION: Council will continue to monitor this issue.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers

- Robert C. Dynes, President
- Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs
- Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations

President Robert C. Dynes

President Dynes praised the campuses and medical centers for their response to the recent Southern California wildfires. Moody's Investment Services has recently upgraded UC's bond rating from an AA2 to an AA1. UC's Stat Finder (<http://statfinder.ucop.edu/>) has been released, which provides UC eligibility and admissions data to the public. 53 UC faculty members have been elected to the American Academy of Sciences. A number of UC faculty members also contributed to the UN Report on Global Climate Change, which was issued by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and shared the Nobel Peace Prize with Al Gore. Sierra magazine recently commended UC for its 'green' operating practices. President Dynes is continuing his campuses visits; he will go to UCSC tomorrow, followed by UCSB, UCD, and Merced.

Provost Wyatt R. Hume

Provost Hume emphasized that the salary plan will re-center the post-tenure review process as the primary mechanism by which faculty receive competitive salaries. Financial trade-offs are inevitable however. He also briefed members about the educational imperative initiative, which, in partnership with the California State University (CSU) system, aims to improve K-12 education by 1) increasing research from scholars outside the traditional fields of education; and 2) increasing K-12 outreach in part through the addition of internet resources. The research initiative focuses on mitigating climate change.

EVP Katherine N. Lapp

EVP Lapp's presentation is included under item VII. The UC Budget.

Questions/Answers and Comments

Budget

Comment: Vice Chair Mary Croughan applauded the new budget process of looking not only at goals and priorities, but also competing priorities.

Q: What percentage of the current budget request is over the Compact?

A: EVP Lapp responded that UC is requesting about \$70 million over the Compact.

Q: Are enrollment growth revenues restrictive funds in the sense that UC must hire faculty with these monies?

A: Assistant Vice President Debora Obley responded that these funds must be used to mitigate workload increases; hiring new faculty members is certainly a component of this. EVP Lapp commented that the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) is intended to cover both hiring new faculty and maintenance of facilities.

Q: How much would it cost to fully fund The Regents' priorities?

A: Provost Hume responded that fully funding The Regents' ten priorities would increase the state's share of UC's budget from \$2.5 billion to \$5.5 billion.

Faculty Salaries

Q: How do the new salary scales differ for different groups of faculty, such as the health sciences, and engineering?

A: Provost Hume replied that new salary scales have been set for all groups. Economics faculty have been moved out of the regular scales and moved into business and management. The

veterinary, medical, and dental salary scales are significantly behind market, but some faculty in the medical and dental fields are able to make some of this up through other compensation.

Educational Imperative

Q: Many high school teachers are facing extraordinary pressures from Washington by the imposition of the federal ‘No Child Left Behind’ program. While the educational imperative will certainly produce significant research on educational theory, it will most likely not directly influence the reality on the ground or what the teachers actually teach.

A: President Dynes responded that UC must demonstrate that it takes K-12 seriously in order to build its national credibility, expertise, and influence in this area. In his estimation, UC expertise in this area is still deficient. This initiative takes a longer-term view of the problem. UC will design the initiative so that actual K-12 teachers are involved in the research. Close collaboration with the CSU and the California community colleges is also important.

Q: What is UC doing with respect to the recommendations regarding learning assessments that are coming from the Department of Education?

A: President Dynes responded that UC is not participating in the so-called Spelling model of assessment. UC already reports many measures of assessment to Sacramento, which insures accountability, but not educational impacts.

Q: K-12’s current assessment environment is only one problem; the funding of K-12 and the distribution of such funding is another. How will the Educational Imperative apply the necessary pressure to correct these problems?

A: Provost Hume remarked that UC wants to engage both the California community colleges and the CSU in this effort. A better alignment of UC’s acceptance standards appropriately with the high school exit standards is also desirable. It will also be important to exploit the relative strengths of the two systems in this area. While CSU produces the most teachers in California, UC has research and evaluative capabilities, along with significant web-based resources and capabilities.

Comment: California has focused on K-8 education in recent years; it has not paid enough attention to high school education. UC research needs to be directed towards 9-12 education.

A: President Dynes observed that the CSU conducts an early appraisal of high school students. UC could cooperate with them on this and other tools.

Restructuring

Comment: Restructuring often strikes a delicate balance between improving efficiencies and losing and demoralizing the best people. Sometimes new inefficiencies are even introduced.

A: Provost Hume responded that efforts are being made to restructure UCOP in ways that do not demoralize its best employees. While the Monitor report was very critical of UC’s administrative systems in terms of cost and efficiency, there are good examples of cases where UC has found new efficiencies and saved substantial amounts of money, which has been redirected towards UC’s academic programs. He summarized the major initiatives: 1) Analyzing UCOP’s role; 2) developing an open and transparent budgeting process; 3) streamlining the capital projects approval process; 4) improving UC’s external relations functions; and 5) increasing returns on UC’s short-term investment pool. UCOP has also instituted a vacancy control policy. The Academic Initiatives unit no longer exists. The greatest savings can come from collaboration between the campuses; the Digital Library and the administrative collaboration among UC’s five

medical centers are good examples of this. He projected that UCOP will likely shrink by 10% this year. Legal services and the Education Abroad Program (EAP) are also being examined.

Q: What mechanisms are being instituted to watch over the effects of restructuring? Are there feedback mechanisms? Actual cost savings is an inadequate measure of success in restructuring. The campuses should also be fully engaged in this process.

A: Provost Hume Rory said that accountability structures are key, citing the Continuing Education of the Bar and UC Press as good examples of restructuring. He envisions similar restructuring of EAP, Legal Services, and External Affairs; campus feedback would be part of this process.

Q: Are their opportunities for increasing efficiencies on the campuses?

A: Provost Hume responded that the Vice Chancellors are working on improving campus efficiencies. The medical centers are now collaborating through common purchasing and reimbursement; the development of common administrative systems is underway. It is also becoming clear that not every service is needed at every medical center.

Non-Resident Tuition

Q: Is there is a written statement from President Dynes or Provost Hume regarding non-resident tuition (NRT)? What is the degree of latitude on the campus level to use this money for graduate support? Is it true that most of this money must be used to support faculty salaries? Although \$30 million has been allocated to graduate education (outside of NRT) over the last couple of years, how much of this money has been used for graduate support? If not what has it been used for?

A: Provost Hume responded that he did report to The Regents that the President had instructed that NRT monies should be returned to campuses and that these funds should be used for graduate education. He added that UC does not receive any support from the state for non-resident students. Both NRT and other funding for graduate support must be used for basic services (such as lighting, energy, and staff needs) and faculty salaries, in addition to graduate support. The only way to totally eliminate NRT is to convince the state to eliminate it for both UC and CSU. However, the state legislature has reinforced its view that it will not pay for non-residents. President Dynes added that he did not want to be prescriptive; he wanted allow some flexibility while placing the debate on the campuses where it belongs.

Enrollment Planning

Q: In the past, if campuses exceeded their enrollment targets, they did not receive additional funds. Is there value in going back to this model?

A: President Dynes said that while the campuses are very accurate in predicting future enrollment numbers, they do sometimes miss them. Provost Hume noted that the Chancellors will be meeting to discuss each other's growth plans out to 2025. Future enrollment growth will be much more focused on graduate students than undergraduates.

Q: Will year two of the salary plan include changes to how UC actually funds faculty salaries beyond patchwork fixes? How will salaries in the health sciences be funded with regard to retirement compensation?

A: Provost Hume said that the effects of year one will be incorporated in the design of year two. With regard to the health sciences, UCOP does not tell people how to administer that money. These plans are administered by the department deans.

Investment in Libraries

Q: While the maintenance of library buildings is certainly needed, is it a mistake to invest significant amounts of money into physical libraries without additional research on how students learn and store information in the modern age?

A: President Dynes responded that UC is partnering with Google to digitize UC's library holdings. As long as the appropriate safeguards are in place, he believes that this is the best way to move forward. Libraries are certainly still legitimate, but their roles are changing.

VII. The UC Budget

ISSUE: The 2008-09 budget will be presented at the November Regents meeting. This budget not only addresses next year's needs, but also begins to identify long-term priorities. EVP Lapp and Provost Hume have been visiting the campuses to reformulate the budget to better reflect the academic needs of the campuses. EVP Lapp also noted that the state's deficit could rise from \$6 billion to \$8-12 billion. The budget proposal includes the following expenditures: a 5% compensation increase (\$168 million); a 2.5% increase in enrollment growth funding (\$102 million); \$31 million for core academic support (instructional technology and equipment and libraries); \$10 million for graduate support; and \$10 million for student-faculty ratios. Additional expenditures include 1) the educational imperative initiative (\$5 million; and 2) a research initiative on global climate change (\$10 million). UC is also proposing to invest \$8 million in student mental health services. There are also normal inflationary costs of \$25 million; professional school programs account for a \$16.6 million increase in expenditures. The net of these expenditures is \$406 million over and above what UC is spending this year. UC anticipates a \$123 million revenue increase (per the 4% increase from the Compact). These include: a \$31 million in core academic support; \$63 million from enrollment growth (2.5%); \$39 million from student fee revenues; \$16.6 million from professional fee increases; \$12 million for indirect cost recovery (ICR); \$6 million from the General Fund; \$6 million from undergraduate NRT; and \$2 million under "other." An additional \$71 million is needed to avoid a student fee increase of approximately 7%. Although revenues amount to \$378 million, a delta of \$28 million remains, which UC will cover through internal cost savings.

ACTION: Council will continue to monitor this issue.

VIII. Monitor Update

ISSUE: The Monitor Group was charged with 1) evaluating, refining, and clarifying the relationship and governing structures between UCOP the campuses and The Regents; and 2) making recommendations on improving efficiencies within UCOP and across the UC system. There are four symptoms of the current state of affairs at UCOP: 1) A lack of transparency in decision-making; 2) a 'gate-keeping' approach; 3) a tendency to impose 'solutions' on the campuses; and 4) a reactive approach to both internal and external issues. The underlying factors of these symptoms include: 1) structural—unclear roles, organizational silos, and underdeveloped processes; 2) systems—an underinvestment in basic infrastructure; 3) cultural—a high degree of risk intolerance; and 4) leadership—a lack of confidence in leadership. As a result, UCOP's credibility has been undermined. The Regents have also tended to become over-involved in some campus managerial functions due to a lack confidence in the information coming from UCOP. Monitor recommends three waves of reform: 1) restoring UCOP's credibility; 2) rebuild UCOP by clarifying its vision and role(s); and 3) engage the campuses to take advantage of the scale of the system to realize further efficiencies. They also reported that Provost Hume recently laid out an

action plan, which includes both rebuilding UC's academic core and reinvigorating UC's relationship with the people of California. Monitor is also involved with two efficiency-related projects: streamlining UC's capital projects processes/practices and human resources and benefits systems. Monitor's contract is scheduled to end in April 2008.

DISCUSSION: Members briefly discussed the importance of moving UCOP back towards its original academic mission of a land-grant institution. Council asked for the basis of Monitor's report that The Regents have become over-involved in campus affairs. The Monitor representatives responded that this finding is based on surveyed campus opinions; it is also true that The Regents, themselves, have expressed concern about their level of involvement. Regents have stated directly their concerns about the reliability of information coming out of UCOP. One plausible reason for such Regental over-involvement in systemwide and campus affairs may stem from a sense of fiduciary responsibility. Such over-involvement creates a lot of extra work for UCOP over certain issues. One member noted the absence of an efficient two-way UCOP-campus feedback/communication and correction mechanism among Monitor's recommendations. Monitor responded that they are trying to better understand the respective functions that are undertaken by the campuses and UCOP under the general heading of consultation, segmenting them by the kinds of consultation and activities. They are exploring the possibility of reallocating these functions in order for them to operate more effectively as well as efficiently. Monitor agreed to incorporate the suggestion about a two-way communication process into their analysis and recommendations more fully. Members also emphasized that the reason(s) for the UCOP's very existence (and its appropriate roles) should be clarified before taking on such secondary tasks as streamlining capital projects processes and human resources. Monitor said that they have remained focused on examining UCOP's role and they have looked closely at least 75 processes performed by UCOP; the bias in this exercise has been to expand the role of the campuses as much as possible, albeit with the appropriate assistance of UCOP. Council members expressed the concern that Monitor may not have devoted sufficient attention in their public presentations to the role(s) that The Regents have played in the evolution of dysfunctional relationships and functions. It is important that this information is presently publicly. Regarding OP restructuring, Monitor expressed their expectation that UCOP will likely be considerably leaner after restructuring. They also suggested that the potential for similar savings exists on the campuses, but that these savings can only be realized through an analysis of campus 'managing entities.' Any restructuring of campus administrative operations will need to preserve campus autonomy.

ACTION: Council will continue to monitor this issue.

IX. General Discussion

ACTION: Council used this time to discuss the Monitor report.

X. University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) Updates and Requests

1. UCFW Statement on the 2008-09 Budget and the Four-Year Plan for Faculty Salaries

ISSUE: The UCFW Chair stated that the range adjustments planned for 2008-09 are inadequate. While some off-scale faculty salaries are at market, other off-scale faculty salaries are below market. Salaries will fall further behind market unless more money is allocated towards their range adjustments in the coming years. The UCFW draft statement asks for more money to be allocated to range adjustments for off-scale faculty in order to keep their salaries competitive while market adjustments are being made to the salaries of on-scale faculty members.

DISCUSSION: Council agreed that the term ‘COLA’ should be replaced with ‘range adjustment.’ Members opined that transmittal was more appropriate than full endorsement of the document because they did not have the time or the technical expertise to fully evaluate the document’s contents. It was moved and seconded to transmit the entire statement to the Presidential Work Group on Faculty Salary Scales as a UCFW document, along with a separate letter to Provost Hume, Executive Vice Provost Jewell, and Executive Vice President Lapp, urging increasing the range adjustments beginning in year two.

ACTION: Member passed the following motions: 1) change the term ‘COLA’ to ‘range adjustment’ in the document; 2) transmit the document as written as a UCFW statement to the faculty representatives on the faculty salary workgroup; and 3) send a separate statement to Provost Hume and Executive Vice President Lapp, urging increasing the allocation of money into the faculty salary plan beginning in year two.

2. UCFW Statement on the 2008-09 Budget and the PERS

ISSUE: UCFW supports UCOP’s plans to provide a one-time ad hoc cost of living adjustment (COLA) of 8.55 percent for participants in the UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan by July 1, 2008. The proposed COLA would restore the purchasing power of UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan annuitants to that of UCRP participants. The UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan does not have a COLA provision. UCOP estimates that this COLA would cost \$9.7 million, thereby reducing UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan from 203 percent funded to approximately 165 percent funded. The COLA for the UC-PERS Plus 5 participants will not impact UCRP.

ACTION: Members approved UCFW’s motion to support the one-time COLA for the participants in the UC-PERS Plus 5 Plan.

3. Health Sciences Compensation Plan – Severance Pay Plan—

ISSUE: This proposal will make immediate payments of their full balance in the Severance Pay Plan to the individual faculty participants before the end of calendar year 2007. UC must terminate the severance pay plan due to a change in the tax laws. The proposal also includes reimbursement for reasonable tax preparation expenses.

ACTION: Members approved UCFW’s request to support the proposal.

4. 2007 Open Enrollment Issues

ISSUE: The UCFW Chair reported that an analysis between the Blue Cross PPO and the new Cigna plans reveals significant savings if faculty switch from Blue Cross to Cigna. UCFW is requesting approval to communicate this analysis of these two programs to faculty members. A draft communiqué was passed out.

DISCUSSION: The UCFW Chair clarified that HR does not dispute the analysis. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) does not have any objections to a UCFW communiqué, but informed HR that they could not advocate one plan over another. The UCFW Chair assured members that this information has been verified. Suggestions included 1) adding a qualifier that would encourage faculty to perform their own calculations on the two programs; and 2) allowing various campus faculty associations to communicate this information. However, members agreed that simply alerting faculty to the discrepancy that was discovered in the course of the analysis, between the

plan details and what was included in the Open Enrollment brochure would be sufficient. Members moved and seconded a motion that Council request HR to send out an email/ mailing alerting faculty to the discrepancy between the website and the brochure.

ACTION: Chair Brown will request HR to notify faculty and staff about the discrepancy between the website and the printed brochure regarding the information on the Cigna plan.

XI. UCPB's Expenditures Report

ISSUE: The 'expenditures report' costs out The Regents' priorities, which are included in The Regents' long-range planning. The UCPB Vice Chair invited members to provide input on the report to Chair Newfield.

ACTION: 1) Chair Brown will send out a memo requesting informal comments on the UCPB Expenditures Report; and 2) the report will be on the November Council agenda.

XII. Proposal for UC Financial Aid for Undocumented Students

ACTION: Council did not have time to discuss this issue.

XIII. Setting Basic Standards for Remote and Online Instruction

ISSUE: This issue originally emerged out of CCGA's proposal for a revised Senate Regulation (SR) 694 and a new SR 695. The pertinent issues are remote instruction (either on-line or physically removed from campus) and residency. These issues are currently being considered by a special subcommittee composed of members from CCGA, UCEP, and ITTP. The CCGA Chair requested advice on the best way to move forward with the dialogue around these issues. In particular, he asked if a related white paper should be forwarded through CCGA's, UCEP's, and ITTP's corresponding divisional committees, if it should be distributed through the divisional chairs, or through both avenues.

DISCUSSION: Members advocated for the widest possible distribution of such a white paper through both divisional chairs and the corresponding committees of CCGA, UCEP, and ITTP. CCGA and UCEP should work out the academic issues independently of the technical issues. However, technical experts should also be consulted. Issues of course and faculty competition, along with the appropriate financial arrangements were also raised. All of these points speak to the emerging issue of system-wide courses. While there are few purely on-line courses within the UC system, there are many hybrid courses. It was also noted that students are already taking many on-line courses at local community colleges for credit in part because they are impacted at UC.

ACTION: Council Chair Brown will distribute a remote and on-line instruction white paper to the divisional chairs, who will forward it to their respective divisional committees.

XIV. Stewardship Review of Senior Management

ACTION: This item was postponed to the November 2007 Council meeting.

XV. Joint Academic Council – Chancellors Meeting

ACTION: Non-applicable/Council did not have time to discuss this issue.

XVI. Ongoing Agenda Item: "Senate Issues/Topics of Concern"

ACTION: Non-applicable/Council did not have time to discuss this issue.

XVII. New Business

ISSUE: One member moved to allow the Chair to move the time-sensitive items to the front of the agenda, given the limited amount of time left for the meeting.

DISCUSSION: Chair Brown responded that the time-sensitive items are the UCPB expenditures report, remote-online instruction, and the two items that were pulled off the consent calendar.

ACTION: Members approved this motion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst

ACADEMIC COUNCIL		Key: X=In attendance, \=Absent, Alt=Alternate, T=Teleconference									
Attendance 2007-2008		9/26	10/31	11/28	12/19	1/23	2/27	3/26	4/23	5/28	
<u>Officers</u>											
Michael Brown, Chair		X	X								
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair		X	X								
<u>Divisional Chairs</u>											
William Drummond	UCB	X	X								
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X								
Timothy Bradley	UCI	X	X								
Elizabeth Bjork	UCLA	X	X								
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X								
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X								
James Posakony	UCSD	X	X								
David Gardner	UCSF	X	X								
Joel Michaelsen	UCSB	X	X								
Quentin Williams	UCSC	X	X								
<u>Committee Chairs</u>											
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X								
Bruce Schumm	CCGA	X	X								
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD	X	X								
James Hunt	UCAP	X	X								
Keith Williams	UCEP	X	X								
James Chalfant	UCFW	X	X								
Jose Wudka	UCORP	X	X								
Christopher Newfield	UCPB	X	Alt								
<u>Alternates</u>											
Pat Conrad	UCPB		X								
<u>Guests</u>											
Maria Shanle	University Counsel	X									
Debra Obley	Budget		X								
Nick Jewell, Vice Provost, Acad Personnel			X								

Academic Council Minutes – October 31, 2007

Mary-Beth Harhen, SC Senate Director		X
Michael Dalby	Monitor	X
Jim Hollingshead	Monitor	X

President & Senior

Management

Robert Dynes, President	X	X
Rory Hume, Provost	X	X
Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR	X	
Katie Lapp, Exec VP, Bus Ops	X	X

Council Staff

Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director	X	X
Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst	X	X