

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting**Wednesday, November 28, 2007****I. Announcements****➤ Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair**

- The deadline for the receipt of vice chair nominations is January 4th.
- Daniel R. Dooley has been appointed the new Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). DANR will also be going out for review and comment in the near future.
- UCSB Division Chair Joel Michaelsen will serve as the Senate representative on the capital projects review work team as part of the UCOP restructuring effort.
- UCOP has conducted consumer surveys on the public's perception of UC. Council will be consulted on public relations' themes based on this data.
- Steven Beckwith has been appointed as the new Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.
- Regent Monica Lozano will attend the December Council meeting.
- Regents' November 2007 Updates:
 - The Chancellors' salary plan was pulled from agenda over questions about the methodology used in developing this plan.
 - Regents deferred further discussion of the Administration's plan to grant COLAs to UC-PERS retirees until additional information is available. UCFW will discuss the UC-PERS COLAs at their December meeting; it may also be on the December Council agenda.
 - Council will review the individual reports from The Regents' Study Group on University Diversity (faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, and climate).
 - Regent Parsky has recently engaged a search firm to continue the search for a Chief Financial Officer (CFO), which initially failed in its first iteration. 2006-07 Senate Chair John Oakley will represent the Council on this search committee.

➤ Mary Croughan, Academic Council Vice Chair

ASCOLI will be working on a resolution on plutonium pit production at the Los Alamos National Lab (LANL). Historically, LANL has produced five or fewer 'pits' per year; their current capability is 10-12. Fifty pits per year (with a maximum of 80) has been suggested as the potential pit production capability at LANL. ACSCOLI is in the process of nominating a slate of names for the LANL Capability Review.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that pit production has not attracted significant attention from the media or on the campuses. The Office of General Counsel (OGC) has expressed its view that divisional discussions would not impact the legal status of the University with respect to the lab contracts in any way. Members expressed their view that increasing pit production is an ethical issue. However, lab directors are arguing that increasing pit production increases the labs' scientific capability. The major issue is the identification of LANL as a nuclear weapons manufacturer. UCPB Chair Newfield noted that the Academic Assembly passed a series principles related to the labs last year. He cited principle nine as especially relevant, which directs the successor of ASCONL to consult with relevant Senate committees on issues involving the labs and

“specify a process of co-drafting standing orders and Regental policies with The Regents, including orders or policies that modify current standing operating structures.” He urged ASCOLI to 1) address principle nine; 2) explicitly inform divisions that they are free to discuss the LLC contracts; and 3) conduct a new faculty opinion poll on the LLC contracts. Chair Brown responded that ASCOLI has already completed the actions associated with the first two points. While a new survey is not being contemplated, the 2004 survey showed that faculty were very supportive of the lab contracts as long as UC’s scientific mission is maintained.

➤ **María Bertero-Barceló, Senate Executive Director/Chief of Staff**

Senate correspondence, which is listed in each agenda, will eventually be posted on the password-protected website. Some correspondence is indeed confidential; Members will be informed as to which correspondence should not be forwarded.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the October 31, 2007, Minutes

2. Senate Representatives to the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee (TTAC)

3. UC Merced Regulation 75 – Honors

ACTION: Council adopted the Consent Calendar, with the exception of the October minutes, which was pulled, and moved to new business.

III. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved.

IV. UCPB’s Expenditures Report

ISSUE: UCPB Chair Newfield noted that UC’s budget is determined by October. In the budget, expenditures are listed in a number of subcategories, but this does not mean they are additional augmentations. UCPB’s expenditures report compares The Regents’ estimated expenses for their priorities to UCPB’s cost calculations. Regental costs for these priorities are relatively high, which he speculated would intensify UC’s dependence on external funding. 85% of these priorities are directed towards infrastructure; only 15% is devoted to personnel. Personnel funding, as projected in the Regents’ calculations, are too low. The report also points out that the full cost of funding The Regents’ priorities is well beyond available funds. A multi-year revenue plan needs to be developed. UCPB will complete the report over the next couple of months.

DISCUSSION: UCPB Chair Newfield clarified that Council is the intended audience of this report when completed, and if endorsed, may forward it to UCOP. Members agreed that late in the spring or early summer would be a good time for submission to UCOP, so that it can be considered in the planning of next year’s budget. One member remarked that UC seems to be moving from a model of high fees-high return to aid towards high fees-low return to aid. With that in mind, Council should stress the importance of devoting all fee increases to undergraduate and graduate return to aid. Members also expressed the need for a major financial fix in the near future. While UC is currently recognized as a premier institution internationally, it will not remain so under current funding conditions. Documenting this degradation or slippage in quantitative and qualitative terms is important. Such a report, which should include measures of faculty retention,

faculty recruitment, graduate student retention and recruitment, and student faculty ratios, could be delivered to EVP Lapp in the spring. UCPB is also engaged in a ‘Tales of Woe’ project, which will provide additional antidotal documentation of this slippage.

ACTION: 1) UCPB will submit its Expenditure Report to Council early in the new year; 2) Qualitative and quantitative evidence of UC degradation or slippage will be documented in another report.

V. Graduate Student Support and the Academic Council’s Recommendations to the Provost regarding the Final Report from the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee (GSAC)

ISSUE: CCGA and UCPB will develop a funding model based on the work in the GSAC report. Non-resident tuition (NRT) may not be properly costed-out in this report however.

DISCUSSION: This funding model should be prepared in time for Council’s discussion with the Chancellors. It should also inform not only the budget discussions in May, but the next budget cycle as well. CCGA Chair Schumm proposed a February deadline. Members briefly discussed whether it would be appropriate for CCGA and UCPB to only address NRT, or all three issues mentioned in the report. Given that faculty have expressed a definitive viewpoint on the elimination of NRT, one member suggested focusing on NRT, perhaps developing a time-line for a NRT phase-out by March. Other portions of the report could be addressed later. However, other members remarked that such a narrow focus on NRT is dangerous not only because of the political nature of the issue, but also because NRT does not represent a large percentage of the total graduate support shortfall. CCGA Chair Schumm noted that it is the preference of CCGA to look at all three issues comprehensively, including a phase-out plan for NRT, rather than focusing on NRT exclusively.

ACTION: CCGA and UCPB will develop a graduate support funding plan by February.

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

- **Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic and Health Affairs**
- **Bruce Darling, Executive Vice President, University Affairs**
- **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

Provost Wyatt ‘Rory’ Hume

Provost Hume reported:

- That the senior management group (SMG) is half-way through its campus academic planning visits.
- Regents Chair Blum has asked UCOP to consider accelerating the time table of the faculty salary increases, and they are exploring it.
- Provost Hume’s presentation to The Regents on UCOP restructuring has been posted to the UCOP website. The development of a clearly-defined governance structure is part of this restructuring. Many UCOP functions actually do not support the President; they support activities/programs on the campuses centrally but do not have to be done at UCOP. Vacancy control has been instituted and staff are being offered monetary inducements to leave UCOP voluntarily.

- The EAP review is now out for Senate review. EAP needs a new governance structure to address its critical financial problems, which Provost Hume will develop in collaboration with the EVCs. Increasing EAP campus authority and financial responsibility/control is one area that needs to be addressed. However, Provost Hume has not taken any definite actions yet.
- The Regents' Long Range Planning Committee has endorsed the vision of UC as ten campuses, or power of ten; they are interested in determining what is needed to get there.

EVP Katherine Lapp

The Regents approved the UC budget at their November meeting. EVP Lapp will be meeting with the Department of Finance (DOF) to discuss the budget. The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) projects that the state budget deficit will grow from \$6 to \$10 billion. The Governor has issued a directive to state agencies to prepare for 10% budget cuts; however, UC has not received such a directive yet. The Governor's budget will be issued in January; The Regents will make budgetary decisions in March. EVP Lapp also handed out a chart on the budget process (see distribution 1), which is designed to be transparent and incorporate campus academic planning. Under this plan, advocacy in Sacramento for the budget starts after its approval at the November Regents meeting.

EVP Bruce Darling

EVP Darling reported that:

- The defense appropriations bill was passed, which will provide a 3% increase for basic research; there is also a 35% cap on the total dollars awarded to grants for indirect costs, which is above the current campus indirect cost rates that are based on negotiated modified indirect costs. 35 cents of each dollar will go towards indirect costs under the new 35% cap; the current rate is about 23 cents per dollar translated into this new methodology.
- President Bush vetoed the Labor HHS Education appropriations bill.
- The Regents voted to oppose Proposition 92, which is the community college funding initiative.
- Many of UC's labor agreements are expiring in 2008.
- College affordability is another concern, especially with impending fee increases at both UC and CSU.
- UC also needs its next capital bond measure approved.
- California State Senator Yee has threatened to put a ballot initiative to restrict salary increases for senior managers at both CSU and UC.
- UC's State Governmental Relations Office is going through a transition with Steve Arditti retiring.
- The Los Alamos and Livermore labs are restructuring their workforces in part due to the higher costs associated with the change in ownership to private entities (higher taxes, etc). Each lab will lay-off between 500 and 700 employees.

Questions/Answers and Comments

Q: There seems to be some substance to the description of UC as being openly hostile to unions, which seems to annoy the State Legislature. To what extent are The Regents aware that such an anti-Union stance is detrimental to UC?

A: Provost Hume said that The Regents are well aware of this balance. There is definitely sympathy and support for UC's workers. While UC must follow certain negotiating procedures

with the unions, there is not a willful intent to make negotiations difficult with the unions. EVP Lapp added that the real issue with the unions is the governance of the pension system and the restarting of contributions, which The Regents are fiducially responsible for.

Q: UC has huge financial needs and a dim budget projection. Is there any possibility of a ballot initiative related to UC funding? If so, would this jeopardize UC's relationship with the DOF?

A: Provost Hume responded that such a ballot initiative would need to be coordinated with the other sectors of California higher education. He is not aware of The Regents discussing any such initiative. EVP Lapp added that a long-term funding plan is needed.

Q: How was \$10 million allocated for graduate education in the 2007-08 budget distributed? Is there a plan for deploying new resources? The 2006 GSAC report laid out a blueprint for how funds should be deployed for graduate education. Is there a general acceptance of this report?

A: Provost Hume said that the \$10 million received for graduate education in the 2007-08 budget is not a permanent allocation. Faculty salaries and graduate support remain the two top UC priorities, but this must be balanced with other needs.

Q: How did UC learn about the community college ballot initiative, and with which entities did it engage? Are there any efforts to initiate a comprehensive ballot initiative that would include UC, CSU, and the community colleges?

A: EVP Darling responded that the community college initiative did not come through the Legislature, but through a signature gathering process. UC discussed this measure with CSU, which also voted to oppose it. If it fails; CSU, UC, and the community colleges could collaborate in a public campaign for new funding. A new ballot initiative could be another alternative.

Q: Will the personnel contraction at the Labs impact technical staff? When and where did this issue first emerge?

A: EVP Darling responded that as the Labs were being competed, UCOP knew that there were going to be new costs, especially with regard to the tax issues relating to the transfer in ownership. Workforce restructuring has only emerged in the last couple of weeks, which has been coupled with the reality of declining budgets.

Comment: A lack of UCOP engagement over the past five to seven years has prompted campuses to go their own way with regard to faculty salaries. Now UCOP is trying to reassert itself with the faculty salary plan. Anything that could be done to make the plan more consistent would be appreciated by all segments of the faculty; a short time line would also be desirable.

A: Provost Hume responded that UCOP is committed to moving the faculty salary plan forward; the only question is how fast it can be done. A key element is the reinvigoration of the peer review process. It is certainly true that UCOP did fail by not adjusting the scales on an annual basis.

Q: Where will the future funding for the Science and Math Initiative (SMI) come from? There are rumors that SMI funding will run out at the end of this year. Teacher training has also not been a high priority in SMI fund-raising.

A: Provost Hume remarked that this is a great program. While the campuses agreed to a central UCOP-based fund-raising model, it is a campus-based program. In the long-term, campuses will need to increase local fund-raising, but UCOP will continue in its fund-raising role for the next

five years. SMI is funded by a variety of private funders (including Intel), as well as some state funding. Campuses are also bringing in additional grant monies in support of SMI. If funded, the Educational Imperative will increase UC's commitment to K-12 education.

Q: Council asked Provost Hume to comment on the following issues related to the United Auto Workers (UAW) contract with the teaching assistants (TA): 1) a number of last-minute changes to the contract were agreed to without faculty consultation; 2) some of the terms represent unfunded mandates (tuition fee remission, child care, etc.), which also sets a precedent for negotiations with other unions; and 3) disputes over TA workload, which would now go directly into arbitration, rather than faculty review, who are responsible for the oversight of TAs. Chair Brown added that Council will investigate this further.

A: Provost Hume responded that the EVCs were consulted during the negotiations, but it was generally recognized that this process was not satisfactory. Given the short time frame, certain value judgment calls were necessary. The UC negotiators felt that the inclusion of the child care allowance was important to support graduate students. While it may be appropriate to institute mechanisms for wider consultation, the EVCs are the representatives of their campuses.

Q: How are budget line-items monitored on the campuses?

A: EVP Lapp responded that she is more accustomed to a process whereby agencies submit annual budget requests with appropriate justification and monitoring. UC is budgeted incrementally. UCOP currently does not have the capability to monitor campus spending on faculty salaries. UCOP is now requesting that the campuses provide this information.

Q: What led to the resurrection of the search for a new CFO?

A: There is a feeling among The Regents that UC does not have a financial management expert, who would be able to pull together the entire needs of the system from a financial perspective. EVP Lapp acknowledged that she does not have this capability. UCOP does have a number of financial management experts, but they look at transactions. A CFO would monitor the University's global financial health, which includes global financial management and coordination of UC's investment strategy; coordinate the operations of the Treasurer's Office. A CFO would not create budgets though. Provost Hume added that The Regents want to develop a UC long-term financial strategy, which cannot be done through the Finance Committee.

Q: At a time when UCOP is restructuring and cutting positions, do you feel that this is an appropriate time and an appropriate position to hire a CFO?

A: Provost Hume responded said that The Regents have made the decision to bring in an external person to fill a CFO position.

Q: What is the Administration's understanding of the Chancellor's salary plan? What is the psychology of going ahead with this plan in light of restructuring?

A: Provost Hume responded that chancellor salaries are significantly behind the privates and other public universities (between 30-40%). UC is facing a scenario where the highest compensated chancellor is only 115th among university presidents/chancellors. While UC appreciates dedicated chancellors, it also needs to attract and keep its best leaders. President Dynes has pledged that he would begin to move on chancellors' salaries once the faculty salary plan was initiated. While the current budgetary environment is uncertain, it is important to rectify this situation. The Regents

will discuss the chancellors' salary plan in January, once they have received information on comparison data.

Q: Council asked for evidence that shows that UC chancellors are leaving because of low salaries.

A: Provost Hume responded that UC recently lost two female chancellors. While the reasons for their departure were multi-faceted, he believes that compensation was one issue. He is also concerned that UC's ability to succeed is damaged by low salaries.

Q: Are chancellors pushing this plan forward?

A: Provost Hume said that the chancellors are supportive of the plan.

Comment: There is a relationship between the chancellors' salaries and restrictions on compensation from external boards. UC must offer elevated salaries if it restricts compensation from other sources.

Q: An affordability task force is being convened. One of the recommendations being considered is a State match for student endowments. How would this plan differ from similar plans that have been tried previously?

A: EVP Darling responded that the old plan called for the State to match gifts that would be donated for endowments for undergraduate scholarships. However, this was tied to an initiative to support transfers students, and it failed in the Legislature. Last year, UC did raise \$121 million for student support. Alumni giving is one area that UC would like to develop.

Q: If such a plan does succeed, will it create the impression among the public that affordability is being successfully managed at UC. Could that impact UC's overall state funding?

A: EVP Darling remarked that this is a fundamental question. It is certainly true that UC needs to arrest the trend in state support; an initiative with CSU might be one option.

VII. General Discussion

DISCUSSION: Members commented that it is important to stress that budget should be academically driven; opposition to a CFO was also reiterated. EAP is another issue that needs attention; One member asked that Council request that Provost Hume wait on the formation of an administrative leadership team until after the Senate has a chance to comment. Faculty representation on such a leadership team should be one request. Campuses may want a larger portion of EAP's budget; this may not be driven academically. Council may also want to comment on Jerry Kissler's analysis, which proposes to not only cut EAP's budget but also fund it through student fees. A suggestion was made to move up the divisional deadline to comment on the EAP to February.

Members also discussed the UAW contract. While UCOP initially did make statements that indicated they were considering ways to fund some of the terms agreed to in the contract, there was no follow-up on the funding issue. Now that the UAW contract has been agreed to, other groups/unions may demand much of the same. Council stressed that unfunded mandates remain a central concern of the Senate, especially if these mandates are funded in such a way that only further erodes limited campus budgets. TA work-load disputes is another issue that will be investigated. Chair Brown will ask the UCOP for a list of commitments that were agreed to, which

agencies were engaged in the negotiation process, and the funding plans for those commitments. Budget line-items were also briefly discussed; there seems to be a certain amount of flexibility in campus decisions regarding the allocation resources to budgetary line-items that the campuses receive from UCOP.

ACTION: 1) Divisional Chairs agreed to move the response date to February; 2) Chair Brown will send a letter requesting Provost Hume to delay forming an EAP administrative leadership team until after Council's comments have been received; and 3) Chair Brown will send a letter to Provost Hume asking for a list of commitments that were agreed to in the UAW contract, which agencies were engaged in the negotiation process, and the funding plans for those commitments. The letter will also inquire into the issue of TA-faculty workload disputes.

VIII. Executive Session: Presidential Search and Its Implication on the Restructuring of UC
ACTION: Chair Brown will send a letter to WASC, inquiring when the WASC accreditation draft will be available.

IX. Chancellor's Proposed Compensation Plan

ISSUE: Dennis Larson, Director of UCOP's Human Resources and Benefits (HR&B)-Resource Administration, briefed Council on the proposed Chancellor's compensation plan (see distribution #2). This item was pulled because The Regents did not feel that there was not enough information on the methodology. Most UC senior management group positions are slotted, which gives the University an approximation of market salary rates. The Chancellors are not slotted. The proposed compensation plan is based on a UC survey of comparable Chancellors/Presidents' salaries. The Regents requested that the new proposed methodology for slotting be applied to the Chancellors' compensation plan, which addresses some key issues associated with the old system, including stratification. The following compensatory factors are used to slot jobs into salary bands and zones: size and scope of the job, complexity of job responsibilities, impact on mission, quality or distinction (may not impact zone/slotting, but will impact individual's pay within assigned zone), and strategic prioritization. Individual pay will be based on performance, assessments, contributions, internal relativity to peers, etc. UCOP expects to have a presentation ready for The Regents January meeting. If agreement is reached over the methodology; it can be applied to the Chancellors. The data that UC has collected from Mercer shows that universities with medical school have higher pay rates than institutions without medical centers. The slotting methodology gives UC guidance for a minimum and maximum pay, against which Chancellors' salaries can be determined. All of this is tied to the market. CPEC methodology allows UC to use bands, but the particulars of individual salary are based on other compensatory factors. The plan is still based on a four-year time-table. The plan is also independent of any restrictions on external compensation.

DISCUSSION: Director Larson clarified that UC chancellor pay is 33% behind the market, which represents the median market chancellor/president pay as compared to the average UC Chancellor pay rate. UC is establishing different salary ranges; individual salaries would fall within those ranges. The estimated cost is \$3 million over four years for ten chancellors. Council asked for the delta between the President and the EVCP, or Provost, as raising Chancellor's salaries could have a 'cascading' effect, thereby raising these other salaries as well (EVCP, vice chancellors, etc.). Director Larson acknowledged that this is possible, but such increases would

also be subject to similar market surveys. Director Larson could not provide a cost estimate for a ‘cascading’ effect, but he could investigate this further. He estimated that this secondary group would encompass between 600 and 800 people. It was also noted that many of the senior managers directly below the chancellors did just receive pay increases, which may weaken any cascade effect. However, chancellors were given a flat 5% due to the fact that the plan was pulled from The Regents’ agenda.

Director Larson confirmed that with the exception of UCRP and other retirement savings plans, this plan will not impact benefits packages programmatically. He also confirmed that the data used to establish the bands came from the aforementioned survey of 26 universities, of which, 17 responded. He added that UC is 37% behind the comparator eight institutions that UC typically compares itself against. Members were also concerned that among the list of compensable factors used for slotting; only one (quality or distinction) is related to performance. For the purposes of slotting, performance is not considered. Once slotted, the individual pay is determined in part by performance. The SMG performance review process recommends a five-year panel review. There is also an annual review process that is completed by the senior manager’s supervisor. One member commented that in Mercer’s survey on total remuneration, Mercer did not include all data on benefits due to a lack of data on comparison institutions. He asked if this is the same Mercer data is being used for the Chancellor’s salary plan. Director Larson confirmed this, but noted that with respect to Chancellors, they receive different elements of compensation, which includes both cash and non-cash compensation. UC does have prevalence data on housing for example. However, at this time, housing is not considered a benefit. He commented that it is important to determine if the benefit(s) being offered is substantially different than that offered by the comparator institutions, then an argument can be made look at the evaluation methodology. It was noted that faculty adjustments are vested in the peer review process. In contrast, the Chancellor’s compensation plan methodology looks outward rather than inward at the peers within their own institution(s).

Members also questioned both the appropriateness and accuracy of the \$3 million estimate of this salary adjustment. This is an estimate; the actual cost could be more or less than this estimate. Council expressed its concern that this plan will have a negative effect on staff morale, as many will question why the Chancellors were chosen as a group in need of a salary adjustment. Director Larson responded that is the Chancellors are a fairly small group of individuals; a salary adjustment for this group entails only a relatively small amount of cost. He added that staff are not being ignored, as The Regents have established a ten-year plan (RE-61) to raise the salaries of all of these groups; the time tables for faculty and Chancellors have been prioritized. Another outstanding issue is campus stratification. Members asked if there are different classes of chancellorial jobs? Director Larsen said that this structure is a broad-band structure; it is approximately twice the range of the current 60% range. These bands will be carved into three somewhat over-lapping zones, which are based on compensable factors, in order to better track the market. It is not a given that the larger campuses will automatically be assigned to higher zones; some smaller campuses may in fact be relegated to higher zones due to resource constraints, etc. The new system focuses on the scope of the job itself, not necessarily on the size of the campus. Instituting multiple zones is important to ensure differential specificity with regard to the varying chancellorial positions. Director Larson informed Council that the plan will be placed on The Regents’ January agenda for discussion; formal approval will take place in March. Chair Brown

requested that Council receive the plan in time for its December meeting for comment. Members also made it clear that stratification issues still remain. It was pointed out that pinning the ‘morale’ of chancellors entirely on pay is misleading and somewhat dubious. The concern was also expressed, that such a plan, if enacted, could damage UC’s public image.

ACTION: The Chancellor’s Compensation Plan will be on the December Council agenda.

X. System-wide Senate Review of the Proposed Amendments to SR 636

ACTION: The review of SR 636 was postponed.

XI. Proposed Legislative Ruling Regarding Graduate Student Residency Senate Regulations (SR) 682 and 694

ISSUE: CCGA Chair Schumm reported that CCGA requested an interpretation of residency requirements as they pertained to a graduate program that included an international component.

DISCUSSION: Members acknowledged that there is a certain amount of ambiguity surrounding this issue, as residency regulations define the length of programs in varying places in terms of both academic units and time. However, curriculum is intended to occupy a certain amount of time, but this is somewhat variable from student to student. One member noted that the second paragraph actually contradicts the first paragraph. The suggestion was made to reword the first paragraph to read: “A student must spend 50% of the program duration in residency, up to one year.” Council may also want to ask for an informal comment about what constitutes the length of a program. CCGA Chair Schumm opposed this recommendation, noting the lack of a test case to base such an informal ruling on.

ACTION: Members agreed to ask UCR&J to reword its ruling more generally and suggest rewording the first paragraph to read “a student must spend 50% of the program duration in residency, up to one year.”

XII. Campus Security Task Force Report

ISSUE: Chair Brown clarified that this report is coming to Council for comment only.

DISCUSSION: One member commented that the use of the label, “active shooter plan training plan,” is problematic. Concern was expressed over the legal liabilities and procedures involved in faculty evaluating the mental health of students. Privacy issues were also mentioned as a concern. Different student constituencies, such as graduate students and post-docs, have different issues. For instance, mental health facilities should be open year-round to accommodate graduate students and post-docs. One member remarked that the report makes a number of good recommendations; however, more clarity is needed on the final cost of these recommendations. For example, an initial analysis from the Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs estimates that a 25% hike in registration fees would be needed. If instituted, such an increase would represent a substantial burden on students. Human Resources should also comment on the authority of faculty supervisors to raise questions about the mental stability of staff members. Implementation and training will be an important component in the ultimate success of these recommendations.

ACTION: Chair Brown will send a letter to Provost Hume incorporating Council's comments.

XIII. Proposal for UC Financial Aid for Undocumented Students

ACTION: This issue was postponed until the December meeting.

XIV. Stewardship and Performance Review of Senior Management

ACTION: Jim Chalfant (UCFW Chair) and Jim Hunt (UCAP Chair) agreed to serve on this work group.

XV. Joint Academic Council – Chancellors Meeting

ACTION: Members agreed to the protocol that was distributed by email.

XVI. The Power of Ten

ACTION: This issue was postponed until the December meeting.

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

ACTION: Chair Brown agreed to schedule Senate Issue/Topics of Concern from 4:15-4:30 at each Council meeting.

XVIII. New Business

ISSUE: The October 31, 2007 Minutes

DISCUSSION: One member felt that the Council comments regarding the Monitor Group were weak and diluted. Council's comments regarding The Regents' interactions with the campuses should be included in the minutes. Also missing was Council's question to Monitor on whether they had considered the basic utility of certain functions that UCOP currently performs.

ACTION: The minutes will be revised appropriately.

Distributions:

1. Budget Cycle Diagram
2. Underlying Methodology of Market Parity Initiative for Chancellors' Pay

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst

Academic Council Minutes – November 28, 2007

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	6/25
<u>Officers</u>											
Michael Brown, Chair		X	X	X							
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair		X	X	X							
<u>Divisional Chairs</u>											
William Drummond	UCB	X	X	X							
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X	X							
Timothy Bradley	UCI	X	X	X							
Elizabeth Bjork	UCLA	X	X	X							
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X	X							
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X	X							
James Posakony	UCSD	X	X	X							
David Gardner	UCSF	X	X	X							
Joel Michaelsen	UCSB	X	X	X							
Quentin Williams	UCSC	X	X	X							
<u>Committee Chairs</u>											
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X	X							
Bruce Schumm	CCGA	X	X	X							
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD	X	X	X							
James Hunt	UCAP	X	X	X							
Keith Williams	UCEP	X	X	X							
James Chalfant	UCFW	X	X	X							
Jose Wudka	UCORP	X	X	X							
Christopher Newfield	UCPB	X	Alt	X							
<u>Alternates</u>											
Pat Conrad	UCPB		X								
<u>Guests</u>											
Debra Obley	Budget		X								
Nick Jewell, Vice Provost, Acad Personnel			X								
Mary-Beth Harhen, SC Senate Director			X								
Diane Hamann, SD Senate Director					X						
Michael Dalby	Monitor		X								
Jim Hollingshead	Monitor		X								
Dennis Larsen, Director, HR & Benefits-Resource Administration					X						
<u>President & Senior Management</u>											
Robert Dynes, President		X	X								
Rory Hume, Provost		X	X	X							
Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR		X		X							
Katie Lapp, Exec VP, Bus Ops		X	X	X							
<u>Council Staff</u>											
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director		X	X	X							
Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst		X	X	X							