

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, February 27, 2008

I. Announcements**➤ Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair**

- 2008-09 Vice Chair Harry Powell attends Council meetings as a 'visitor.'
- The UCLA Faculty Association sent a memo to Regent Blum on the faculty salaries plan; Chair Brown will send it out to Council members.

II. Consent Calendar

- 1. Approval of the January 23, 2008, Minutes**
 - 2. Science and Math Initiatives**
 - 3. Law School Faculty Salary**
 - 4. Proposal for a School of Public Health at UC Davis**
 - 5. Amendment to Senate Bylaw 141**
 - 6. UCPB Representative to the Steering Committee of the Industry University Collaborative Research Program (IUCRP)**
 - 7. UCI and UCSF Variances to Senate Regulations**
 - 8. Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force to Establish a Funding Model for Graduate Education**
 - 9. Resolution (Statement) on Animal Research**
 - 10. Review Protocol for Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)**
 - 11. Cancellation of the March 12 2008, Assembly of the Academic Senate Regular Meeting**
- ACTION: Items 4 and 10 were pulled from the consent calendar; Council approved the rest of the consent calendar.**

III. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved.

IV. The Proposed Multi-Campus Global School of Health -- Professor Haile Debas, UCSF Medical School, and Ellen Switkes, School of Global Health Liaison

REPORT/ISSUE: The incentive behind the development of a systemwide School of Global Health is the fact that complex global health challenges require a cross-disciplinary approach, engaging scientists, engineers, business people, and lawyers, among others, from the University's ten campuses. These global health challenges include poverty, socioeconomic disparities, education, social pandemics and emerging infections, education, neglected diseases, chronic diseases, climate change and health, climate change and health, environmental degradation, migration, peace/security/disaster responses, etc. The School will utilize a problem-based and action-oriented approach, and add value without replacing existing schools. Planning is taking place through a senior advisory committee, an all-campus planning committee, -- both having Senate reps-- and an external scientific advisory committee. Cooperation/assistance from the Academic Senate is also requested. The proposed structure of the School is an administrative core on one campus with five or six 'Centers of Expertise' on other campuses. The Dean would report

to both the Chancellor of his/her respective campus and the Provost. ‘Letters of intent’ will be requested from key faculty for the Centers of Expertise. The proposal will be ready for review by September 2008; The Regents will review it sometime in 2009.

DISCUSSION: While Council applauded the proposal’s innovation, there was some concern about the proposed School’s revenue stream. Professor Debas confirmed that the School will be expensive, as each Center of Expertise will need at least eight FTE. Revenue and support for the School will come from both public and private sources, student enrollment, and master’s programs. Members also asked whether a multi-campus unit (MRU) might be better suited to meet these stated needs. Professor Debas responded that two planning committees considered this issue and decided that a MRU model would not work because 1) it does not provide the sustainability of a School; 2) it could not recruit faculty; and 3) a ‘School’ attracts significantly more external recognition than a MRU; and 4) MRUs cannot support degree programs.

V. Long Range Enrollment Planning-- *Nina Robison, Director, Policy & External Affairs*

REPORT/ISSUE: UC’s current enrollment plan extends out to 2010-2011. The State Legislature asked for a set of UC enrollment projections, which is due in March 2008. The goals articulated for the UC long range enrollment planning are to identify enrollment levels campuses need to achieve their academic goals; increase both number and proportion of graduate enrollments; increase the proportion of undergraduates who enter as transfer students; move forward on planned health sciences enrollment growth; enhance diversity at all levels; and ensure compliance with the LRDPs. By 2020-21, UC’s projected enrollment will be at 265,000 total students, 195,700 undergraduates, 52,500 graduate students, and 16,600 Health Science professional students and residents. The total growth from 2007-08 to 2020-21 is projected to be 21%; the undergraduate population would increase by 15% during this same period. While several campuses will stop growing during this period (UCB, UCI, UCLA, and UCSD), others (UCD and UCSB) will continue to grow slowly, and still others (UCM, UCR, and UCSC) at more or less normal rates. Graduate enrollment projections are projected to grow by 45% (+16,300 students); their proportion of total students will rise from 21% to 22%. The challenge with graduate growth is sustaining enrollments over time. The greatest percentage graduate growth will be in the professional schools, while the greatest numerical growth will be in the STEM fields. In the Health Sciences, the projected enrollments are generally consistent with Health Sciences planning. Building the proper public and legislative support will critical, especially in graduate studies, in order to realize this growth.

DISCUSSION: Members acknowledged the funding difficulties associated with increasing graduate enrollments; a relatively large amount of resource will be required. Director Robinson responded that she does not have information regarding the resource magnitude that will be needed, but she added that this plan is relatively consistent with UC’s facilities’ plans. They also asked how graduate growth would be divided between degree types. She remarked that while a few campuses are interested in increasing some stand-alone master’s programs, the bulk of the growth will come in the form of traditional Ph.D. programs. Growth in the undergraduate population runs counter to the notion that California is hitting a plateau in its projected numbers of high school students. Director Robinson responded that some campuses have proposed modest out-of-state enrollments, but the primary ‘fuel’ for the undergraduate growth comes from underserved communities. Regarding the effect of new medical schools on enrollments in the

Health Sciences, she added that their impact will be relatively minor; a typical new medical school only enrolls 300 students at most in its first year. Incremental growth at already established departments/schools (even by just a few percent) will add substantially more students. Council also observed that there seemed to be very little value-added from UCOP in terms of a system-wide analysis or coordination. She responded that UCOP has not imposed a top-down planning effort, which was what the campuses wanted.

VI. The University's Budget

1. UCFW Statement on the UC Budget and the Future of the Faculty Salaries Plan

ACTION: This discussion was postponed to a later meeting.

2. University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) Report on the Cuts proposed by California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger

REPORT/ISSUE: UCPB requested that Council endorse both the cover letter and the Cuts Report; the letter includes a number of recommendations associated with the proposed 10% cut. UCPB Vice Chair Patricia Conrad emphasized that while the economy may be weakening somewhat, economic conditions are not dire enough to justify a 10% cut. However, the Governor is asserting that spending is out of control in California. It is important to note that spending on higher education has not been sufficient and the University has not grown in the same way that it has for other state agencies. The proposed 10% cuts come on top of the chronic and recent cuts, not on recent increases. These cuts would be made after the Compact is funded, so it really amounts to an approximate 3.6% cut. The Budget Stabilization Act, which would go on the ballot in the fall, calls for an automatic and permanent 5% cut to all state agencies if there is a deficit of \$1 million or more in any one budget year. Under this scenario, UC's budget would be permanently cut by 5%, or an additional \$145 million in revenues, if California remains in deficit over \$1 million in 2009-10. If these permanent 5% cuts were to continue for two years, UC's budget would essentially be frozen, and far below that of even what the Compact promised.

UCPB has made the following recommendations: 1) UC should publicly oppose the proposed budget cuts; 2) that the University engage in a campaign to build the public's confidence in the value of the UC; 3) The President make a public commitment to maintaining the current, albeit reduced level of resources, devoted to each UC student; and 4) that the President make clear that the University will need to respond to cuts by limiting enrollments and/or disclose the level of fees required to prevent further reductions in the quality.

DISCUSSION: Members suggested that UCPB deemphasize its message that the economy is not as bad as it seems; the 'push-back' should center on how the budget cuts would significantly damage the core of the University. UCPB Vice Chair Conrad also clarified that Council is being asked to endorse both the Cuts Report and the cover letter, not the presentation. Members remarked that statements regarding 'further erosion in quality' are politically problematic. Some members may be able support the recommendations, but not the report itself. There was also not unanimous agreement that the Budget Stabilization Act would be bad for the University. Overall, Council agreed that the language in the report was not ready for public consumption. A motion was made to table both the report and the letter, which was seconded.

ACTION: Members voted to table the report and the letter, with 12 in favor, two opposed, and one abstention.

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

- **Robert C. Dynes, President**
- **Wyatt R. Hume, Provost and Chief Operating Officer**
- **Bruce Darling, Executive Vice President, University Affairs**
- **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

President Dynes

- Applications are up across racial and ethnic groups, including a 17.9% increase for Latinos and 16.1% for African-Americans. Freshman applications are up 31.2% at UCM.
- The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) Board will make a final decision on the PUC proposal on March 15th.
- The National Academy of Engineering admitted eight new UC members; the Alfred Sloan Foundation awarded 17 fellowships to UC faculty.

Provost Hume/EVP Lapp

- UCOP is engaging in a push-back against the proposed budget cuts in cooperation with CSU.
- UCOP will not limit enrollment this year, but over enrollment will not be funded. The University may restrict enrollments next year, if the cuts are severe.
- A presentation on student faculty ratios will be made at the March Regents' meeting.
- The Regents will probably take action on student fees in May; in March, they will hear an initial presentation on student fees. The Regents will consider an increase to the education fee of at least 7%.
- UCOP is moving forward with restructuring. Inter-campus administrative savings will be realized through common administrative savings; UC hospitals are leading the way in this area.
- UCOP is committed to restoring salary scales; a final decision will be made in September; a few Chancellors and EVPs are arguing for only a small COLA however.
- UCOP is asking if certain types of legislatively funded research, which are specifically mandated by the Legislature, can be used for the University's other priorities.
- The University will try to streamline state-mandated reporting
- UCOP is currently engaged in discussions over the high cost of student textbooks.
- There are ongoing discussions regarding strategic sourcing and other short-term investments.
- UC only funded filled-lines on campuses last year due to a lack of resources in order to fund the first year of the faculty salaries plan.

Questions/Answers and Comments

Q: Will fee increases be separated out for undergraduates and graduate students? Will undergraduate and graduate fees be raised by the same rate?

A: President Dynes responded that separating out graduate and undergraduate fees is needed in the long run. It costs more to educate graduate students than undergraduates. The University made a deal with the State to fund both sets of students at the same level in the late 1990s.

Q: Will the non-funding of unfilled FTEs become a permanent practice?

A: Provost Hume responded that this will not become permanent; it was a compromise that was made to fund the faculty salary scales this year.

Statement: Concern was expressed over the decision not to freeze enrollments; also, UC eligibility should not be considered a ‘high bar,’ as a number of technically ineligible students have achieved far more than technically eligible students.

A: Provost Hume responded that both the Chancellors and UCOP felt that it would be a problem politically to deny enrollment to any eligible students; it would also damage UCM and UCR.

Q: What types of inter-campus administrative collaboration should the campuses be engaged in?

A: EVP Lapp responded that a workgroup is looking at data centers, payroll systems, etc. She will send a list of possible inter-campus administrative ventures to Divisional Chairs.

Q: Why isn’t the University making larger noises in response to the proposed cuts? Will UC inform the public with a real public relations strategy?

A: Provost Hume responded that UC’s message should be both strong and consistent with the CSU. The University will also use its proponents in Agriculture, Biotech, Telecommunications; UC students and alumni will also be involved.

Q: Is there any news on restarting retirement contributions?

A: This issue will be discussed in closed session at The Regents’ next meeting.

Q: Does freezing enrollments increase the likelihood that student fees will be increased?

A: There is not a direct linkage between these two actions—they are separate value judgments.

Q: Is the University serious about capping enrollment next year? When will UC inform the public if it decides to do so?

A: UC is cooperating with the CSU to deliver a common message; it is hoped that the joint decisions and/or statements, which would be coordinated with the CSU, will make a larger impact on the public. Regarding the question of whether UC will cap enrollments next year, the University will need to evaluate costs at the time. UC did cap on enrollments in 2004, and directed those students to community colleges with the promise that it would enroll these students as transfers. This produced significant negative press for the University. Although enrollment can be managed, it is admissions that really gets the public’s attention.

VIII. Regent Russell Gould

Council’s discussion with Regent Gould was held in executive session.

IX. General Discussion

The General Discussion was held in executive session.

X. BOARS’ Eligibility Reform Proposal

REPORT/ISSUE: The primary change in the revised proposal is a much more robust guarantee with statewide eligibility 5% and Eligibility in Local Context get at 12.5% but effectively producing another 5% eligible. BOARS asks for a review of the revised proposal.

DISCUSSION: Members praised the revised report. There was some discussion about the new review response due date, (some wanting an earlier date; some a later date) it will be sent out for systemwide review with a May 2, 2008 deadline. There was interest in how the combined guarantee criteria compares to the current guarantee. Chair Rashid responded that BOARS' projections show that this combination confers an approximate 10% guarantee, which should be sufficient to satisfy most critics. It was also asked how the revised proposal would change the entering class. BOARS Chair Rashid replied that this would be very difficult to accurately predict, but the new policy would make the new entering class more similar demographically to the state of California.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved sending out the revised proposal for systemwide review with a May 2, 2008 response date.

XI. Report of the Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education

ISSUE: Council was asked to finalize a Council position on the report. UCPB's response is missing from the draft response, but will be sent to Provost Hume at a later date.

DISCUSSION: UCPB Vice Chair Conrad remarked that UCPB's response does not significantly differ from the draft response. One member expressed difficulty in supporting the budget statement in the response that states that EAP's budget should not be cut by 'the full 15%' (on p. 2 of the draft response). Instead, it was suggested that this should read that "While Council agrees that in the current budgetary climate a cut of some kind is necessary, all cuts should be done carefully to minimize impact on academic quality, and in consultation with the Academic Senate." This suggestion was accepted as a friendly amendment. The revised draft response was moved and seconded.

ACTION: Members approved the draft response with only one opposed and one abstention.

XII. Executive Session: UCFW Concerns Regarding the Possible Privatization of UCRP Administrative Functions

ACTION: This issue was postponed until the March 26th meeting.

XIII. Board Agency Announcement

ACTION: After a short discussion, members sent this issue back to UCORP for a discussion related to the policy dimensions of this issue.

XIV. Proposal for UC Financial Aid for Undocumented Students

ACTION: Members endorsed this proposal.

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

There were not any 'topics of concern.'

XV. New Business

Members did not have any new business.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Academic Council Minutes – February 27, 2008

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair
Minutes prepared by Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst

Academic Council Minutes – February 27, 2008

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	3/5	3/26	4/23	5/28	6/25
<u>Officers</u>												
Michael Brown, Chair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
<u>Divisional Chairs</u>												
William Drummond	UCB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Timothy Bradley	UCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Elizabeth Bjork	UCLA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
James Posakony	UCSD	X	X	X	Alt	X	X	X				
David Gardner	UCSF	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Joel Michaelsen	UCSB	X	X	X	\	X	X	Alt				
Quentin Williams	UCSC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
<u>Committee Chairs</u>												
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Bruce Schumm	CCGA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
James Hunt	UCAP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Keith Williams	UCEP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
James Chalfant	UCFW	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Jose Wudka	UCORP	X	X	X	X	X	T	X				
Christopher Newfield	UCPB	X	Alt	X	\	T	Alt	X				
<u>Alternates</u>												
Kum Kum Bhavnani	UCSB							X				
Pat Conrad	UCPB		X				X					
Daniel Donoghue (Div. Vice Chair)	UCSD				X							
<u>Guests</u>												
Haile Debas	UCSF						X					
Ellen Switkes	UCSF						X					
Russell Gould, UC Regent	Regents						X					
'Harry' Powell	UCSD					X	X	X				
Nina Robinson	UCOP						X					
<u>President & Senior Management</u>												
Robert Dynes, President		X	X		X	X	X	X				
Rory Hume, Provost		X	X	X	\	X	X	X				
Bruce Darling, Exec. VP-UR		X		X	X	X	\	X				
Katie Lapp, Exec VP, Bus Ops		X	X	X	\	X	X	\				
<u>Council Staff</u>												
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				