

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting  
Wednesday, March 26, 2008****I. Senate Officers Announcements****➤ Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair**

- Regent Blum, Provost Hume, and EVP Darling are not attending today's meeting.
- Chair Brown presented the Assembly's 'Pits' resolution at the March Regents meeting.
- UCSC Chancellor George Blumenthal presented the report from The Regents Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Diversity.
- At their March meeting, The Regents approved revisions to the planning process for privately-funded capital projects that allows campuses more discretion over the use of non-state funding sources (donor monies and Garamendi funding) and streamlines the review process (UCOP and Regental approval is no longer required for such funding). The revision shortens the timeline from pre-planning to construction by 6-12 months, which equates to savings between \$100 and \$200 billion per building.
- Chair Brown will email a request for input regarding the two-day meeting Council meeting in May—members were asked to choose between May 27 or May 29 as the additional day.
- Agenda items for the April 23, 2008 meeting are due by April 10, 2008.

**DISCUSSION:** Members briefly discussed the reception of the 'Pits' resolution at The Regents meeting. Chair Brown remarked that knowledge of the specifics of the UC contract seems to be uneven among The Regents. Vice Chair Croughan also noted that funding for 'phase one' (design and planning) of the replacement facility for plutonium pits at Los Alamos National Lab (LANL) has been allocated.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of the February 27, Minutes
2. Cancellation of the April 16, 2008, Assembly of the Academic Senate Regular Meeting
3. Reapportionment of Assembly Representatives
4. Approval of the Assembly 2008-09 Meeting Dates
5. UC Santa Cruz Regulation 11 – Honors
6. Amendment to Senate Bylaw 337
7. CCGA/UCEP/ITTP 'Dialectic' Paper On Remote/Online Instruction
8. Proposal for a School of Public Health at UC Davis

**ACTION: Council approved the Consent Calendar.**

**III. Approval of the Agenda**

**ACTION: The agenda was approved with the following modifications. A general executive session has been added immediately following item III; Item VI is postponed until after the consultation with UCOP Senior Managers (item VII); and item VIII (Regent Blum) has been cancelled because Regent Blum could not attend the meeting. A discussion of campus budget planning will be included in executive session, and a discussion of the CCGA/UCEP Report and Proposal regarding 'The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction' has been added to New Business, time permitting.**

**IV. Executive Session: 2008-09 UCOC Member-At-Large Appointment**

*Besides actions, minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed Professor Joseph P. Konopelski (UCSC) as UCOC’s member-at-large; this nomination will be placed on the next Assembly agenda.**

**V. Executive Session: Selection of the 2008 Oliver Johnson Awardee**

*Besides actions, minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**ACTION: Council approved the selection of Professors Gayle Binion (UCSB) and Larry Pitts (UCSF) as the 2008 Oliver Johnson Awardees.**

**VI. Executive Session: UCFW and Concerns Regarding the Possible Privatization of UCRP Administrative Functions**

*Besides actions, minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**ACTION: Council tasked UCFW with drafting a revised letter that will separate out the general issues from specific areas of concern regarding restructuring and outsourcing; the final resolution of the letter will be completed over email.**

**VII. Consultation with the Office of the President, Senior Managers**

➤ **Robert C. Dynes, President**

➤ **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

*Provost Rory Hume and EVP Bruce Darling were not in attendance.*

President Bob Dynes:

- President Dynes discussed his draft report entitled, “UC ‘Promise & Power of Ten’ Campus Visits,” and asked for informal comments.

EVP Katherine Lapp:

- Provost Rory Hume and VP Patrick Lenz made a presentation on the UC budget at the March Regents meeting, which shows a \$56 million reduction (\$30 million in actual reductions along with the transfer of some functions to the campuses). The revised budget priorities were also presented, which includes provisions for student mental health services, 2008-09 enrollment growth, faculty/staff salary increases and the faculty salary plan, and graduate student support. The Regents will act on the budget in May.
- Next week, Provost Hume will testify before the Senate budget committee; he will highlight UC’s role in higher education.
- Provost Hume and EVP Lapp have met with the CSU leadership regarding joint advocacy efforts. UC is developing and refining its public messages, meeting with editorial boards, working on more TV/radio coverage, meeting with business leaders, updating the UC budget website, and gearing up for participation in CSU Lobby Day.
- Searches are still underway for a new State Government Relations Director and a new Chief Information Officer.

**Questions/Answers**

**Q:** Council asked for an update on the proposal for an ‘Institute for Climate Solutions’ to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

**A:** President Dynes responded that the \$600 million proposal is still under consideration. The PUC postponed a final vote on the proposal in March due to concerns over whether rate payers would be suitably reimbursed. Also, the proposal did not make clear enough the educational and training benefits of the proposal (that language now rests with CSU and the Community Colleges). It is scheduled to come to a vote in April.

**Q:** What is the status of a memo from Provost Hume to Chair Brown, entitled ‘UC Procedures Related to Nonresident Tuition (NRT)’? This memo concerns fundamental changes to the profile of NRT, e.g., the process by which each campus determines its NRT population (with that money going directly back to that campus). The concern was expressed about possible impacts on faculty-student ratios and the differentiation of campuses through the return of NRT revenues.

**A:** EVP Lapp stressed that the State has made it clear that over-enrollment of resident students will not be funded. A \$20 million shortfall resulted from campuses missing their respective non-resident enrollment targets. The new process addresses the perception that UCOP simply distributes NRT out to the system; the campuses will also have more flexibility to distribute NRT monies as they see fit. Provost Hume will provide more information on this at a later date.

**Q:** How will the ‘May revise’ evolve relative to the Governor’s budget? Has there been any sort of revenue enhancement?

**A:** EVP Lapp responded that although gasoline tax revenue has increased, there is not much in the way of new information from the Governor’s Office. The Legislature has been especially receptive to UC delegations however. She noted that UC has a poor track record in responding to data requests from the Legislature in a timely fashion. Recent negotiations have resulted in the Legislature becoming more selective in submitting data requests to UC. The University is also providing more accurate budget information to the Legislature, which is also helpful.

**Q:** Are there any specific objections to allowing staff members to take one course free of charge? Would a pre-tax tuition plan for faculty and staff and/or their dependents be appropriate?

**A:** President Dynes and EVP Lapp did not have any immediate objections to these suggestions. EVP Lapp will follow-up on these suggestions.

**Q:** President Dynes was asked if any of the basic principles from his ‘Power of Ten’ Report could be applied to individual campuses.

**A:** President Dynes emphasized that the strength of UC lies in the diversity of its campuses. The University’s challenge is to manifest the power of one University, not ten campuses. It should do this in a way that enables the University to accomplish things that no single campus could do alone. He pointed to the proposed UC-wide ‘School of Global Health’ as one example.

**Q:** EVP Lapp was asked for revenue targets. It was noted that if The Regents approve a ten percent increase in student fees, this would result in approximately \$100 million in new revenues. Compared to the November budget, UC would still be facing a gap of about \$440 million. Is UCOP developing an alternative plan if revenue targets fall short?

**A:** EVP Lapp said she is working with both the campuses and the Legislature to arrive at a final ‘number’ in terms of revenue targets. A better sense of The Regents’ current priorities is also needed. UCOP is looking at certain historical legislative ‘earmarks,’ which could be cut. Campus auxiliary activities are also being examined.

**Q:** Is UC planning to privatize its retirement program?

**A:** EVP Lapp responded that there are not any discussions to privatize the retirement program. UCOP is looking into the possibility of privatizing benefits administration, which is somewhat analogous to the transfer to Fidelity for the administration of UC’s Retirement Savings Plans.

### **VIII. Regent Richard C. Blum**

*Regent Blum could not attend the meeting.*

## **IX. General Discussion**

*The general discussion was held in executive session. Besides actions, minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

## **X. Faculty Salary Plan and Its Financing**

**ISSUE:** A one-sentence modification (to be added at the end of the original statement) was passed out: "...At the same time, we oppose any approach to repairing faculty salaries that would cause serious harm to campus academic programs." It was moved and seconded to adopt this modification.

**DISCUSSION:** A number members spoke against the inclusion of the modification, remarking that it provides a possible loop hole to negate the entire faculty salary plan; recruitment of quality faculty for quality academic programs is simply becoming increasingly difficult with the current salary scale structure; competitive academic salaries actually protect academic programs. The concerns was also expressed that the public may take the original statement to mean that UC faculty are only interested in 'feathering' their own nest. The proponent of the modification agreed, stating that his main concern is that sentences one and two will be perceived as self-serving. Other members countered that the original statement is not totally self-serving, as it argues for fixing the salary scales over a simple salary increase. Council also observed that Senior Management has consistently argued that faculty salaries are one of their top priorities, but some EVCs have recently tried to chisel away at the faculty salary plan. It is important for Council to be on the record as having said that the salary plan is essential. The motion failed on a vote of four in favor, 13 against, and one abstention. The original statement was moved and seconded. Council also accepted the correction of 'Academic Council' for 'Academic Senate' in the first sentence.

**ACTION:** Council endorsed the original statement, as noted in the agenda, on a vote of 12 in favor, 2 against, and 1 abstention, which will be sent to President Dynes.

## **XI. The University's Budget**

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

**ACTION:** UCFW Chair expressed his committee's support of UCPB's Cuts Report; Council did not discuss UCFW's statement.

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

**ISSUE:** UCPB Chair Newfield noted that the Cuts Report has been modified per comments from Council and the Chancellors. UCPB developed the report immediately after the Governor's proposal for a ten percent cut to the University's budget with the intent of bolstering the Administration to take a tough line against the proposed cuts. The premise behind these cuts--that state agencies have enjoyed regular budget increases over the years (7.3% annualized increases) is generally false for the University. UC was cut in the early 1990s, and has grown more slowly than other state agencies and other public universities; UC also grew more slowly than that the State's capacity to fund the University (based on the growth in state personal income rates). Since January, UCOP has begun to implement some of the recommendations in the report (e.g., 'push-back' against the proposed cuts); many of the points in the report are no longer controversial. The previous statements regarding declines in quality have also been omitted; the report now states that these budget cuts will reduce quality in the future. However,

the testimonials regarding the austerity resulting from the 2002 cuts are still included. The description of the Budget Stabilization Act (BSA) now emphasizes the positive points of saving money in order to spend it when you don't have money. The findings have not changed; most striking is the fact that a 45% increase in student fees would be necessary to fund the gap that would result from these cuts. Chair Newfield asked for Council endorsement of the Cuts Report.

**DISCUSSION:** There was general support for this version of the Cuts Report albeit with some minor modifications. One member noted that she is still bothered by recommendation one that states that these cuts "...are harmful to the public." The following was accepted as a friendly amendment, "...and its ability to contribute to the public good." It was also suggested that the vignettes from faculty may be more appropriate in an appendix. One member recommended removing the reference to the fact that this year is an election year, as it is speculative. Chair Newfield remarked that it is important to keep the BSA scenario because it does represent a possible budget future. The sentiment was also expressed that CSU budget should also be included in statements regarding the slow growth in the University's budget over the years. It is important that this report serves as a stand-alone document (similar to the 'Future's Report'). Therefore, the recommendations should be included in the report (and not only in the cover letter). Regarding recommendation three, (establishing a minimum cost of instruction), one member asked how will the University maintain funding levels? Chair Newfield responded that this could be done by limiting enrollment; there would also be pressure to raise funding every year. Subsequently, the suggestion was made to use the term 'cost per student' or 'funding ratio.' Recommendation four should also be separated into two recommendations.

**ACTION: Council endorsed (13-0-2) the UCPB report pending the suggested edits.**

## **XII. Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group (SMG) with Underlining Academic Appointments**

**ISSUE:** The draft Council letter endorses policy option three that would allow SMG members with underlying faculty appointments to accrue Sabbatical Leave credits while working in their respective SMG appointments and Sabbatical Leave credits would be reduced following the leave. UCPB's response was not available in time to be included in the draft letter, but it is included as a separate enclosure in the agenda.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed the Council draft letter.**

## **XIII. Broad Agency Announcement National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship Program**

**ACTION: This item was postponed to the April meeting.**

## **XIV. UCAF Request Regarding "Collegiality" in the Review of Faculty for Merits and Promotions**

**ISSUE:** The draft Council letter to UCAF that 1) maintains that 'collegiality' should not be used as a formal criterion in personnel reviews; 2) agrees with UCPT that awareness of the value of 'collegiality' is a good thing generally; and 3) endorses UCAF's recommendation that all faculty should be made aware of the responsibility to participate in civil discourse. Council agrees with UCAP that UCAF's request that all CAPs "suspend the use of collegiality" in the evaluation of candidates is unwarranted.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed the UCAP and UCPT recommendations.**

**XV. Resolution on Maintaining the Reality of Stewardship**

*Council did not discuss this issue.*

**XVI. Ongoing Agenda Item: “Senate Issues/Topics of Concern”**

*There were not any ‘Senate Issues/Topics of Concern.’*

**XVII. New Business: CCGA/UCEP Report and Proposal regarding ‘The Role of Graduate Students in University Instruction’**

*Council did not have time to discuss the CCGA/UCEP Report and Proposal.*

Meeting adjourned at: 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

Prepared by: Todd Giedt, Committee Analyst



<b>ACADEMIC COUNCIL</b>													
<b>Attendance 2007-2008</b>	Key: X=In attendance, \=Absent, Alt=Alternate, T=Teleconference												
	9/26	10/31	11/28	12/19	1/23	2/27	3/5	3/26	4/23	5/28	6/25	7/23	
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Eric Zarate								X					