

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday & Thursday, May 27 & 28, 2008

I. Announcements

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

- UCOP will also restructure Academic Affairs, which was not covered under the original scope of Monitor's work.
- UCOP anticipates a \$98.5 million restoration to its budget on the basis of the Governor's May Budget Revise.
- May Regents Meeting: 1) The Regents are reviewing the Presidential Search process--lessons learned and best practices will be examined; 2) Chair Brown presented the work team report of the Regents' Task Force on Undergraduate Diversity, which The Regents received quite favorably; and 3) Timothy P. White was named as UC Riverside's new chancellor.
- The June Assembly teleconference is scheduled for June 11, 2008, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.
- The deadline for submitting items/documents for the June 25th Council agenda is June 10th.
- Service and patient-care workers at UC medical centers, who are represented by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), have threatened to strike over wages, as mediation efforts have failed
- Smoking/breast cancer research program cuts are focused on reducing administrative costs, and not cutting the actual programs.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the April 30, 2008 Minutes

2. June 11, 2008 Assembly Agenda

ACTION: Members approved the consent calendar.

III. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: Chair Brown replaced Item VII., 'Special Committee of the Academic Senate on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency,' which is postponed until the June meeting, with 'Net Lab Fee Allocation.' Members approved the revised agenda.

IV. Executive Director Search Update—Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this discussion item.

ACTION: Members approved the advisory search committee.

V. The UC Irvine Faculty Case Regarding Academic Freedom—Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this discussion item.

VI. Broad Agency Announcement

ISSUE: One ancillary issue related to this announcement concerns that fact that the Department of Defense (DoD) is using this program to enlarge and replace its aged workforce. As recipients of this award are required to attend classified briefings (but not to conduct classified research), there is concern that most, if not all, recipients will need U.S. citizenship for the necessary security

clearances. In response to this concern, VP Steven Beckwith drafted a policy that effectively divorced the University from the security clearance; it is now entirely incumbent on the applicant to obtain the required security clearance. UC also has the right to revisit and renegotiate its position if the DoD decides to change the wording for this award. VP Beckwith has also received assurances from the DoD that they will not change the parameters of the program. This is an intermediate step, as he would like a consistent policy, which a small working group could develop. UCORP recommends that the University should draft a policy that would address these issues systematically, rather than dealing with them on a case-by-case basis.

DISCUSSION: Members endorsed the draft letter from UCORP. It was clarified that the citizenship restriction is on the PI, not on graduate students involved in the research. Some Council members expressed interest in appointing a Senate subcommittee, as opposed to a joint administrative-Senate task force. However, UCORP Chair Wudka expressed his desire that a pure Senate subcommittee should have some representation from the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. This specific issue was separated from endorsement of the letter, and postponed to a later discussion. Finally, a typo was noted in the second bullet (there is a duplicate ‘this’).

ACTION: Members unanimously endorsed the response from UCORP; Chair Brown will draft a cover letter and consult with Professor Wudka regarding the formation of a task force.

VII. Net Lab Fee Allocation

This item replaces the ‘Special Committee of the Academic Senate on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency,’ which is postponed until the June meeting.

ISSUE: Chair Brown noted the short time line associated with this issue, and briefed members on its history. It is estimated the net fees will amount to between \$20 and \$22 million. After UC won the contract for the national labs, The Regents agreed that a process would be put in place, after consultation with the Senate, for an allocation of these fees. Such a process has never existed in the past. The allocation scheme is based on last year’s Senate-wide review. That said, and in the meantime, a number of faculty members have begun receiving copies of the draft RFP from their respective Vice Chancellors for Research (VCRs). One of the outstanding issues is the proper dissemination of such RFPs for comment and review to all members of the faculty; in the past this type of review has been haphazard and has not always reached all members of the faculty.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that Council should comment on the ‘strategic priorities,’ and how these are determined. Another recommendation is to review a list of these ‘priorities’ before they go to either the President or The Regents. It was also asked why the VCRs were given the draft RFP, while the Senate was asked to review what looks like a draft policy document? Chair Brown noted that this was due to a miscommunication or misunderstanding of what Vice President Steven Beckwith was intending to do with the RFP: we had understood that he was sending it to campuses for soliciting proposals. Another member argued for some sort of designated allocation to research in the Humanities and the Social Sciences in areas that do not have anything to do with the Labs. Chair Brown clarified that it is Regental policy that guides the focus of these priorities; which were also approved by Council last year. Council generally spoke against pre-allocating this money. Priority is also given to graduate students and collaborative research, which includes research in the humanities and the social sciences that do not need to have a specific connection to

the Labs such as conflict management, peace studies, etc. Historically, the Labs have funded graduate students in a way to promote workforce development; this mechanism is intended to change this focus. The CCGA alternate noted that CCGA would like to look at the role that graduate students play in the labs.

ACTION: Members were instructed to send any remaining comments as soon as possible.

VIII. Systemwide Senate Review of the BOARS' Revised "Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy"

ISSUE: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid reviewed the proposal, which includes: 1) An 'Entitled to Review' (ETR) construct; 2) the elimination of the SAT Subject exam requirement; and 3) guaranteed admission via the referral mechanism. In the BOARS' proposal, the additional criteria would be set so that about 10% of CA graduating seniors would enjoy a referral guarantee if they apply to UC. BOARS recommended within-school and statewide criteria that identify 12.5% and 5% of all graduates, respectively. Five divisions (UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCM, UCSB) and UCAAD endorsed the proposal as written; three divisions (UCB, UCR, UCSC) and two committees (UCOPE, UCPB) withheld endorsement. UCSD did not explicitly endorse or reject the proposal, and UCEP endorsed two of the three elements, splitting on the third.

The main areas of concern include the BOARS' recommended guarantee structure and a general lack of certainty about outcomes and costs. With the proposed guarantee structure, BOARS seeks to strengthen UC's presence in each school and promote a diverse demographic profile of the guarantee pool. Although BOARS believes that the recommended 12.5% within school \times 5% state-wide guarantee structure is optimal, the BOARS chair offered the following compromise assuming that the BOARS recommended structure was not viewed as acceptable at this time: 1) Implementation of the ETR and elimination of the SAT subject-exam requirement for Fall 2012 freshman admission; 2) implement an initial, modified guarantee structure based on 9% within-school \times 9% statewide criteria for Fall 2012 admission; 3) commit BOARS to annual and five-year evaluation and reporting of academic and fiscal impacts; and 4) for Fall 2015 admission, pending positive results with the 9% \times 9% guarantee, transition to a 12.5% within-school guarantee criterion. Chair Rashid stressed that the important elements of the proposal are the elimination of the SAT subject exam and the ETR structure.

DISCUSSION: One member suggested that BOARS should redraft the proposal and bring it back to Council at a later date. BOARS Chair Rashid responded that his committee has been absolutely exhaustive in its study of this issue, and has reached a point of diminishing returns. Chair Brown clarified that the BOARS original proposal, as noted in the agenda, still stands because the 9% \times 9% compromise has not yet been moved and seconded. There was also concern that the differential between the current guarantee structure and either the 9% \times 9% compromise and the BOARS' proposal is too large. For example, at some high-quality schools, a student may not be given the guarantee even though his or her record might be better than students at lower-quality schools, who did receive the guarantee. One member opined that the first three elements of the BOARS' proposal are acceptable, but the last one is not, as the transition to 12.5% should be driven by the data, not prescription. There also needs to be some philosophical reasoning behind the technical adjustments to the ratios in #3. It was suggested to amend point #4 to consider new data before automatically transitioning to a 12.5% within-school guarantee criterion. Chair Rashid

clarified that BOARS is not mandating future decisions to future Councils and/or BOARS' committees; the 12.5% approach is 'optimal' based on the current data, which could change in the future.

It was also noted that white students seem to be the winners under the new guarantee; this should be of concern to Council. BOARS Chair Rashid acknowledged that the percentage of white students does indeed go up and the percentage of Asian students goes down. The reason for this is that Asian students seem to be very good at figuring out the technical requirements of UC eligibility. If the subject exam is removed, even more white and Asian students meet the requirements of eligibility. Political perception is another concern. This proposal should also not be viewed as the ultimate solution to diversity. It was also noted that the numbers of females goes up under either scenario. It was also mentioned that while diversity is important, it is equally important to get all high schools from all of the different regions in California represented in the new eligibility construct. It was stressed that the actual demographic profile of the actual 'class' cannot be predicted from the data as it depends on campus admissions decisions; only the probable referral guarantee pool can be estimated reliably.

One member asked why the SAT Subject exam is being linked to the ETR? BOARS Chair Rashid responded that the University is obliged, per the Master Plan, to accept the top 12.5% of graduating high school seniors in the state. If the SAT subject exam is removed, UC must ratchet up other elements of the index (e.g., test scores and GPA), requiring adjustments to the specifications underlying the guarantee structure. There are two problems that attend simply ratcheting up the eligibility index. The first is that it would destroy the demographic profile of UC's guarantee pool (under-represented students in the profile would plummet). The second problem is that the SAT subject exams serve as a signal to the University as to how interested a student is in attending UC because the only reason most students take these tests is to complete UC's unique testing requirements for eligibility. Unfortunately, the SAT subject exam only tests for a moderate level of ability, and almost no one tests below the required standard. Therefore, when the subject test-taking is removed, the eligibility pool includes many more students who show academic strength but also who have no intention of applying to UC: and application rate for the entire pool would fall as a consequence. It was also asked if the subject exam is eliminated, are there no other ways to compensate for the drop in the application rate without ETR? Chair Rashid responded that there is not a way to do this without the ETR or something very much like it, assuming one didn't want radical changes in the demographic profile of the eligibility pool.

A motion was made and seconded to endorse points 1-3 of the BOARS compromise (9% × 9% guarantee), but replace #4 with the following statement: **“Based on the results of these ongoing studies, BOARS should periodically consider recommending adjustments to the guarantee structure.”** Subsequently, the following friendly amendment was suggested (to be added to the end of the sentence above), **“with a goal of attaining 12.5% and 5%.”** However, this amendment was rejected as unfriendly. One member viewed the motion as premature. It would have to be sold not only to President-designate Yudof, but the general public as well. It may be a good idea to put it on hold until President-designate Yudof has a chance to look this over. Chair Brown noted that President-designate Yudof has had a short briefing on this issue. Another member declined to support the motion because Council would be endorsing something that BOARS does not consider optimal. The percentages in the 9% × 9% compromise may not be the right ones. As it

stands now, this is really a geographic plan, and not one that would necessarily enhance other forms of diversity. It may be useful to start with a lower within-school percentage, thereby giving the University room to raise it later on; it would be difficult to lower it once it is in place. Regarding the geographic argument, one member stated that the ETR would broaden diversity in principle; however other members countered that ETR only slightly captures more under-represented minorities. Chair Brown stated that while it is true that Council does not know exactly how the ETR would work, the University does have reasons for optimism based on its experience with Comprehensive Review.

ACTION: Members endorsed the following motion with 12 in favor; 7 opposed; and 1 abstention: 1) Implement ETR and elimination of the SAT subject-exam requirement for Fall 2012 freshman admission; 2) for Fall 2012 admission, implement an initial, modified guarantee structure based on 9% within-school and 9% statewide criteria (yields approximately 9.7% guarantee rate overall); 3) commit BOARS to annual and five-year evaluation and reporting of academic and fiscal impacts; and 4) “Based on the results of these ongoing studies, BOARS should periodically consider recommending adjustments to the guarantee structure.”

IX. The University Budget and Budget Priorities—Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for these discussion items.

1. The UC Budget

2. The UC Budget and the Implications for the Faculty Salary Plan and Faculty Issues in General

i. UCFW’s Priority for Funding Year Two of the Faculty Salary Plan

ACTION: Members approved the UCFW priorities for funding of year two of the faculty salary plan (but not the statement) with a vote of 15 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions. A statement will be developed over email within three weeks time.

ii. Faculty Salary Cost Recovery

iii. UCAP Report on “Non-Progressing” and “Disengaged” Faculty

ACTION: The UCAP letter was approved with minor amendments; a revised letter will be sent out.

X. The Restructuring of UCOP—Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for these discussion items.

1. Restructuring Presentation to Chairs of the Divisions and Standing Committees of the Assembly

ACTION: Chair Brown will send an email to Divisional and committee chairs, asking for input on data and analytical needs.

2. Possible Resolution on Restructuring Without Damaging UC

ACTION: It was decided that there was no need for such resolution on restructuring at this time.

3. The Power of Ten

XI. Faculty Presence on Campus in Non-Teaching Times: Need for a Good Citizenship Policy?

ISSUE: Chair Brown remarked that what faculty do with their time has also been a concern by the Legislature. UCB Division Chair Drummond observed that, indeed, an increasingly number of faculty are able to conduct much of their business at home on-line, thereby minimizing their time on campus. In addition, there are some who would like to better quantify what faculty do. In light of this, the value of a face-to-face presence is important; it may rise to the level of issuing a policy statement over this issue.

DISCUSSION: Any statement on a ‘good citizenship’ policy would need to be commensurate with CCGA/UCEP views regarding the importance of face-to-face contact in on-line instruction. However, other members were unsure that simply being in an office for eight or nine hours per day would improve the visibility of the faculty to the general public. Another issue is how to impose such a principle. Also, when does such behavior cross over from simply making efficient use of limited academic time to abuse? For many professors, their research often takes them away from the campus. If such a principle is imposed, it should strictly be for campus-related duties.

ACTION: This issue will be agendized for a future meeting for fuller discussion.

XII. Systemwide Review

1. Proposed Revisions to Academic Personnel Policies 110-4(10); 230-17; 230-18; 279-20: 360-80-a; 520-4; and 710-14-b, 710-14-1, 710-38, and 710-46; and Proposed New Academic Personnel Policy 765

ISSUE: UCOP requested a Senate review of these academic personnel policies under Chair Oakley’s tenure. The Senate subsequently requested more information from the Administration. The information has been received, and the request for Senate review still stands. At issue is the fact that a review cannot conclude before the end of the year. If approved, these APMs would be sent out for review immediately, with a response date in the next academic year.

ACTION: Members approved the request to send these APMs out for review with a response date in the next academic year.

2. Amendment to Senate Bylaws 125.A. 4–Academic Council Membership 4; 128 – Membership of the Standing Committee of the Assembly and 130- Academic Freedom

ISSUE: Given Council’s current size, there are implications for how Council functions and the decisions that would come out of Council if Council size increases; Council may want to impose some kind of discipline process on itself. As systemwide committee membership enlarges, division influence is diluted and Council becomes even more unwieldy. Another issue is whether the Senate can state a position on these issues separate from UCAF’s petition to join Council. Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló added that per the bylaws, UCAF also has the option of petitioning the Assembly directly. Council also has the option of requesting a broader justification from UCAF.

DISCUSSION: One member cautioned that it is important to keep a smaller body than the Assembly to do most of the Senate’s business. Others stressed that it is probable that most committees are not familiar with many of these issues; it may be wise for Council to provide information in some kind of statement. Council may want to ask UCAF to strengthen their request by stating reasons why other committees should not be allowed to join Council as well. However, it is important for the Council to maintain a majority of divisional chairs. Council could also make a statement on the desired composition of Council before such a systemwide review begins. It was moved and seconded to send these amendments out for review, but to communicate the general opinion of Council regarding enlarging the size of this body at the same time. Those opposed stated that it would be unprecedented to opine on an issue before actually sampling the opinion of the Senate’s constituencies. It also sets up an adversarial situation from the start. The motion failed with 3 in favor, 15 opposed, and 2 abstentions. Members held a short discussion about the original motion (sending the amendments out for review); most members were in favor of this action with the caveat that Chair Brown collegially contact the UCAF Chair beforehand to discuss the relevant issues. Chair Brown agreed to do this. It will be incumbent upon next year’s Council to develop a systematic procedure for adding new committees to Council.

ACTION: Members approved the motion to send out the specified bylaw amendments for systemwide review with a vote of 13 in favor; 3 opposed; and 2 abstentions.

XIII. Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

DISCUSSION: Chair Yahr noted that at least one of the letters references a letter from an administrative body which did not accompany the agency’s review response; Chair Yahr suggested that this appeared to violate Council procedures. Executive Director Bertero-Barceló clarified that all divisional comments must be included as part of Senate review, even if administrative comments are referenced but not provided. Chair Yahr also noted that most administrative offices are divorcing themselves from the term ‘affirmative action’ and yet seem to have concerns about UCAAD doing so.

ACTION: Members approved draft letter, which will be sent to UCAAD Chair Yahr.

XIV. New Business

There was not any new business on May 27th.

The May 27th meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

XV. Announcements

There were not any new announcements on May 28th.

XVI. UCR Medical School Proposal

ISSUE: The main issue is the appearance of new money. While CCGA said that approval should be conditional upon the money; UCPB recommended approval, but that UCOP should provide the funding. UCPB Chair Newfield remarked that his committee simply did not want a sub-par medical school; the draft cover letter essentially represents the consensus of his committee. CCGA

Chair Schumm stated that the fundamental issue is whether Council should approve the proposal conditionally or unconditionally.

DISCUSSION: One member remarked that this seems to be another example of the ‘launch and starve’ phenomenon; it is irresponsible for Council to approve school after school without proper funding. The Riverside member stated that while it is true that UCR has had a lack-luster fund-raising record, his campus has improved this record over the past five years. One planning assumption has been that a massive bond will be issued to build the School. Therefore, building the School of Medicine will only happen if it is done right. If the State cannot or will not provide new resources, it will not happen, and approval should be conditional upon the appearance of new resources. A motion was made to adopt this letter as written, but it failed on the lack of a second. Another member noted that the Compendium committees seem to be in accordance, but this letter does not reflect that accordance. Subsequently, a motion was made and seconded to remand the letter back to CCGA for redrafting to reflect the accord with the following changes: 1) delete references to UCPB’s unqualified approvals, which appear twice; 2) delete the final sentence of the letter; and 3) rephrase the second to last sentence: “Compendium committees recommend a qualified approval as described in the second paragraph of this letter.” Members agreed that it is not necessary to bring the revised letter back to Council. It was clarified that ‘contingent’ actually means that Council does not approve this proposal if there is not new money.

ACTION: Members unanimously approved the motion to endorse a letter in concept if it indicates Senate approval is contingent on new monies coming to support the effort and if the other relatively minor modifications are included.

XVII. UCR Public Policy School Proposal

ACTION: Members approved the draft letter with one abstention.

XVIII. Graduate Student In-Absentia Policy

ACTION: This issue was postponed to the June meeting.

XIX. Systemwide Senate Review of the UC Information Technology Guidance Committee (ITGC) report, “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure”

ACTION: Members approved the draft letter, which will be sent to Provost Hume.

XX. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Revisions to the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences

ISSUE: In the 1990s, many medical schools had difficulties with the federal government regarding funding, which resulted in a number of audits by the Office of the Inspector General. One outcome was a resolution to address faculty conduct; the Code of Conduct has been updated and simplified into principles.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that the following statement should be added to the third bullet: “These appear to be left out and should be reinserted.” The amendment was accepted.

ACTION: Members approved the amended letter with the amendment.

XXI. President-Designate Mark G. Yudof—Executive Session

No minutes were taken during executive session.

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

President Dynes

President Dynes recounted his career—from a researcher at the Bell Laboratories, to a UCSD faculty member, to a Chancellor, and to President of the University of California. He also recalled the closing of Bell Laboratories, one of the greatest research and development organizations of all time, noting that many of the decisions that led to its closing were very short-sighted. He does not want to see UC go the way of Bell Laboratories; it is up to the faculty to not allow the University to diminish in its sense of responsibility and its excellence; the faculty create the environment of innovation, creativity, education, and the sense of duty to the State of California, the country and the world. Short-term decisions should not be allowed to get in the way of maintaining UC's excellence. President Dynes said that he will not leave public service, but will walk away from public scrutiny. In closing, he expressed his appreciation for the support that the Academic Senate has given the Administration over some very difficult times. He also praised staff members, who contribute substantially to the University, but he remarked that it is ultimately the creativity and the industry of the faculty that make the UC great.

Provost Hume

- This is Provost Hume's last Council meeting as Chief Operating Officer; he expressed his gratitude and appreciation to President Dynes, the Chancellors and the Academic Senate.
- At the last Regents' meeting, Provost Hume spoke about the vision of the nature of the University that President Dynes has helped to create and advance; the University is sometimes one University and sometimes ten campuses. The Academic Senate also plays a large role in this vision.
- President Yudof will formally take office on June 16th. John Sandbrook has been appointed as President's Yudof's transitional chief of staff. He served as chief of staff to former UCLA Chancellor Chuck Young. Also on June 16, Provost Hume will relinquish his duties as Chief Operating Officer and report directly to President Yudof.
- Restructuring: President Yudof is intensely interested in completing the reorganization of UCOP. The Restructuring has been a very rational process over the past year. The Voluntary Separation Plan has also reduced the budget, thereby allowing UCOP to shift resources to areas of higher priority.
- The May Revise restored almost \$100 million of the proposed cuts to UC. However, this is still \$240 million less than The Regents' November budget. In real terms, this is a flat, no-growth budget that presents particular challenges, but it is better than before. Allocations will be made to campuses by the end of June based on the assumption that the May Revise holds.
- Provost Hume has collaborated on a number of advocacy points with the heads of CSU and the California Community College systems, which highlight 1) the opportunities that higher education offers; and 2) the economic benefits of public higher education to the state.
- UCOP will try to give some funding for enrollment growth desperately needed on some campuses; faculty merits and continuation costs related to growth will be funded. However, COLAs may not be funded. The most pressing issue is funding for the second year of the Faculty Salary Plan Restoration may, which is extremely important for the long-term health and well-being of UC. Restoring faculty scales is essential to ensure that the rigorous peer-

review process is directly linked to faculty compensation. It is also more economically sensible than the alternatives – off-base salaries or lack of base salaries.

Q&A

Q: What is the best way to communicate to the public and the Legislature the choices faced by Californians as a consequence of budget cuts to UC? Would a white paper that poses specific questions and lays out the consequences of different funding scenarios make any difference in the public discussion?

A: Provost Hume said that it is essential for UC to work with CSU on this issue. The Master Plan is one of the keys to our success; it provides a clear vision and roles for UC and CSU. President Yudof is interested in increased accountability especially around learning outcomes and a desire to measure and publicly report outcomes. President Dynes added that it is more powerful for the stakeholders of California to make the case.

Q: What are the details about the magnitude of funding detriment associated with not fully funding enrollment growth?

A: Provost Hume responded that it will vary by campus and he can not give across-the-board percentages. UCOP will do whatever it can to meet the needs of the system. He will be meeting with the EVCs on how best to address growth needs.

Q: Does the Compact with the State still exist? What is the impact of funding the COLAs without funding the Faculty Salary Plan? What does the new marginal cost of instruction look like?

A: President Dynes said that the Compact still exists; the Governor really does believe that UC is the brightest star in California. Provost Hume added that UC is unable to fund COLAs for faculty and staff at this time. He couldn't comment on the marginal cost of instruction.

Comment: Implementing the salary plan without a COLA means that many faculty who have done well will get very little.

A: Provost Hume responded that it is virtually impossible to give COLAs to faculty and not to staff.

Q: The May Reviser returned almost \$100 million in to UC's budget. How is this progressing to relieve the tension between salaries and reducing the number of students in classes?

A: It will depend on the new President. UCOP has spent a lot of time working out the priorities. One of the benefits of restructuring is the monetary savings. President Dynes added that priorities are real. There are trade-offs for the campuses in meeting savings targets. He remarked that campuses have budget flexibility; setting priorities should be a communal exercise. He doesn't believe that it is the role of the President to tell Chancellors where their savings should come from.

Q: Could you pick out one or two factors that contributed to the destruction of the Bell Labs that have parallels in UC?

A: A major factor was the short-term view taken about how to resolve the 1980s anti-trust suit, which resulted in a settlement which broke apart AT&T and eliminated basic industrial research in the U.S. UC is not robust; it is not permanent. Society seems to lack interest in making long-term investments, which are essential for higher education.

Q: Does the change in funding methodology to which some campuses have strongly objected remain a component of how Year Two of Faculty Salary Plan would be implemented?

A: Provost Hume admitted that in hindsight it was a mistake to not fund unfilled faculty FTEs; it added stress on those funds. UCOP will fund the unfilled FTE if it can afford to; this will be reflected in bigger savings targets for the campuses.

XXIII. Regent George Marcus

Regent Marcus could not attend the meeting.

XXIV. Student Mental Health

Vice Chancellor Michael Young (UCSB) and Professor Joel Dimsdale

ISSUE: The genesis of these findings was the appointment of the Student Mental Health Committee in 2005, which was charged with assessing trends in student mental health, review services on UC campuses, determine the level of services needed, and assess campus resources. In December 2006 the committee presented their findings to The Regents, who created a special ‘Student Mental Health Oversight Committee.’ In summary, UC funding for mental health has been stagnant for the past 20 years. While undergraduates are suffering, trends are even more pronounced among graduate students. The Student Mental Health Committee found that campuses lacked ‘markers’ of student mental health, and there were very few processes to collect data on student mental health. Local and national surveys report increased incidences of mental health issues and incidences, which include high stress levels, problems coping, visits to therapists, and even suicide. International and under-represented students face similar challenges, who often feel alienated from campus activities. These data show that the problem is not getting any better. Across the campuses over an eight-year period, the number of students utilizing campus counseling services has increased by 45%. These statistics also translate into such national tragedies as Virginia Tech, but also many threatening behaviors on local UC campuses. The estimated need is \$41 million; in 2008 UC campuses only received \$4.6 million and \$8 million of funding is proposed in 2008-09 as part of a phased-funding program. However, it is clear that these funding levels, even when combined with other potential sources of funds, such as the Student Mental Health Initiative, would still fall well below the need of \$41 million. The committee’s recommendations include a three-tiered model; tier one is an increase in staffing, 24-hour response telephone lines, and salary increases to retain high-quality staff. Tier two includes targeted interventions, a comprehensive prevention program, restored staffing levels, and parent outreach. Tier three would create healthier learning communities and engagement of the faculty. Vice Chancellor Young and Professor Dimsdale emphasized that student mental health issues really impact the business of every committee on the Council.

DISCUSSION: One member asked if these problems are being discovered earlier. Professor Dimsdale said that while it is true that rates of depression are going up at younger ages, much of this is not just depression. Many mental health experts feel that this is a marker of good care; many of these kids are being rescued in their adolescence, but go off their medicine in college. It was also asked if the reduction in wait-time (to get help) could be translated into a corresponding reduction in actual events. Professor Dimsdale responded that one cannot translate this reduction into events, as the odds of being able to detect a change given the newer interventions are miniscule. Another member remarked that two pivotal components are the parent outreach/notification and faculty awareness of these problems. Vice Chancellor Young responded

that there are privacy issues with FERPA; however, UCSB errs on the side of notification when it is appropriate and necessary. In order to increasing faculty awareness, UCSB has created a mechanism in the form of a Coordinator of Mental Health Services, who does not have a therapeutic relationship with the student and can communicate with departments and faculty.

XXV. General Discussion

Members did not hold a general discussion.

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

There were not any ‘topics of concern.’

XXVII. New Business

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Attest: Michael T. Brown, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst

ACADEMIC COUNCIL															
Attendance 2007-2008		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	5/27	5/28	6/25	7/23	
Officers															
Michael Brown, Chair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Mary Croughan, Vice Chair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Divisional Chairs															
William Drummond	UCB	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Alt	Alt	X	X			
Linda Bisson	UCD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Timothy Bradley	UCI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Elizabeth Bjork	UCLA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Shawn Kantor	UCM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	\	X	X	X			
Thomas Cogswell	UCR	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
James Posakony	UCSD	X	X	X	Alt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
David Gardner	UCSF	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Joel Michaelson	UCSB	X	X	X	\	X	X	Alt	X	X	X	X			
Quentin Williams	UCSC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Committee Chairs															
Mark Rashid	BOARS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Bruce Schumm	CCGA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Alt	X			
Pauline Yahr	UCAAD	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	\	X	X	X			
James Hunt	UCAP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Alt	X	X			
Keith Williams	UCEP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
James Chalfant	UCFW	X	X	X	X	X	T	X	X	X	X	X			
Jose Wudka	UCORP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Alt	X	X	X			
Christopher Newfield	UCPB	X	Alt	X	\	T	Alt	X	X	\	X	X			
Alternates															
Kum Kum Bhavnani	UCSB							X							
Farid Chehab	UCSF										X				
James Carey (UCORP Vice Chair)	UCD								X						
Pat Conrad	UCPB		X				X								
Daniel Donoghue (UCSD Vice Chair)	UCSD				Alt										
Mary Firestone (UCB Div. Vice Chair)	UCB								X	X					
Steven Plaxe (UCAP Vice Chair)	UCSD									X					
Vicki Scott (UCSB Alternate)	UCSB				Alt										
Guests															
Nina Robinson	UCOP						X								
Haile Debas	UCSF						X								
Russ Gould	Regent														
Ellen Switkes	UCSF														
Maria Shanle	OGC	X													
Debra Obley	Budget		X												
Nick Jewell, Vice Provost	UCOP		X												
Mary-Beth Harhen, SC Senate Director	UCSC		X												
Diane Hamann, SD Senate Director	UCSD			X											
Michael Dalby	Monitor		X												
Jim Hollingshead	Monitor		X												
Dennis Larsen, Director, HR	UCOP			X											
Sellyna Eihers (UCR Senate Director)	UCR				X										
Monica Lozano	Regent				X										
Henry Powell	UCSD					X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Andrea Greenbush, UCB Senate Dir.	UCB								X						
Daniel Simmons	UCD					X									
Joel Dimsdale	UCSD											X			
Michael Young, Vice Chanc. For Std. Aff.	UCSB											X			

ACADEMIC COUNCIL															
Attendance 2007-2008		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	5/27	5/28	6/25	7/23	
President & Senior Management															
Robert Dynes, President		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X			
Rory Hume, Provost		X	X	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	\	X	X		\			
Council Staff															
Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Director		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Todd Giedt, Policy Analyst		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Eric Zarate									X	X	X	X			