

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Approved Minutes of Meeting
December 15, 2004 Meeting

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Blumenthal welcomed George Sensabaugh, who was sitting in for UCORP Chair Neiman. He announced that Council members Parrish and Tuzin, and President Dynes would be absent from the meeting, but that the President would try to call in to provide his briefing. Two Council members have asked for meeting time to provide short reports, and they will be accommodated as time permits. Chair Blumenthal also reminded Council that Regent Blum would be visiting later, along with Leigh Trivette, Secretary to the Regents, and noted that the discussion of executive salaries (item XI) will be moved to after the discussion with Regent Blum.

Vice Chair nominations. The deadline for nominations is January 2. Chair Blumenthal will talk with each nominee to confirm his/her interest and offer an overview of the Chair's job. Nominees are asked to submit a one page summary cv along with a one page statement of their vision for the Senate. All nominees will be invited to make a short presentation at the January meeting. The nomination packets will be sent to all Council members and are to be kept confidential.

Joint Senate/EVC meeting. The topics and other arrangements for the meeting will be discussed tomorrow, so members are asked to put forward any additional discussion topics before then. Extending the meeting length to three hours will be proposed.

Action: Council members are asked to send Chair Blumenthal any additional topic suggestions for the joint AVC/Academic Council meeting, and to submit the suggestions before tomorrow (Thursday), if possible.

WASC review. This matter was brought up with ICAS. That body agreed that the WASC review is unsatisfactory and is interested in taking on a formal inquiry into the cost justifications, the need for WASC, and the possibility of establishing an alternate accrediting agency. Chair Blumenthal and San Diego Division Chair Tuzin spoke with WASC board member Aimee Dorr yesterday for advice on starting a discussion with the board, and will report back to Council later with further information.

Legislative activities. Members were thanked for their quick responses on recent proposed legislation. Senator Alarcon is planning to recommend a state audit of the UC faculty hiring process, with an emphasis on achieving diversity. Part of the proposal will be a recommendation for UC to set up a task force on this issue, and Chair Blumenthal has encouraged the President and the Provost to do so in any event so as to get out in front of the issue. Also, there is now legislation being considered that would mandate state public employee retirement systems to change from a defined benefit program to a defined contribution program. As written, the proposed legislation would cover UCRS, but UC will work to amend it so as to exclude UCRS. This legislation may, however, have an impact on UC's consideration of changing to a defined contribution plan for new employees.

Discussion: A recent study was mentioned, done by the California Research Bureau on diversity in the UC and CSU professoriate. Chair Blumenthal noted he had read the report and found its analysis did not reflect a good understanding of UC practices. UCSF and UCLA

divisions noted diversity hiring efforts on their campuses. Hiring practices and diversity was suggested as an additional topic for the joint meeting with the EVCs.

Action: Division Chair Zegans will distribute to Council information on the “Ambassador Program,” a UCSF program for encouraging faculty diversity.

Action: In view of a possible state audit of UC’s hiring process, Chair Blumenthal will discuss with Provost Greenwood how UCOP can perform or is performing its own assessment of data regarding the UC hiring process and diversity.

Action: A discussion of faculty hiring practices and diversity will be added to the list of possible topics for the joint EVC/Academic Council meeting.

Cut in Senate budget. The systemwide Senate office was levied a 5% budget cut for 2004-05. The Senate office has in the past ten years taken on much added responsibility, yet the budget has remained essentially static. A number of cost-cutting measures were already put in place last year, and despite this year’s cut, the Senate will be able to operate as usual.

UCR&J rulings. UCR&J will soon issue legislative rulings on: 1) voting rights of non-Senate faculty; and 2) Senate Regulation 904 – the delegation of authority to Graduate Deans to disqualify graduate students. These rulings will come to Council for comment and then be brought to Assembly.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The minutes of the November 22, 2004 meeting were approved.

III. Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education

Issue: The language of the draft Concurrent Resolution has been vetted and comments have been incorporated into the current version. Further suggestions for changes will be accepted until noon on Friday. The action before Council today is the endorsement, on behalf of the Assembly, of the proposed Assembly Resolution, which calls on the President and the Senate Chair to make every effort to move the proposed concurrent resolution through the state legislature. Also, Council should consider how to proceed with the resolution in the possible absence of support from OP.

Discussion: There was general agreement that, given the prime importance of graduate education to UC, the faculty should go on record with the statement in the resolution regardless of administrative support. Members discussed the need to be politically sensitive to the Governor’s previous position, the timing of the resolution coming in the middle of the state budget process, and the need to communicate with legislators and approach potential authors. CCGA Chair Williams mentioned the potential threat to graduate student support contained in the compact with the Governor (which includes terms that allow graduate fees to be 50% higher than undergraduate fees), and emphasized the importance of this concurrent resolution in light of that threat.

Action: The Academic Council voted unanimously to: 1) approve the Concurrent Resolution as an item to go before the Assembly in March; and 2) on behalf of the Assembly of the Senate, to approve an Assembly Resolution urging that the Chair of the Academic Senate and the President of the University move the Concurrent Resolution forward.

Action: Any additional suggested changes to the language of the proposed Concurrent Resolution should be submitted to the Senate office by noon on Friday (December 17).

IV. Alignment of the Academic Calendar

Issue: Last March the Academic Council approved UCEP's proposal to align the beginnings of terms (semesters with semesters; quarters with quarters) across all campuses. Then Council Chair Pitts forwarded the proposal to the Provost, emphasizing the plan's academic and cost savings benefits. Since then, campus registrars have raised concerns that the plan may not have the endorsement of the faculty-at-large, so the administration has asked for Senate confirmation that the proposal is supported by the faculty.

Discussion: Chair Blumenthal noted that a full reconsideration of the proposal is not being called for, but rather an assurance that there is not strong faculty opposition to the plan. In the experience of some members, there did not seem to have been full consultation by the divisional senates. It was also pointed out, that since campus registrars interact mostly with undergraduate deans, the concerns raised may not be an indication of grass roots opposition among faculty. One member raised the related need for campus multi-year calendars to be reviewed by a systemwide body for consistency among campuses and good planning in view of actual future calendar days (holidays, e.g.).

Action: Chair Blumenthal will draft a letter to Provost Greenwood acknowledging the previous Council recommendation to align the beginnings of terms across campuses (semester with semester; quarter with quarter), and reflecting the unanimous opinion of the this year's Council that the issue does not need to be re-opened within the Senate. The Senate Chair will respond to any faculty feedback that may result from the plan's implementation.

Action: UCEP will be asked to be responsible for conducting regular review of campus multi-year calendars.

V. Consultation with Senior Management

- **M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs**
- **Joseph Mullinix, Senior Vice President, Business and Finance**
- **Bruce Darling, Senior Vice President, University Affairs**
- **Lawrence Hershman, Vice President – Budget**

Provost Greenwood

Provost Greenwood extended apologies on behalf of President Dynes, who is in Santa Cruz with the newly appointed UCSC Chancellor, Denise Denton. In the absence of President Dynes, Provost Greenwood first covered several items on his behalf.

National Labs. The draft RFP for LANL is out for comment until January 7. After the final RFP comes out in early 2005, there will be 60 days to submit a bid. The current plan is that DOE will select a contractor next summer to begin in October 2005. The plan may be altered because a new Secretary of Energy will be assuming office. The comment period for the LBL contract is closed. There will be 45 days to respond to the final RFP. Selection will be made in the spring; the current management contract expires on January 1, and as yet there is not an extension. UC is currently also waiting on an extension of its management contract for LLNL, which will also eventually be out for competition.

Stem Cell Initiative. The ICOC is now fully appointed and will hold its first meeting on Friday. There are ten members on the commission who are from UC or are UC affiliated, plus others who are closely associated with the university. UC has only influence, not control, over how the institute will be set up. The ICOC is establishing three working groups made up of outside experts. A president of the Institute also needs to be appointed from the scientific community.

Names for that position and for members of the workgroups can be forwarded to the Provost's office.

Provost's Remarks

Science and Math Initiative. The original focus of this initiative was to increase the number of UC qualified math and science teachers in the state. UC produces only about 5% of the teacher credentials in the state, but about 25% of the science and math credentials. Doubling that number could have a significant impact on meeting the state's needs. Broad consultation with more than 500 or so individuals on campuses has shown strong agreement that this is an important issue. The problem is two-fold: 1) retaining students who start in these fields; and 2) improving the output of science and math teachers. Ideas now being discussed range from building on existing UC programs to large proposals, such as the establishment of a science and math state trust fund similar to what has been done in Singapore and Australia.

Regents Activities. The Committee on Educational Policy will have an extensive session this year that will afford the committee members an education in the background and details of education policy. The group will begin by discussing the Master Plan and then maybe go on to external funding issues.

Study Group II. The group's has held its first meeting, which included a review of last year's recommendations, current student demographics, compliance with Proposition 209 and disparate impact of admissions decisions. Some interesting data is now available from the 2004 UCUES survey indicating that 20% of UC students were born in another country, and 50% have at least one foreign-born parent and grew up in a bi-lingual environment.

Action: Provost Greenwood will make available to Council members the preliminary data from the 2004 UCUES survey on undergraduate students.

Sr.VP Mullinix

Core Values Statement. A draft Core Values Statement is being further developed in joint effort with UCFW to achieve a document that will be acceptable by both the Regents and the Senate.

UCRS. Fidelity was selected last year as the administrator of the DC plans. The full implementation process is now being worked on with the UCFW Task Force, with the objective of having a program that provides more information and flexibility. It should be ready by July 1.

Labor issues. The bonus winter holiday could not be given to union members automatically, but needs to be negotiated as part of contract extensions for CUE and UPTE. It is hoped that an agreement can be reached soon with UPTE. There is little prospect that an agreement with CUE will be reached soon, as they have increased their wage demands. A contract extension until January 31 has been concluded with AFSME.

Strategic Sourcing. In accordance with this initiative, agreements are being made with vendors in an effort to improve efficiency and lower costs. The first element is office products, for which Office Max is the preferred vendor.

Action: SVP Mullinix asks that the Senate encourage faculty to purchase products/supplies from vendors with whom UC has pricing agreements.

VP Hershman

State Budget. A budget plan was presented to the Regents, which was approved. The plan incorporates fee increases. Some longer-term issues were discussed and there is interest in establishing a multi-year plan that would be in accord with the budget priorities set out last year.

The latest LAO report indicates a deficit of \$6-7B in 05-06, growing to \$10B in 06-07. However, revenue is up about \$1B from previous estimates and will rise more by the end of the year, although much of this will go to K-12. The Governor will likely propose deep cuts in his budget, but it is unclear how this will be done without tax increases and in light of the balanced budget law.

UC Budget. All indications are that the compact with the Governor will be honored. Without having the agreement, it is likely UC's budget would have been cut in several areas. There is also a general commitment among state legislators that they will continue to view higher education as a priority. Discussions on the science and math initiative are ongoing. It is unclear whether the Governor will support a new general obligation bond issue or lease revenue bonds, much of which decision depends on whether more capital outlay for K-12 will be supported at a time when enrollment is not growing in that segment and there is about \$5B in unspent K-12 funds from the last bond issue. A report on the Governor's budget proposal will be presented at the January Regents meeting.

VI. USA Patriot Act – President's update

[Remarks as presented by Provost Greenwood on behalf of President Dynes]:

The Academic Council's Resolution on SUTI refers to a wide range of policies and practices, including new interpretations of export controls that may make it more difficult for non-citizens to do work with controlled technology. The Office of the President is very concerned about this continuing trend, which has resulted in tightened visa regulations and in extending ITAR rules to allow federal access to student, faculty, or staff records. The Office of Research Administration at OP has distributed advisory memos to campuses on how to respond to requests for records, etc. (There have, though, been very few of these requests, if any.) Additionally, there is new restrictive language being adopted in the grants of some foundations in response to anti-terrorist measures. UC has so far been successful in achieving acceptable modifications to that language. OP continues to monitor federal legislation and regulations in all of these areas, and is working closely with other higher education organizations (e.g., AAU) to advocate for civil rights of faculty and students.

VII. Discussion with Regent Richard Blum

Regent Blum is Vice Chair of the Board of Regents, Chair of the Finance Committee, and Vice Chair of the Laboratory Oversight Committee. He introduced himself and gave a brief overview of his background in investment banking, and then outlined what he sees as the strategic issues facing UC, making the following points:

- The state should not be seen as a reliable long-term partner, so UC should become much less dependent on state funding.
- UC should continue to improve advocacy efforts with the Legislature to get non-targeted funding (and make use of polling and focus groups).
- UC should focus more effort on alumni giving to increase the general endowment.
- University operations should be run more efficiently, with centralized sourcing, e.g., and a projection of savings.

Discussion: Council members raised questions with Regent Blum on the topics of student fee increases, alumni giving, student diversity, UCRS plans, and an overall vision for the University, among others.

VIII. Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California

Issue: The Provost has asked for the Senate's comments on this report, which was developed by the University Librarians and the Office of Systemwide Library Planning. Council will hold a preliminary discussion today, with final action slated for next month's meeting.

Note on procedure: Chair Blumenthal reminded members of the procedure followed for general reviews. Submission of committees responses is usually scheduled a month ahead of divisional responses. A member of the Senate staff drafts a summary of the committee responses, which is included in the agenda packet along with the individual letters, and used for discussion purposes. This way the divisions have the benefit of being informed by the committee opinions before they finalize their responses. The following month the item is again on the Council agenda, but this time for full discussion and final action in light of both division and committee responses.

Discussion: Members noted several points, including the importance of distinguishing, in the Council's response, between shared and sharable resources, the concern that publication costs may end up being passed on to individual faculty as a result of pricing negotiations, and the need to archive print documents. One member thought that the archiving and digitizing efforts as outlined in the report may soon be rendered outdated or unnecessary, given Google's current project to create a comprehensive online collection. It was noted that the report is an evolving effort and an incremental process on the part of UC libraries.

Action: Final Council action on this item will be at the January 26 Council meeting.

IX. Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC)

Issue: The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) has submitted the SciGETC proposal to the UC Senate for review and approval. The plan is modeled on the IGETC and is intended to help better prepare transfer students who will be majoring in the sciences.

Discussion: It was pointed out in the committee responses and in discussion that the IGETC agreement is not universally accepted by campuses (and individual colleges within campuses). Non-acceptance of IGETC would be against senate regulations, although cases of non-acceptance may be more a matter of advising practices for certain majors. UCEP Chair Kiskis found the SciGETC documents confusing and open to different interpretations as to whether the plan may stand in for major preparation. Council Chair Blumenthal clarified that this is a conceptual proposal and that ICAS would at this point like buy-in with the idea. The next step would be an implementation plan and the drafting of legislation.

Action: Clarification will be sought on the non-acceptance of the IGETC curriculum by UC colleges, schools, etc., and whether such non-acceptance is out of compliance with Senate regulations.

Action: Final Council action on the SciGETC proposal will be at the January 26 Council meeting.

X. Joint Academic Council/University Librarians Letter to All Faculty

Issue: The Academic Council is being asked to endorse a joint letter with the University Librarians to all UC Faculty regarding the rising costs of scholarly publications. This letter is similar to a joint letter sent to faculty last year, with this year's letter having to do with contract negotiations with Blackwell, the American Association for the Advancement of Science and other publishers.

Discussion: One member mentioned that negotiations with Blackwell may already be settled. It was noted that many faculty belong to the AAAS and because faculty normally have high regard for these publishers of academic society journals, the situation is awkward. Questions were raised as to the reasons behind such inflated costs. It was suggested that UC Librarian Daniel Greenstein come to a future Council meeting, or alternatively provide Council with a white paper that offers background on the issue.

Action: Council endorsed the letter, with an amended first paragraph that specifies the publications as being electronic.

Action: UC Librarian Greenstein will be asked to provide background on rising costs of scholarly publications, either at a future Council meeting or in a white paper for distribution to Council members.

XI. Faculty/Senior Management Salaries [Discussed after item VII in actual order of meeting.]

Issue: At the October Council meeting it was suggested that Council review two earlier Senate reports on executive salary levels at UC: a 1995 report that included among its set of recommendations that the salaries of senior managers be tied to UC faculty salaries; and a 2002 report, issued after the Regents had approved significant salary raises for EVCs and deans of engineering schools. The latter report saw the salary increases as understandable in view of market realities, but recommended that the raises be based on performance, that merit reviews be instituted, and that the planned raises not be implemented until such time that faculty salaries too could be raised to the national level.

Discussion: There was general agreement on the need for performance standards in reviewing high-level administrators and that their salary increases should be merit-based. It was suggested that these standards be founded in how well the university's 3-part mission (teaching, research, service) is being fulfilled within the areas overseen by an individual administrator. It was pointed out that providing competitive (market-based) salaries for administrators is not essentially different from faculty negotiating market-based salaries or offering competitive recruitment packages. It was suggested that policy and practice relating to the recruitment and review of administrators should mirror the policy and practice of faculty. Performance standards, salary constraints, and equitable practices would be called for, but the necessity of being market-competitive would also be acknowledged. There was general agreement that the Senate should be involved to the greatest extent possible in salary decisions for executive management. Members also discussed the questions of whether raises for senior administrators should be implemented while faculty and staff salaries are not being increased, and how to address the "halo" effect of additional raises for those associated with higher-level administrators.

Action: Detailed notes covering Council's discussion of this item will be drafted and distributed to Council members.

Action: Discussion of this item will continue at the January 26 Council meeting.

XII. Mental Health Service for Students and Faculty -*UCSF Divisional Chair Zegans*

Issue: There has been recent recognition on a national level of mental health problems among students, faculty and staff in higher education. These problems- such as suicides, anxiety and the discontinuance of psychiatric medications –are in evidence at UC. They are complex and call for complex management; however, because of budget cuts, the university health services cannot

adequately provide an adequate level of care. The San Francisco division recommends forming a task force to address the issue

Discussion: Members agreed that steps be taken to establish a task force to look at whether adequate services for mental health care and crisis intervention are available for UC students, faculty and others on the campuses. It was reported that, through the efforts of graduate students, a campus task force on this issue was set up at Berkeley. It was suggested that the various vice chancellors for student affairs be approached about what is being done on campuses. Members raised the matter of past budget cuts coming from the Office of the President that had targeted campus mental health services. It was agreed that, in an effort separate from that of the suggested task force, UCPB (on behalf of the Council) look into the origin and deployment of past budget cuts that have affected student health services. The matter of these directed budget cuts was suggested as an additional topic for discussion at the upcoming joint meeting with the EVCs.

Action: The 12/3/04 article in the New York Times relating to the issue of mental health problems among students will be distributed to Council members

Action: Chair Blumenthal will raise with Michael Drake, Vice President of Health Affairs, and Provost Greenwood the idea of establishing a task force that would assess needs and current practices at UC as to crisis intervention and mental health services on the campuses.

Action: UCPB will be asked to consider looking at and reporting back to Council on recent directed cuts to student services on campuses that have in particular affected mental health services.

Action: The topic of support for mental health services on campuses will be added to the list of possible items for discussion at the joint Senate/EVC meeting.

XIII. ACSONL Update *Academic Council Vice Chair Brunk*

Update: The LBL and LANL RFP timelines were covered in the Provost's briefing earlier today. Possible industry partners are being considered for joint management of LANL. It is still unclear how many competitors there will be for the contract and whether the Regents will choose to compete. The Council of Lab Directors, a newly formed group, has held its first meeting. The lines of reporting at LBL have been redrawn to position an advisory group between the President and the lab director, to which the LBL director will directly report.

Action: Council will again be updated on ACSONL activities at the January meeting.

XIV. Topics of Concern

1. UCFW Update on the draft Statement of Core Values and Standards of Business Conduct

Update: Last month Council was apprised of the Regents consideration of a set of "core values" for the university. UCFW was asked to work on revising the initial draft, and has developed, jointly with OP, a "Statement of Core Values" that in no way conflicts with the faculty code of conduct, and that is supplemented by a set of standards of business conduct. This set of standards would regulate dealings with third parties in a "marketplace" context and included links to related areas already covered in the faculty code of conduct. These documents will be a Regents information item in January.

Action: The draft Statement of Core Values and Standards of Business Conduct that will be in the Regents' January agenda as an information item will included in the Council January agenda.

2. UCAP Update on the review of the Professorial Step System, UCAP Chair Alan Barbour
Update: UCAP has continued to look at the function and meaning of Step VI, as well as above-scale salaries. Most of the response to last year's report on the step system was in favor of keeping step VI, but also evidenced some concern as to how that step as well as the successive steps are defined. UCAP has taken these points into consideration and has also discussed how to obviate the need for above-scale salaries by adding steps. UCAP is concerned with how the steps are differently interpreted on the various campuses, and has been working on drafting definitions of steps and of above scale criteria that will better distinguish them and serve the purpose of maintaining faculty quality. Input from the campus CAPs will be sought. Data on gender and ethnicity as it relates to progress within the step system will be analyzed once it is received from OP.

Action: UCAP will submit draft definitions of the professor steps (as a proposed amendment to the APM) for inclusion in the January Council agenda for review.

Meeting adjourned, 4:30 p.m.

Attest: George Blumenthal, Chair
Academic Council

Minutes prepared by
Brenda Foust,
Policy Analyst