

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
November 30, 2016****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Council Minutes of October 2016
3. UCFW Letter on Faculty Exit Surveys
4. Self-Supporting Master of Finance Degree at UCI
5. M.S./Ph.D. in Conservation of Material Culture at UCLA

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officer's Announcements

- **Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair**
- **Shane White, Academic Senate Vice Chair**
- **Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director**

November Regents Meeting: Chair Chalfant's [comments](#) to the Regents focused on the uncertainty and anxiety created by the results of the national election, and affirmed the faculty's ongoing commitment to access, inclusion, non-discrimination, and principles of community. He also affirmed faculty support for maintaining strong and clear disciplinary processes for faculty misconduct in the context of the current review of policies and procedures for complaints of sexual misconduct involving faculty.

The Committee on Finance and Capital Strategies discussed the outlook for revenues and expenditures in the 2017-18 UC budget and a Three-Year Financial Sustainability Plan for the University. The state is expected to fund a 4% increase to UC's base budget and the enrollment of 2,500 new resident undergraduates. UC proposes that the funding from the State return to its full historical share of marginal cost, \$10,000 per student. UC hopes that the state will also provide funding for 900 new graduate students. UC is anticipating a 5% increase to the student services fee, a 5% adjustment to nonresident supplemental tuition, and a 2.5% adjustment to resident tuition. In addition, Finance and Capital Strategies discussed a small decline in the University's financial position resulting from new debt issued to support capital improvements and UCRP, and from a decline in the valuation of retiree health benefit obligations, a result of changes to the discount rate. The Public Engagement and Development Committee noted that private support to UC grew by \$100 million last year.

Graduate Program Reviews: The administration has asked the Senate to expedite its review process for new graduate programs and titles. Senate leaders have been exploring ways to reduce the overall review time, particularly the time between CCGA's approval of a program and the final Council/Assembly action. One possibility is for Council to delegate its approval authority, which is typically undertaken on behalf of the Assembly. Another is for Council to retain authority but vote on programs over email between meetings.

Discussion: Council members agreed that Council should remain engaged in graduate program reviews, and should reserve the right to discuss and vote on new programs. It was agreed that following CCGA’s approval, Council will receive new programs over email for one week “consent calendar” approval. Council members may request the removal of any proposal from the consent calendar for discussion at an in-person meeting.

III. National Laboratories

- **Kimberly Budil, Vice President, Office of the National Laboratories (phone)**

Vice President Budil noted that the Office of the National Laboratories manages UC’s oversight of three Department of Energy (DOE) national laboratories. UC has sole governance authority over the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), and is a member of LLCs with Bechtel and other corporate partners that hold the contracts for Los Alamos (LANL) and Lawrence Livermore (LLNL). In general, UC is responsible for the science and technology missions at LANL and LLNL, while the partners focus on the operations and business functions.

Los Alamos National Security (LANS) is the LLC formed in 2006 to manage LANL, and its current contract ends in September 2018. The initial contract was structured to give LANS seven years of management with the option to earn additional years. Due to a number of safety and operational missteps, UC failed to earn an award year four times, which triggered a clause that vacates the contract at the end of the term. UC is preparing for the possibility that the DOE will open the contract for re-competition sometime in 2017.

Since their founding, the national laboratories have engaged in a broad range of national security work related to nuclear weapons, biosecurity, and other classified activities. However, the labs also have large unclassified research portfolios, recognizing that their mission is to be a resource to any government agency requiring science and technology support. To this end, they develop tools and technologies to support a broad range of activities and goals, including non-proliferation agreements (including the recent deal with Iran), nuclear test ban monitoring, counter-terrorism activities, cybersecurity, climate research, and energy security. UC’s engagement in the laboratories is critical to their health, vitality, and intellectual integrity.

UC uses a portion of its DOE management fee to fund academic research collaborations between lab scientists and faculty and graduate students on UC campuses, through the [Laboratory Fees Research Program](#). The program recently shifted its focus to larger-scale interactions involving at least four UC campuses and one lab. Vice President Budil values her connection to the Senate through her work with ACSCOLI and UCORP. She is also willing to visit campuses to speak with faculty and other groups about work at the labs, their value to UC’s public mission, and opportunities for new collaborations that benefit the campuses and the labs.

IV. Nonresident Enrollment Policy

- **Nina Robinson, Associate President and Chief Policy Advisor**

The state budget requires UC to adopt a policy specifying a limit on nonresident undergraduate enrollment. In preparation for the Regents’ discussion of a policy in January, UCOP provided several models to them as options. UCOP recommended a policy that would not represent a significant change for most campuses; however, the Regents believe it is critical to UC’s identity

for campuses to enroll a much lower proportion of nonresidents than other public university peers. There is support on the Board for a policy limiting undergraduate nonresident enrollment to 20%, both on a systemwide basis and on each campus. The policy would require the three UC campuses above 20% to reduce enrollments, and would also interrupt the plans of other campuses that had hoped to grow to that level. UCOP is considering two models for phasing in the cap at the three campuses. The first would reduce the number of incoming undergraduates to 20% on each campus over four to five years beginning in fall 2017. The second would increase both resident and therefore total undergraduate enrollment on each campus over three to five years, holding nonresident enrollments at their current levels. The second option would better preserve nonresident tuition revenue for the affected campuses. A planned five percent increase to nonresident tuition will help offset the lost revenue, although the tuition increase may also affect demand.

UCOP is emphasizing to Regents and state officials the benefits of nonresident enrollment, noting that nonresidents add to the intellectual and cultural life of the campuses and their supplemental tuition helps support the enrollment and education of more California residents.

V. Consultation with Senior Managers

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**
- **Aimée Dorr, Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**

National Election: The presidential election has numerous implications for the University. One is the potential elimination of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that President Napolitano created as Secretary of Homeland Security, which could subject undocumented UC students to deportation. Today the University will issue a [Statement of Principles in Support of Undocumented Members of the UC Community](#). It notes that UC will protect the privacy and civil rights of the undocumented members of the UC community, will not release confidential student records without a court order or subpoena, and will direct campus police departments not to undertake joint efforts with any government agencies to enforce federal immigration law. President Napolitano's November 30 New York Times [op-ed piece](#) and a [joint letter](#) from the leaders of the three segments of California public higher education to President-elect Trump also express continued support for DACA. President Napolitano is working with the Undocumented Student Coordinators from the ten UC campuses to discuss the implications of different potential federal policy changes. She also plans to appoint a systemwide advisory group for undocumented students and staff.

The University will also be assessing how potential changes to the Affordable Care Act could affect the UC Medical Centers, and also how new cabinet appointees in areas related to financial aid, Title IX, civil rights, research administration, and the Department of Energy could affect the University. The new political world will require UC to be agile and also to remain committed to its core values.

November Regents Meeting: The Academic and Student Affairs Committee hosted a discussion about California demographic trends and efforts to improve college readiness in the public school system, with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education Chair. The Finance and Capital Strategies Committee hosted a presentation on financial aid that emphasized UC's financial accessibility for low-income students. It noted that

tuition is the main source of revenue for financial aid, and that more than half of UC students pay no tuition, and that one-third of all new tuition directly supports financial aid for low-income California residents. UCOP also presented actuarial reports on retiree health and UCRP, which noted that poor investment performance led to a \$5 billion decline in the market value of UC's assets, and a decline in UCRP's funded ratio from 84% to 78%. UC will continue its current strategy of meeting the full UCRP funding policy through a combination of employee and employer contributions and STIP borrowing.

Leadership Searches: The search committees for the Davis and Berkeley Chancellor positions have identified finalists. The Regents are expected to appoint a new Davis Chancellor in January and a new Berkeley chancellor in March. In addition, UCOP has posted a position for a systemwide Title IX coordinator.

Student Housing: The President launched an initiative to build as many as 14,000 new housing units for undergraduate and graduate students by 2020, to help meet increasing demand for on-campus housing and to address the decreasing affordability of off-campus housing. The initiative will explore two capital funding mechanisms: the first using Limited Project Revenue Bonds to build facilities owned and operated by UC; the second using private developers to cooperatively finance, develop, and operate student housing facilities across the UC system.

Nonresident Enrollment Policy: The University is developing options for implementing a 20% cap on nonresident enrollment that will be as least disruptive as possible for campuses above 20% and include a "glide path" to give those campuses time to identify compensating revenue.

Long-Range Enrollment Planning: In response to the Regents' request for a long-range enrollment plan, UCOP asked campuses to identify their optimal total enrollment, an end-point for achieving it, and the capital, revenue, and faculty needed to support the enrollment and sustain the campus as a high-quality research institution. UCOP recognizes that campuses have different enrollment goals, strategies, and constraints, and will be working with them on long-range models to see what is feasible. The final plans will take into account demographic projections of state population growth and the number of high school students expected to be UC-eligible in the future. UCOP has asked campuses to provide final plans by June 30. UCOP expects decisions to be grounded in local planning, in consultation with local Senates. The President sees long-term planning as a way to change the funding dynamic with the state.

Discussion: Council members applauded the President and Chancellors' joint [statement](#) on the election and efforts to support and protect undocumented students. They noted that faculty are also concerned about the potential for new immigration restrictions to limit UC's ability to recruit international graduate students.

Council members encouraged UCOP to present the benefits and trade-offs of different revenue and enrollment models, and noted that the University should not accept inadequate state funding as a "new normal." A long-term enrollment plan based on additional resources must acknowledge that current resources are inadequate. Long-range planning decisions should be realistic, and include viable sources of capital funding. Credible plans require buy-in from a broad range of campus constituencies, including the Senate. One division chair noted that his campus took on new students this year without an adequate plan to accommodate them or any Senate consultation about doing so. Council members noted that a nonresident enrollment cap would be financially irresponsible. Berkeley estimates that a 20% cap will add at least \$30

million to its budget deficit. A cap will threaten the quality of education at all three campuses above 20%.

The President noted that UCOP recognizes that the enrollment cap will extend the time Berkeley needs to resolve its deficit. UCOP will provide assistance; however, some of Berkeley's problems are solvable and need to be addressed by that campus. Provost Dorr added that UCOP will encourage academic administrators to engage faculty in enrollment planning.

A Council member expressed concern that a 14% employer contribution to UCRP may not be sustainable, particularly if a market downturn causes a sharp decline in the funded ratio. The Regents have authorized an employer contribution of up to 18% and may want to consider a higher contribution level.

VI. Consultation with the Office of Academic Personnel

o Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel

Revisions to APM 015 and 016: Vice Provost Carlson noted that UCOP hopes to bring the final proposed changes to the March Regents meeting, a deadline that could be extended to the May meeting. UCOP policy authors hoped to minimize the proposed changes and keep them aligned directly with the Joint Committee recommendations. She noted that many Senate comments focused directly on the proposed changes, but others weighed in on other aspects of the APMs. She said all comments are welcome, but suggested that the Senate propose a limited range of changes relevant to the immediate goals now, with a separate evaluation of the other issues during the following year.

Negotiated Faculty Salary Pilot Program: A task force is reviewing outcomes from a negotiated salary pilot project for general campus faculty implemented in 2013 at UCI, UCLA, and UCSD. The program allows faculty to contribute external funding resources toward their total UC salary. The task force has been asked to recommend next steps for the pilot. Its final report is due to Provost Dorr by June 1.

Faculty Diversity Pilot Project: The state budget provides UC with \$2 million in one-time funding to support faculty diversity. UCOP invited campuses to submit proposals for using up to \$600K of the funding on a plan to hire a more diverse faculty in a specific unit. A joint committee of faculty and administrators selected pilot projects at UCD, UCR, and UCSD. A systemwide advisory group will monitor the progress of each project. More details are available in UCOP's November 15 progress [report](#) to the Department of Finance.

Management Consultation Review of APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740: UCAP, UCFW, and Senate division chairs were invited to participate in a "management consultation review" of proposed revisions to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) APM series. Management review is a limited pre-review by selected entities intended to help policy authors determine whether they are on the right track, prior to a full systemwide review. The impetus for the review came from campuses wanting a clearer and more consistent policy framework for LSOE faculty who are growing in number and have increasingly important roles. Campuses have given LSOE faculty a variety of working titles that may not fully reflect their role. A subcommittee has recommended the title "Professor of Teaching (e.g. *Theater*)." Excellence and innovation in teaching are included in the criteria for appointment and advancement in the LSOE series.

Discussion: It was noted that campuses do not usually consider LSOE duties to include research, even if that research is limited to teaching pedagogy. It was noted that the title “Teaching Professor” may be more appropriate than “Professor of Teaching,” as the title “Professor” implies a position with a research component, while “Professor of Teaching” may imply that ladder-rank faculty do not teach. It was suggested that LSOEs might be permitted to opt-in to the new title or choose to remain in their existing title, but any change should be structured to ensure that LSOE faculty are not required to change behavior.

VII. Concerns about the Future of the University

Council discussed the possibility of a short position paper, statement, or op-ed summarizing the faculty’s concerns about the declining quality of the student experience and the future of the University, in preparation for upcoming Regents discussions about nonresident enrollment policy and other long-range enrollment and budget decisions.

Council members noted that faculty are concerned about the long-term trends of diminishing state support and quality, and believe the University has no realistic chance of recovering its past ambitions within current resource projections, and no viable alternative revenue source identified to replace lost state support. They are questioning the additional revenue constraints imposed by a policy cap on nonresident enrollment and the financial feasibility of new undergraduate enrollment growth agreements that do not carry full marginal cost funding. Many faculty believe that the University needs to change course.

It was suggested that the statement provide a collection of compelling stories illustrating the decline in quality, as well as a vision for the future. It was also noted that the UCPB [Futures Report](#) (2006), [Cuts Report](#) (2008), and [Choices Report](#) (2010), address many of the same points and concerns.

VIII. Undocumented Students

- **Jerlena Griffin-Desta, Deputy to Vice President and Executive Director of Student Services**
- **Julia Friedlander, Deputy General Counsel-Educational Affairs**
- **Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Vice President for Student Affairs**

The President has assembled a working group to assess the potential effects of the election results on undocumented students, to prepare the University for any potential policy changes or actions by the federal government, particularly related to the Deferred Action on Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program,

DACA acknowledges that undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as children, and who may have lived most of their lives and attended school in this country, should not be a priority for deportation. DACA provides individuals with a two-year renewable deportation deferral and work authorization. Individuals convicted of a crime are ineligible for DACA status. Undocumented DACA students also have the right to pay in-state tuition at California public colleges and universities under California Assembly Bill 540.

Ms. Griffin-Desta and Ms. Friedlander noted that many undocumented students are anxious about the future and the privacy of their information. The good news is that state and federal law

provides broad protections for student privacy, and the Office of General Counsel will meet any requests about immigration status with a vigorous commitment to student privacy. In addition, the University has established a principle that immigration law enforcement is a task for federal officials, and that UC campus police and other campus officials will not participate in enforcement. UC policy and state law also require UC to admit undocumented students on the same basis as other students. Nevertheless, UC is advising undocumented students not to apply for a DACA renewal, and to avoid participating in study abroad or otherwise traveling abroad. In addition, Ms. Griffin-Desta and Ms. Friedlander noted that campus Undocumented Student Coordinators would appreciate any support and flexibility faculty can offer students.

Discussion: Council members noted that many faculty are unfamiliar with campus resources for undocumented students and would be open to learning more about those resources and the laws and policies protecting students. It was noted that the spike in hate crimes following the election is an opportunity to remind campus community members that they are bound by a code of conduct and principles of community. It is also important to ensure that mental health and drug and alcohol counseling resources are available for students experiencing stress.

IX. UC Care and Maximum Out of Pocket Costs
o **Lori Lubin, UCFW Chair**

Council reviewed a letter from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) expressing concern about the recent consolidation of maximum out-of-pocket (MOOP) expenses in UC Care. UCFW is concerned that the change will reduce benefits and increase costs for UC Care subscribers with the highest medical and pharmacy costs. UCFW was also unable to verify how the consultant who determined that consolidation would produce cost savings came to that conclusion, because no data were made available to UCFW. UCFW is requesting a reversal of the consolidation until convincing data are provided regarding the projected cost savings that led to UC's decision to aggregate the MOOP. In addition, UCFW wants UCOP to permit UC employees who may have left UC Care due to the change in MOOP expenses to rejoin the plan outside of the open enrollment period.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to endorse and forward the letter to Executive Vice President Stobo and Chief Operating Officer Nava. The motion passed unanimously.

X. UCEP Report on Reexamination of Alternative Credit–Advanced Placement Exams
o **Ed Caswell-Chen, UCEP Vice Chair**

As part of the Senate's response to the programmatic initiatives in the budget agreement with Governor Brown, UCEP was asked to review alternative means of earning credit that may help reduce time to degree for students. As part of this effort, UCEP reviewed campus policies for awarding UC credit for Advanced Placement (AP) exams taken prior to college matriculation, and for applying that credit to UC graduation requirements for specific majors and/or for general education requirements.

UCEP found that all campuses recognize and incentivize AP courses and exams, both in admissions and to the extent that they award credit for specific AP exams. All students who earn scores of 3 or higher on AP exams receive at least elective credit toward graduation. Individual campuses and departments may also award credit for GE requirements or the specific graduation

requirements of a major, based on a minimum score of at least 3, and usually 4 or higher. In addition, some campuses offer enrollment priority for students with AP credit.

UCEP also identified variations in the way individual campuses and departments apply AP credit, the minimum scores they require for more than elective credit, and the limitations they set; however, it found those differences are justified, based on the individual educational goals and course expectations of specific majors, and because UC courses generally are more rigorous than high school AP courses. UCEP also noted a concern about UC further incentivizing AP or increasing reliance on AP exams due to disparities in the availability of AP curriculum across CA high schools, particularly schools serving first-generation and URM populations. Based on those concerns, UCEP asks campuses to re-examine their policies for enrollment priority.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to forward UCEP’s report to Provost Dorr. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. UCAADE Letter on Letters of Recommendation
o **Amani Nuru-Jeter, UCAADE Chair**

UCAADE’s cursory review of the existing research on diversity in admissions found much evidence to support holistic review as an effective way to improve diversity, but very little research focused specifically on Letters of Recommendation (LORs). UCAADE supports continuing the Berkeley LOR pilot and analyzing outcomes from Berkeley’s expanded 2017 study on the effect of LORs, to help the Senate make an informed decision about a systemwide policy on LORs.

XII. New Business

It was agreed that several items on today’s agenda will be discussed in a supplemental Council videoconference meeting on December 14. The Assembly meeting scheduled for that day will be cancelled.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting**December 14, 2016****I. Announcements**

- **Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair**
- **Shane White, Academic Senate Vice Chair**

COC Meeting: Chair Chalfant and Vice Chair White attended a portion of the Council of Chancellors meeting to discuss systemwide Senate reviews of new graduate programs and a request to the Senate to streamline its review process. The chair and vice chair noted examples in which the systemwide Senate review improved a program substantially; they clarified that delays occur at different stages of the campus and systemwide review, and offered that the Senate could reduce its review time by up to three weeks by asking Council to review new programs over email following CCGA's approval. They agreed to work with the Chancellors and Provost Dorr on additional approaches to streamlining, and made additional suggestions such as offering financial incentives to internal and external reviewers for meeting a specified deadline.

December 13 ICAS Meeting: ICAS discussed the upcoming state budget season and proposed legislation affecting the three segments of higher education. The Committee met with the Governor's senior advisor on higher education, who invited faculty to forward nominations for vacant positions on the segments' governing boards to the Governor's appointments office. The senior advisor suggested that the state may need to rethink some multi-year funding agreements due to lower than expected revenues, and encouraged the segments to "scale-up" to complete their educational missions. She also encouraged the segments to work together to address the K-12 teacher shortage, especially in STEM fields.

New HSCP Review: UCOP recently released for systemwide Senate review [proposed revisions](#) to APM Sections 278 and 210-6 related to the non-Senate Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. This is the second systemwide review of the proposed changes to APMs 278 and 210-6. The Senate [reviewed](#) them last year as part of a package of APM changes that also included revisions to the Volunteer Clinical Professor title (APM 279) and a new policy covering non-faculty Clinical Associates (APM 350). The Senate supported APM 350, but rejected changes proposed for APMs 278 and 279. One point of concern was the proposed addition of research and creative activities to the criteria for appointment and advancement.

II. Proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities

Council discussed a draft letter summarizing comments received from Academic Senate divisions and systemwide committees to the systemwide review of a proposed [Presidential Policy on International Activities](#). All ten Academic Senate divisions and six systemwide committees (UCAAF, UCAADE, CCGA, UCFW, UCIE, and UCORP) submitted comments. The document is intended to provide an updated policy framework for supporting and facilitating international activities at UC, to account for a broader, more contemporary set of issues, including ethics, risk, and compliance.

Senate reviewers expressed significant concerns about the policy, including uncertainty about vague statements and ambiguously defined terms, especially "risk," and how risk is assessed and

by whom; concerns and uncertainty about the potential scope of administrative authority, especially the role of Executive Officers to approve international activities; and potential impingements on academic freedom.

ACTION: Council approved sending the letter with minor amendments.

III. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM 015 & 016 and Senate Bylaw 336

Council discussed a draft letter summarizing comments received from Academic Senate divisions and systemwide committees about [proposed revisions to APM 015 and APM 016](#) intended to implement policy revisions recommended by the Administration-Senate Joint Committee on investigation and adjudication processes for sexual violence and sexual harassment (SVSH) cases involving faculty. The Senate also considered a set of conforming amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 addressing procedures and timelines for Privilege and Tenure proceedings in discipline cases, which are intended to align Bylaw 336 with the proposed APM revisions. Ten Academic Senate divisions and five systemwide committees (CCGA, UCAADE, UCFW, UCAP and UCPT) submitted comments.

Senate reviewers found many aspects of the proposed amendments helpful, but expressed concerns about their clarity, intent, and effectiveness. Some reviewers also took the opportunity to weigh in on other aspects of APM 015 and 016 not directly related to the revisions proposed as a result of Joint Committee recommendations. The draft summary letter separates those comments from comments focused directly on the specific changes proposed. It invites UCOP to consider the additional comments, but acknowledges that they may require a separate evaluation.

Discussion: Council members noted several local SVSH policy implementation issues requiring clarification. It was suggested that faculty send local issues to the systemwide Senate Executive Director or campus Senate Director for inclusion in a master list of issues for future consideration. It was also suggested that UCRJ draft a proposed revision to Bylaw 335.B.6 to resolve an inconsistency in the language about grievance procedures requiring a faculty member to file a grievance no later than three years after an incident. In addition, UCAADE made several additional recommendations, including a request to clarify administrators' reporting responsibility when breaches of APM 015 are an "open secret," even if not reported.

ACTION: Council approved sending the letter with minor amendments.

IV. Management Review of Proposed Amendments to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, Lecturer with Security of Employment

Council discussed the management consultation review of proposed revisions to APM 285, 210-3, 133, and 740, related to the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) title, and a proposed new title for individuals in the series, "Professor of Teaching (e.g. *Theater*)." Chair Chalfant's draft letter summarizes comments received, and suggests an alternative title: "Teaching Professor."

Council members noted that the proposal does not provide a clear rationale for the new title, why the current LSOE position description is no longer relevant, and for the new requirement that individuals in the new title do pedagogical research. It was noted that the title "Professor" implies the higher level of research expected of ladder-rank faculty that is not expected of

LSOEs. In addition, it was noted that LSOEs are less expensive to hire than ladder-rank faculty. As campuses add more LSOEs to meet increasing demand, there will be a negative trade-off: fewer ladder-rank faculty who do both teaching and research.

Members also noted concern that the LSOE title conveys a second-class status and has limited meaning nationally. A title that includes “Professor” would be more meaningful for individuals in the title and could help some departments recruit faculty into that title. Council members also noted that “Professor of Practice” is more common nationally, and could be a better option than Teaching Professor.

V. Statement on Proposed Policy on Nonresident Enrollment

Council reviewed a letter from UCPB arguing against a proposed cap on nonresident undergraduate enrollment and in favor of a 2.5% tuition adjustment. The UCPB letter notes that the 2.5% tuition increase will generate about \$53M of new revenue after 33% is redistributed to lower income students through the return-to-aid mechanism. The new revenue is roughly equivalent to the \$50M earmarked for “Investments in Quality” in the UC budget, and is critical to maintaining educational quality.

The UCPB letter notes that the proposed nonresident enrollment cap of 20% would hurt the three campuses above 20% and also the UC system as a whole, creating a net loss of \$56M for the three campuses and a \$14M loss of return-to-aid for CA residents, effectively working like a 2.73% cut in state general funds. Nonresidents bring educational benefits to campuses, and nonresident tuition provides additional resources that help UC enroll and provide financial aid to more CA residents. 20% is an arbitrary figure that has not been studied or justified. The length and shape of the “glide path” to the cap would not materially change the magnitude of the loss.

UCPB notes that an additional annual 0.33% tuition increase or 0.23% state contribution over an eight-year glide path could help offset the fiscal impact of the cap. This would require addressing the fact that the formula for distributing state funds does not align with the current distribution of nonresident tuition revenues. UCPB also recommends investigating a “cap and trade” scheme that would redistribute nonresident tuition revenue through a modified rebenching formula to campuses below the cap.

Discussion: Council members noted that campuses affected by the cap will need to think creatively about how to replace the lost revenue. They may propose additional self-supporting graduate programs, and implement more funding cuts affecting undergraduate education. The Regents should remember that the Committee of Two agreement provided for a tuition increase tied to inflation, and that UC’s public peers enroll a much higher proportion of nonresidents.

VI. Clinical Affairs Task Force

Chair Chalfant invited Council members to send comments on the draft charge for a proposed Academic Senate Clinical Affairs Task Force.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: Jim Chalfant, Academic Council Chair