

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting  
Monday, January 28, 2009****II. Announcements**

- **Mary Croughan, Academic Council Chair**
- EAP: VP Greenstein is recommending an interim plan that will allow time for thoughtful review and hopefully will avoid irreversible changes to the structure and budget of EAP.
- Council previously requested the Provost to inform the Director of the National Science Foundation of UC's and the Academic Council's concerns regarding tracking diversity in the reporting of doctoral degrees awarded. The NSF Director responded with assurance that UC's concerns will be considered. In addition, in response to Council's request, UCAAD's chair has been appointed to the UCOP Diversity Implementation Committee to help ensure that the recommendations of the Regents' Study Group on University Diversity are implemented.
- Academic Affairs reorganization: Chair Croughan and BOARS committee member Joe Watson are part of an advisory group that has met to consider restructuring options and will continue to evaluate the plan. The process will be completed this spring.
- The eligibility reform policy will be considered by The Regents next week. Senate representatives made a presentation on issues related to diversity at a legislative briefing last week.
- Retiree rehire policy: The policy was not implemented this month as scheduled; UCOP has made some, but not all, of the changes Council requested. The revised policy is on the Regents' agenda next week.
- The President has convened an Enrollment Management Group, including Chair Croughan, Vice Chair Powell, and BOARS' Chair Hurtado.
- Vice Chair nominations are due by 2/18/09.

**II. Consent Calendar**

6. **Approval of the December 17, 2008 Minutes**
7. **Cancel the Assembly meeting on February 11, 2009.**
8. **UCFW letter on Regents' item [Appendix E](#).**
9. **[Regents Item J1: New Capital Funding Strategy](#).**
10. **Responses to the revised Accountability Framework.**

**ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.**

**III. Approval of the Agenda.**

**ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved with the following change: Item XI "Blue and Gold Opportunity Program," was switched with Item IV, "Expansion of the Area "d" Laboratory Science Admissions Requirement.**

**IV. Provost Search and Senate Involvement (*Executive Session*)**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

## **V. Budget Discussion (Executive Session)**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

## **VI. Regent Eddie Island**

Introductory remarks: Chair Croughan welcomed Regent Island and President Yudof and thanked them for coming. Regent Island emphasized that his priorities as a Regent are to improve access, affordability, and diversity and that unlike past Boards, the current Board of Regents is sympathetic to these issues. He stated that the Board also understands the importance of shared governance, and noted that since joining the Board, he has cast only one vote in opposition to the Senate's point of view—on research funding from tobacco companies. He stated that he enthusiastically embraces the Senate's eligibility reform proposal, but wishes that it had been more daring, and would like to discuss how we can further the goal of access.

On curtailing enrollment: Regent Island voted against reducing enrollment at the last Regents' meeting, given its impact on underrepresented minorities. He would like to understand why the faculty is in favor of enrollment reductions. He thinks we should have found another way to address the budget problem. Every stone should be turned over to achieve savings and we should reduce enrollment only as a last, desperate act because it will touch the lives of students, families and taxpayers, and it will disproportionately affect minorities. He believes that we should examine whether our actions harm diversity, and this action does.

On eligibility reform: Regent Island believes that a majority of his colleagues would have supported a bolder plan. Especially in California—a majority minority state—we must challenge ourselves to ensure that we are doing enough to serve all of the state's residents. The Regents and the University adopted the Senate's eloquent statement on diversity. But there is a big gap between that statement and reality. He agrees that not everyone should go to UC, but passionately believes that everyone ought to have the *opportunity* to try to meet the standards. Many kids do not have access to a full complement of a-g courses, or schools do not offer them frequently enough. If the faculty continues to embrace these requirements, what solution do you have for the tens of thousands of kids who do not have access to the a-g courses? The University represents a portal of opportunity to minority kids. The Senate's recommendation to eliminate the SAT II subject tests as an admission requirement is promising because the test has little predictive value and eliminating it removes one more barrier to access.

Regent Island questioned whether UC is using the right definition of academic excellence and academic merit; he believes that merit is an arbitrary construct. We should ask whether underrepresented minority students enhance the educational experience, whether they graduate and return to serve their communities, and whether true quality can be achieved absent diversity and affordability. UC appears to remain wedded to a definition of merit defined by test scores and GPA. And he asked what we should do about the particularly low numbers of underrepresented graduate students.

On K-12 education: The state of K-12 education *is* UC's problem and we must engage it. We have the talent and resources to do so. If we do not, we will further distance ourselves from the citizens

upon whom we rely for support. The people of the state contribute \$3.3 billion per year to UC. It's not enough, but we must appeal to them.

## **Q&A**

**Comment:** BOARS' chair described the evolution of the eligibility reform proposal, noting that it was a result of a series of compromises, but that it greatly expands the pool of students who can be considered for review. For 83% of high schools, the number of students guaranteed admission under eligibility in the local context (ELC) will double; for 93% of high schools, ELC students will increase by 150%.

**A:** I accept your answer, but I hope that you will continue to study this matter and return with a new proposal that addresses some of my concerns. I'd like to see a fresh focus on the concept of merit to ensure that our definition of merit embraces what we say are our core values.

**Comment:** Division Chair Firestone invited Regent Island to Berkeley to be trained as a reader of applications and to learn how to do comprehensive review resulting in excellence and quality; it is a complex process.

**A:** I would benefit from an understanding of the difficulty of student selection. I am outcome driven. However, to the extent that your process does not change the low numbers of minorities admitted, I would wonder about the process. People who lead change are often confronted by the comfortable reality of the status quo. The first response to change leaders is "You do not understand." We must challenge this level of comfort.

**Comment:** The faculty applauds your efforts to increase access and affordability. But we would like to see you add quality to your list of priorities. Quality is not provided to a student sitting in a class of 300-500 and not having access to a TA or to the services and support they need. This particularly impacts those from disadvantaged backgrounds and first-generation college students. We share your concern about kids who are turned away. We are interested in examining who was turned away, and what difference the increase in transfer students will make, if any. But over the past three years, UCPB has strongly advocated curtailing enrollment. We did not take this position as a money-saving measure. We did so to highlight the relationship between declining educational quality and the continuous decline in state funding. Without adequate state funding, we must raise fees, and this impacts access by the same kids that we are concerned about in admissions. Unlike private schools, who can fund these students from endowments, return-to-aid funds are not "free money." Much of the student's financial package will be in loans. Our professional students are graduating with an average debt load of \$100,000. We need to send a message to the public and the legislature that we can not continue to allow the quality of education to deteriorate.

**Comment:** We reduced enrollment because we have trouble maintaining educational quality for the students we already have in the system. There are shortages of seats and classes in certain majors, and it lengthens students' time to degree.

**Comment:** I question whether UC should be in the remediation business. The a-g course requirements force high schools to try to meet UC standards; if we abolish these requirements, there is no incentive for the schools to offer some of these courses, and the students will be even less prepared for college.

**A:** I understand this, but will reducing enrollment by 2300 students address this problem in any meaningful way? Isn't the University obligated to see if there's a better solution for the tens of thousands of high school students who do not have access to college-preparatory courses? This population is becoming a majority; ignoring them helps to marginalize UC. Will they support UC as citizens, taxpayers and adults if we did not provide them an opportunity to attend UC? And is ignoring them the right thing to do?

**Comment:** At UCLA, we are engaging K-12. We are in the process of building a school in conjunction with LAUSD. At UCSD, there is a University-sponsored charter school, the Preuss School (established by former Regent Peter Preuss), that is ranked sixth among all charter schools in the country. These efforts could serve as a model. UCI is promoting diversity by allowing honors community college students to transfer directly to UCI without applying, and educating its own undergraduates about applying to graduate school.

**Comment:** Graduate diversity is the next step of excellence. There is a crisis in diversity in graduate education at UC. I would like to see you champion this as much as you do undergraduate diversity.

**Comment:** Graduate student diversity is the main avenue to increasing faculty diversity. The UCLA campus offers diversity training for search committees to broaden the pool of applicants, but only some departments take advantage of it. The local Senate asked the administration to require the training.

**A:** Graduate education is a key element in my diversity goals. I intend to be a champion of this aim. In the corporate world, diversity goals advanced faster because there were real incentives connected to them. If goals are not met, the executive does not get a bonus. I hope similar incentive tools can be adopted at the University. Increased diversity of faculty would address many problems. Due to increasing retirements, we have a wonderful opportunity to make change. But if the same old boy network is in place, the next generation will look the same. We should ask why we want diversity? Not just because it's fair, or necessary to a land grant institution, but because it is fundamental to our society. How does diversity benefit all of us?

**Q:** Merced is unique in the UC system. 50% of our students are first-generation college students. We've done well on diversity measures. I'd like to extend your definition of diversity to include poor students. Since UCM was established, high school graduates from Merced County who continue to college have increased from 20% to 40%. But we need funding for resources to help these students be successful. Our success in attracting a diverse student body presents us with a dilemma of how to support these students. I also would appreciate it if you would convey the successes of UC Merced to your colleagues, and help create a more positive impression of the school among the Regents.

**A:** I embrace your mission. Some people believe that these students should be steered toward community colleges and Cal State. That's wrong. If Merced succeeds, it will be a shining star of opportunity for many.

**Q:** How would you suggest that UC present its public persona in times of budgetary stress?

**A:** If you approached corporations, I think they would line up to talk to legislators on our behalf. Because we have many campuses, each campus lobbies its local companies. But we need the support of corporate California from a systemwide perspective; we have not harnessed that.

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

- **Mark G. Yudof, President**
- **Robert D. Grey, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Lawrence Pitts, incoming Interim Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

### **President Yudof**

- The University reached a tentative 5-year agreement with AFSCME last night.
- President Yudof has asked Berkeley Law School Dean Chris Edley to serve as a Special Assistant to the President on a part-time basis.
- The restart of employer and employee contributions to UCRP is on the February Regents' agenda. The governor has included \$20 million in his 2009-2010 budget proposal for this purpose, but it is not enough to cover the full year's obligation. So the administration has asked the Regents to delay the initiation of contributions until April 2010. The University will not ask employees to contribute unless the employer contributes, as well. However, some Regents feel that we must contribute as soon as possible for the health of the system. The President will be establishing a committee with all employee groups represented to examine options for funding UCRP over the long term.
- President Yudof thanked the Senate leadership for their work on the eligibility reform proposal. He noted the success of their presentation yesterday at the legislative briefing.
- The Blue and Gold Opportunity Program aims to simplify financial aid in order to provide certainty and accountability to low-income students and their families. He wants to ensure that qualified, low-income students know that they can afford to come to UC; some overestimate the cost of college and do not even apply. The program will be a success if more low-income students apply.

### **Q&A**

**Comment:** Chair Croughan expressed the Senate's thanks to Interim Provost Grey for his service, and welcomed incoming Interim Provost Larry Pitts as a guest. He has been the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, has served on TFIR and chaired the Health Care Task Force and the Shared Governance Task Force, and was division Chair at UCSF.

**Q:** Does the state accept the idea that they must fund UCRP?

**A:** President Yudof responded that the state does accept that it has an obligation to fund the retirement system, as it does for other segments. In principle, the state knows it is obligated to provide funding, but given the economic situation, it is not a priority. EVP Lapp noted that initially, the governor included \$95 million dollars (a 4% contribution per employee) in his proposed budget, but it was reduced in the final proposal.

**Q:** If the state's economy collapses, how long can we pay faculty and staff salaries? I have heard that The Regents can cover up to two months of salary for all employees.

**A:** EVP Lapp responded that this is correct; UC could pay two to three months of salary without new state funds.

**Q:** Can we predict future fee increases so that students can plan for them?

**A:** President Yudof responded that he would like to take this approach, but that the Regents are wary of making long-term commitments, and also the financial circumstances of individuals may change. The University of Illinois has a program that guarantees that students will pay no more than a certain percentage increase. But if the calculation is wrong, the University will have to raise fees significantly for future classes and students will pay different fees depending on when they entered the University.

**Q:** The Blue and Gold program seems to remove the campus discretion to decline aid to students whose parents employ complex tax shelter strategies.

**A:** President Yudof noted that a small number of students will take advantage of this situation, but it is worth the risk to achieve clarity for students who are not financially savvy. We do need to monitor the program. He clarified that there will be no change in the authority of campuses to determine financial need.

**Q:** Could you describe some of the alternative funding ideas from the budget discussions you had with campus leaders?

**A:** President Yudof stated that the purpose of the discussions was to ensure that each campus accomplishes its reductions in a thoughtful, collaborative way that is appropriate for each campus. He did not want to dictate across-the-board cuts. Campus leaders are taking this crisis seriously. Many ideas have been floated, and these all will be considered by a new task force he has appointed on creative funding strategies. Chair Croughan will serve as co-chair of this committee with UCSB EVC Gene Lucas. In answer to a concern raised at our last meeting, differential fees across campuses will not be considered, but we will consider whether differential fees within campuses and across fields are advisable. Interim Provost Grey added that he planned to discuss these ideas at a meeting with the EVCs, and share best practices

### **VIII. General Discussion**

A member asked what will happen to UCRP in July 2010 if the state does not fund it. Chair Croughan responded that the President is convening a committee to examine possible paths to ensure the long-term health of UCRP. She also noted that there is significant Senate representation on the task force to examine creative funding strategies, including the chairs of UCPB and UCAP, as well as a divisional representative.

### **IX. Proposal for a New School of Nursing at UC Davis**

**ISSUE:** The Compendium committees did not come to a consensus regarding the degree to which the revised proposal responds to their concerns. Per the Compendium, the Academic Council acts as an arbiter if there is not a concurrence among the review committees on their final recommendations.

**DISCUSSION:** The Compendium committees agreed that there are three major issues with the current proposal: 1) long-term funding, which is highly dependent on state funds and faculty fundraising, and is not realistic in a start-up work environment; 2) FTE and student/faculty ratios; 3) curriculum, although CCGA noted that the curriculum and degrees would later be reviewed.

The key question is whether the School is sustainable. UCPB's chair suggested that a letter outlining these concerns could be used by Davis to leverage additional support. She also offered suggestions for alternative structures. A member responded that Davis is prepared to limit the scope of degree programs offered if funding is not available. Several members stated that the convergence of the \$100 million gift and state need for nurses provides a unique opportunity for UC to expand and a strong incentive to approve the proposal. However, another member cautioned that in the recent past, several professional schools were established with the promise of funding and these schools are now struggling; they have become burdens for their campuses and for the University. He argued that in the context of the budget crisis, Council should ask the proponents to clarify the financial commitment of the campus, OP, the donors, and the state.

The chair of the Davis division argued in favor of approving the proposal. He noted that the Davis Senate strongly supports the proposal. Any concerns regarding curriculum will be allayed as the School hires faculty and develops degree and program proposals to be submitted for review and approval by CCGA. He asserted that the initial gift will support the School for its first eleven years. The combination of need, funding, and fit with UC Davis' programs and expertise is unprecedented. A member observed that the budget in the proposal assumes that 1/3 of the School's funding will come from the state by 2012. A Council member spoke in favor of recommending approval conditional on UC Davis constructing a realistic budget and business model that does not depend on state funding or high student/faculty ratios. Another member pointed out that the program will not address the state's nursing shortage because it aims to produce nursing educators, rather than nurses, and asked whether the Moore Foundation would accept a School offering a Ph.D. program, only.

**ACTION: Council recommended approval of the UC Davis School of Nursing contingent on the proponents addressing the Compendium committees' major concerns (9 in favor, 6 opposed, 3 abstentions).**

#### **X. Blue and Gold Opportunity Program**

**ISSUE:** President Yudof has developed a plan to simplify existing financial aid programs and to convey the message that UC is financially accessible to low-income students. The plan covers systemwide fees for undergraduates whose family income is less than the California median household income of \$60K. He will present the plan to the Regents on February 4.

**DISCUSSION:** A divisional chair stated that financial aid officers at his campus objected to the proposal because it could remove campus discretion to decline aid to students whose parents employ complex tax shelter strategies. The proposal should clarify the authority of campuses to determine need. Another member expressed concern that the governor may reduce funding for the Cal Grants program; the Blue and Gold program is based on the assumption that Cal Grants will rise to cover increased student fees, as they have in the past. Several members expressed support for the plan as simple and clear.

**ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed the Blue and Gold Opportunity program; Senate comments will be forwarded to President Yudof. One member later indicated that he had abstained.**

#### **XI. Shared Governance and Senate Review (*Executive Session*)**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**XII. UCFW Letter on Restart of Contributions to UCRP (*Executive Session*)**

*Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

**ACTION: Council endorsed UCFW’s letter endorsing the restart of contributions to UCRP and calling on the Regents to determine the effect of restarting contributions on total remuneration and to resolve to reverse any negative effects through appropriate salary increases in the 2010-2011 budget year (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).**

**XIII. Information on UCRP Lump Sum Cashouts**

*Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed. Council agreed to address it via email.*

**XIV. Graduate Support Funds and Accountability**

*Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.*

**XV. Graduate Academic Certificate Programs**

*Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.*

**XVI. Guidelines for Professional Behavior, Compliance Measures and Workload Issues**

*Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.*

**XVII. Minimum IT Guidelines for Instruction**

**ISSUE:** The University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) has recommended that guidelines be established for minimum Information Technology resources that should be available to all faculty members for instructional purposes. Currently standards vary widely within and across campuses. While it is beyond UCCC’s expertise to create such guidelines, the committee provided a preliminary list of resources to which every instructor should have access, and initially recommended that a task force composed of faculty and technical staff be established to develop such guidelines. Prior to formally establishing a task force, UCCC would like to collect data from all campuses about their technology needs for up to five years (to ensure that the information is current if funding becomes available).

**ACTION: Council approved a motion that UCCC may conduct a biennial systemwide survey of technology needs (17 in favor, 1 abstention).**

**XVIII. Stewardship Review Task Force**

*Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.*

**IX. Expansion of the Area “d” Laboratory Science Admissions Requirement to Include Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences (EESS)—**In June 2008, the Davis Division requested a Universitywide review of a proposal to expand the UC “d” Laboratory Science admission requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS). In July 2008, Council referred the request to BOARS for consideration. BOARS notes that the goal of the admission requirements for a-g coursework is to ensure adequate preparation for success at UC, and that the

courses offered in EESS do not, on the whole, fulfill this goal. It recommends against the proposed change in the area “d” requirement, and against further Senate review of the matter.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS’ chair Sylvia Hurtado noted that EESS courses already can be approved for area “d” or as an area “g” elective on a case by case basis. However, most EESS courses do not meet the laboratory science requirement. She noted that meeting the California high school standards is not sufficient to meet UC standards; BOARS’ aim is to ensure that students are prepared for UC-level work. Three BOARS committees have dealt with this issue, and in each case geologists and earth and environmental scientists on BOARS agreed that EESS should not be included in area “d.” One Councilmember strongly disagreed with the recommendation that the proposal should not go out for review. He stated that the proposal has never been sent for systemwide review and that it is inappropriate for a committee to summarily reject a proposal without allowing for discussion at the campus level. Another argued that other systemwide committees, such as UCOPE and UCEP, should be consulted, per their charges. Several members, including those who felt that the “d” requirement should not be changed, supported a systemwide review given that this issue has been of concern for a considerable length of time. Another member asserted that students are deeply interested in EESS courses, and that while the content of most courses currently offered is not sufficient to fulfill the “d” requirement, including EESS on the list may encourage the development of adequate courses. BOARS’ chair Hurtado noted some contradictions in the aims expressed by the proponents. A Council member volunteered to help BOARS determine what documents to send for review.

**ACTION: A motion to endorse BOARS’ recommendation against changes in the “d” requirement and against further Senate review failed (6 in favor; 11 opposed; 1 abstention).**

**ACTION: A motion that the proposal be sent out for systemwide review passed (14 in favor; 1 opposed; 3 abstentions).**

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Mary S. Croughan, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst