

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Monday, December 17, 2008****I. Announcements**

- **Mary Croughan, Academic Council Chair**
- The Provost is establishing a Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to examine creative funding strategies.
- Regent Eddie Island will attend the Council meeting in January.
- Nominations for the 2009-2010 Vice Chair are due by February 25.

II. Consent Calendar

1. **Approval of the November 24, 2008 Minutes**
2. **[Proposed Revisions to APMs](#) 110-4, 230-17, 230-18, 279-20, 360-80, 520-4, 710-14, 710-38, 710-46; addition of APM 765.**
3. **Cancel the Assembly meeting on January 14, 2009.**

ACTION: Item 2, Proposed Revisions to APMs, was removed from the Consent Calendar; the remainder of the consent calendar was approved.

III. Approval of the Agenda.

ACTION: The agenda was approved with the following changes: Item XV, Minimum IT Standards for Instruction, was postponed to the January Academic Council meeting since Chair Naugle was unable to attend; Item 2 from the Consent Calendar will be discussed after item IV on the agenda.

IV. Proposed Bylaw Change

ISSUE: Council received responses to the systemwide review of [proposed amendments](#) to Senate Bylaws 125.A.4, 128, and 130, which would add the Chair of the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to the Academic Council as a standing member, and change the chair's term from one to two years.

DISCUSSION: A member noted that when UCAAD was added to Council, the committee thoroughly documented how it could have contributed to the discussion of issues on every Council agenda over the course of the previous year. The information in the current proposal does not meet this standard. Another member noted that UCAF currently meets only twice per year. Several members agreed that having ten committee chairs and ten divisional chairs provides a balanced perspective and noted that a larger Council may not be as functional. Another expressed concern that if UCAF were allowed to join Council, other committees may make the same request. Regarding the extension of the chair's term, some members felt that a two-year term may be beneficial because many issues span more than one year, but others stated that this is common to many committees, and that UCAF's issues are not more complex. One member argued that having a vice chair who will become chair addresses concerns about continuity.

ACTION: Council passed a motion to reject any changes in its membership (19 in favor, 1 opposed), and unanimously passed a second motion to reject the extension of the UCAF chair's term from one to two years.

V. Proposed Revisions to APMs

ISSUE: In March 2007, Acting Assistant Vice President Sheila O'Rourke wrote to request Senate review of the proposed changes. In May 2007, Chair Oakley requested justification for the proposed changes before proceeding with a review. In February 2008, Vice Provost Nick Jewell responded to the request; the changes are primarily technical or minor ones.

DISCUSSION: Since these amendments were first proposed in 2007, there have been a number of legal changes in the definition and status of domestic partners. The delay also has made some of these changes unnecessary.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved forwarding these concerns to Provost Grey.

VI. BOARS Concerns on Analytic Support from UCOP

ISSUE: BOARS drafted a letter expressing its concern about the potential impact of the reorganization of Academic Affairs at UCOP on the availability of expertise and analytic support within Student Affairs and on the ability of BOARS to carry out its mission.

DISCUSSION: BOARS' chair stated her concern that the new Institutional Research unit will provide data management, but not subject-area expertise in policy analysis. Several members noted that the reorganization has posed a problem for all committees' access to information and staff support, and that the letter should be broadened. Members felt that it is important to communicate to The Regents that the cuts at UCOP are impacting the Senate's work. Members debated whether to send a single letter, or letters from individual committee chairs. Members agreed that a letter from Council should outline the analytic roles that OP should fulfill, as well as the kinds of expertise which the Senate needs.

ACTION: Chair Croughan will draft a letter for Council's review regarding the data management and analytical support that the Senate needs from UCOP.

VI. Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate/Professional Degree Programs

ISSUE: In August, 2008, Provost Hume requested that CCGA review the current policy on Part-Time Self-Supporting Graduate and Professional Degree Programs and provide advice on guidelines for the operation of such programs. Since the policy was written in 1996, such programs have proliferated in number and kind; CCGA found the policy to be outdated and in need of significant revision.

ACTION: CCGA will form a subcommittee to draft proposed revisions to the policy.

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

- **Robert D. Grey, Interim Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor**
- **Katherine N. Lapp, Executive Vice President, Business Operations**

Interim Provost Grey

- President Yudof believes that the University must better manage enrollments as a system. He is considering a proposal to reduce freshman admissions by approximately 2000 students and raise community college transfer students by approximately 750. He attended a BOARS meeting to discuss this proposal, and also asked the Chancellors and EVCs for feedback.
- The plan regarding how to restructure Academic Affairs is nearing completion; it will be circulated for comment. Provost Grey noted that he is aware of Senate concerns about staff support. A faculty vice provost for educational partnerships will supervise academic preparation programs and community college outreach and articulation programs. Academic Personnel will remain under the Academic Affairs umbrella. A vice provost for academic planning and coordination will oversee systemwide issues such as enrollment planning, which must be driven by academic concerns.
- Provost Grey is looking forward to the Senate's recommendations on the Education Abroad Program. He noted that the budget situation has worsened, and difficult choices will have to be made.
- The Provost is establishing a small group of three EVCs and three Senate representatives to suggest ideas for ways to respond to the budget crisis, including how to cut or shift costs and generate revenue.

EVP Lapp

- EVP Lapp noted that in response to a request from Council, UCOP will convene a group to examine multi-year enrollment issues. The Regents will conduct a special meeting on January 14th to set enrollment targets for next year.
- The state GOP has proposed a 10% budget cut for UC.
- President Yudof played a lead role in writing a two-page letter published in the December 16th *New York Times* regarding how economic stimulus for higher education could benefit the economy in general. UCPB and the division chairs reviewed it prior to its submission.

Q&A

Q: Will you revisit the size of campus base budget allocations?

A: EVP Lapp noted that she and Provost Grey will be meeting with the Chancellors, EVCs and local budget officers on each campus to discuss whether current allocations are appropriate.

Q: Will enrollment discussions include graduate students? Have you talked about major enrollment cuts? Cutting 2000 students systemwide does not add up to many students per campus.

A: EVP Lapp noted that while decisions about graduate student enrollments are at the discretion of the campuses, it certainly will be part of the conversation. Provost Grey stated that the President does not support major cuts in enrollment.

Q: Through its research and development activities, UC could be an engine of economic growth and recovery in California. The University needs to convey that message.

A: EVP Lapp stated that the University did produce a publication and two video spots about the benefits to the general public of its research endeavors. As Interim SVP of External Relations, Dan Dooley is assembling an advocacy team to communicate this message.

Q: What are the budget options for the state and for UC? How bad can it get for UC?

A: EVP Lapp responded that according to projections by the legislative analyst, the state deficit will reach \$40 billion by next June, and those numbers may be optimistic, given what is happening in the economy. Every day without a budget, the hole gets bigger. It could be devastating for UC. UC will provide experts for budget panels.

Q: Regarding the proposed budget for EAP, there is much concern that the marginal cost of instruction (MCOI) funds from EAP going to the campuses will not go toward international education. Is there any way to assure that these monies will support EAP? There is great concern among the faculty that the administration does not consider EAP to be a core part of the educational enterprise.

A: Provost Grey stated that generally, campuses are better positioned to determine how to use funds. He noted that, due to the magnitude of the fiscal crisis, the University must make difficult choices. The administration has made a commitment to a more transparent budget process, but EAP is very expensive and must be cut.

Q: Is there a contingency plan if the state refuses to contribute to UCRP or contributes at a low level?

A: EVP Lapp stated that contributions are subject to consultation with The Regents, but that further delay is not a good option; it is critical for the health of the retirement system to begin contributions as soon as possible. She hopes to receive notice of the amount the state can contribute in early January, and then will consult with the actuary to determine employee contributions.

Q: If cuts and allocations are based proportionately on enrollment, then UC Merced is in trouble.

A: Provost Grey responded that he and others in the administration are mindful of this, and they discuss strategies for ensuring the success of UC Merced daily.

VIII. General Discussion

Members discussed the extent to which Senate divisions were consulted by campus administrations about budget priorities, and whether Senate representatives will be present at the campus budget meetings with the President. Several division chairs commented that they had been consulted on campus budgets, with two chairs invited to attend the budget meetings.

IX. Appointment of Senate Representative to the LBNL Advisory Board

ISSUE: In consultation with the President, the Academic Council must appoint a representative to the LBNL Advisory Board to serve a 3-year term beginning in January 2009.

DISCUSSION: The Senate representative should understand shared governance, be actively engaged in the central systemwide senate, and have an understanding of the labs, but need not be a scientist. In the past, it has been the ACSCOLI chair. A slate of four candidates was proposed. Several members spoke in favor of selecting someone who had not previously served in order to broaden Senate knowledge of the labs.

ACTION: Council voted to appoint Vice Chair Powell as the senate representative to the LBNL Advisory Board (19 in favor, 1 abstention).

XI. EAP Business Plan

ISSUE: The systemwide Senate reviewed the proposed EAP business plan and found the budget proposal insufficiently detailed and specific, and potentially devastating to the quality of the academic program.

DISCUSSION: UCIE Chair Lobo provided a brief overview of the plan and his committee's recommendations that: 1) the restructuring take place over a five-year period, at a minimum; and 2) an oversight body be appointed for the development and administration of the program. Council members discussed their concerns about the budget plan. Discussion focused around alternative solutions to the EAP budget crisis. Several members felt that reductions in the budget could be accomplished without dismantling the program's structures. Most agreed that the process should be decelerated to minimize the impact on the program and to provide time to explore alternatives. For example, a critical evaluation of where study centers are necessary and where they could be cut should be conducted.

ACTION: Council passed a motion (with 2 abstentions) calling for the establishment of a Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force to create a new business plan. The Task Force should be chaired by a Senate representative and include members from UCIE, UCPB, campus EAP offices, study center directors, Interim Director Cowan and up to two other administration representatives.

XII. Sexual Harassment Prevention Training

ISSUE: In October 2008, Interim Provost Grey sent a letter to Academic Council seeking its opinion on proposed sanctions for failing to comply with the required sexual harassment prevention training. Council sent it out for systemwide review and received responses.

DISCUSSION: Chair Croughan noted that the Senate will soon be asked to review similar proposals for compliance on ethics, human subjects, and several other areas and suggested forming a Task Force to examine all of these proposals. Other members favored addressing the sexual harassment prevention training separately because it is in response to state law and applies to all faculty. Some members objected to the assumptions underlying the proposed sanctions and to the increasing compliance burdens on faculty.

ACTION: Council approved forwarding the responses received to Provost Grey (with 3 abstentions); it will address the broader issues surrounding compliance measures at its January meeting.

XIII. Report on the Professional Doctorate

ISSUE: In recent years, there has been an increase in professional doctorates in a number of fields. A subcommittee of the UC Task Force on Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education (PPDE) was formed to outline principles and processes that should be used to determine when it may be appropriate for the California State University to offer them and when it is appropriate for UC to do so. Academic Council has received responses to the systemwide review of these recommendations.

DISCUSSION: UCSC Division Chair Williams, who co-chaired the PDPE subcommittee that authored the report, provided an overview. Members expressed concern that involving an outside body to adjudicate disputes would impinge on the purview of the Academic Senate. They requested that the document: 1) clarify the role of the Senate in negotiations between UC and

CSU; 2) require an analysis of the fiscal impact and need-based assessments of each program under consideration; and 3) correct one factual error—that UCLA does not offer a joint Ed.D. degree with CSU.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed forwarding the proposal, with the clarifications requested above, to Vice President Beckwith.

XIV. Response to CSHE Paper on Eligibility Reform Proposal

ISSUE: Recently, a paper that mischaracterizes the Senate’s eligibility reform proposal, its aims, and the analyses of data that led to the proposed reform, was released to the media and posted on the [Center for the Study of Higher Education](#) website at UC Berkeley. BOARS members believe that it is necessary to respond to this paper formally, since it is crucial that misunderstandings are corrected before the February Regents’ meeting, and that the public and The Regents understand the proposal. Three current and former BOARS chairs and UCOP’s Coordinator for Admissions Research and Evaluation wrote a response.

DISCUSSION: Council members discussed the pros and cons of responding to the paper. Some were concerned that a response gives credence to the paper. Chair Croughan noted that it has received attention from members of the state legislature and the *Los Angeles Times*. A member suggested adding a box highlighting the response’s main points because the paper is very technical.

ACTION: Council approved posting the response on the Senate website; sending it to President Yudof with a request for him to forward it to the Regents; and requesting that CSHE post the BOARS response on its website. (18 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention).

XV. UCAAD Dependent Care Expenses

ISSUE: In response to a request from then-Assistant Provost Sheila O’Rourke, UCAAD endorsed a proposed new APM (APM 669) which would allow, but not require, campuses to pay additional, taxable compensation to academic appointees for dependant care expenses associated with academic activities such as attending conferences or travel for research. In addition, UCAAD endorsed a related amendment to the UC Business and Finance Bulletin. The proposal aims to address gender inequities and to promote a family friendly university.

DISCUSSION: Chair Croughan noted the need for UCAAD to confirm that this is a formal proposal from Academic Advancement, as opposed to a draft in progress. A member also asked whether it has been vetted by General Counsel.

ACTION: Council unanimously approved sending APM 669 for systemwide review if it has been formally issued by Academic Advancement.

XVI. Expansion of the Area “d” Laboratory Science Admissions Requirement to Include Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences (EESS)

ISSUE: 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).

ACTION: This item was postponed to the January Academic Council meeting.

XVI. New Business

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

Members did not have any special issues of concern.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Mary S. Croughan, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst