

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, March 30, 2011****I. Announcements****▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair**

1. **Report on the Regents' meeting.** Chair Simmons stated that the main topic at the March Regents' meeting was the budget and that Patrick Lenz, Vice President of Budget and Capital Resources, will address UC's budget later in the day.
2. **Responses to Council letters.** We received a letter from AVP Dooley stating that the ANR funds for competitive research grants and graduate student support will remain dedicated to those purposes.
3. **Update on Working Smarter Initiative.** EVP Brostrom and CFO Taylor requested regular meetings with Council to respond to questions and concerns on the Working Smarter Initiative. While administrative efficiencies are not part of the core Senate purview, Council can play a role by providing feedback to help mitigate the risks of large expenditures for little gain.

II. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed.

III. Consent Calendar

1. **Approval of the February draft minutes**
2. **Forward UCEP Statement on UC Quality to the Task Force for the Implementation of the Powell Committee Report**

ACTION: The consent calendar was approved with a minor change to the minutes.

IV. Nomination of Senate representative to UCRS Advisory Board

ISSUE: One of the two Senate positions on the UCRS advisory board will become vacant on July 1. Chair Simmons requested nominations by May 15 for a new representative. Additionally, at the request of the administration, TFIR and UCFW considered whether a faculty representative to the Board who retires during his or her term should be immediately replaced by an active faculty member to avoid over-representation of emeriti. TFIR and UCFW recommended against this proposed policy change for faculty.

DISCUSSION: Chair Simmons asked Council members to nominate candidates to become a Senate representative to the UCRS Advisory Board. Council then discussed whether representatives who retire during their term of service should be allowed to continue service on the Advisory Board. Some members expressed concern that having a preponderance of retirees on the board would not reflect the perspectives of younger, active faculty. A member stated that Council should take care to select a representative who is not planning to retire in the following four years.

ACTION: Council endorsed UCFW's recommendation that faculty representatives may continue to serve on the UCRS Advisory Board if they retire during their term (11 in favor, 7 opposed).

V. MRU Guidelines for the Compendium

ISSUE: At Council's request, UCORP examined the policies governing multi-campus research entities and developed a set of guidelines for the establishment, review, and discontinuance of such entities in consultation with the Office of Research and Graduate Studies that are intended to replace the [current section](#) on MRUs in the Compendium.

DISCUSSION: UCORP Chair Phokion Kolaitis stated that the recent revision of the Compendium did not include a revision of the section on MRUs. In July 2010, Council asked that UCORP examine the policies covering multicampus research efforts and make recommendations for their governance. UCORP issued the enclosed guidelines, recommending that all multicampus research efforts be encompassed by two categories: Multicampus Research Units (MRUs) and Multicampus Research Programs (MRPs) (these recommendations do not include CalISIs). UCORP proposes that MRUs be defined by a long-term research horizon and that they can exist independently of funding from UCOP. In contrast, MRPs are fully or partially funded by UCOP and have a shorter research horizon; MRPs may compete twice at most for UCOP research funding. However, they can apply to be reconstituted as MRUs should their research programs warrant it. UCORP recommended other changes to the current policy, including expanding eligibility to serve as director of an MRU to any Academic Senate member, including non-tenured faculty and Professors in Residence and Professors of Clinical X, who are barred from that role under current Regents' policy. UCORP also proposes streamlining the review, approval and disestablishment processes for MRUs. If an MRU is disestablished, a one-year no-cost extension will be made possible through central funding. A member pointed out that despite the expansion of titles eligible to serve as a director of an MRU, if an MRP headed by a PI converts to an MRU, the PI would have to step down as head of the unit if he or she were not a Senate member. Chair Kolaitis acknowledged this, but countered that PI status is conferred broadly at some campuses, for example to post-doctoral fellows. A member commented that while not perfect, UCORP's proposal extends access to leadership of research units beyond the current policy and is a step in the right direction. A member asked whether a successful Independent Research Program (IRP) that operates solely with external funding must apply to become an MRU. Chair Kolaitis stated that it is not necessary, but UCORP would encourage it. He noted that UCORP intends to address some additional issues in the future, including developing guidelines for the CalISIs and for managing the proliferation of "centers" on campuses that use the University of California name without going through any formal review process or verification of quality.

ACTION: Council endorsed UCORP's guidelines for MRUs and referred the guidelines to the Academic Planning Council for consideration (16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention).

VI. Guidelines for Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs)

ISSUE: CCGA drafted guidelines for Graduate Councils to use in reviewing proposals for SSPs.

DISCUSSION: CCGA Chair Jim Carmody stated that responsibility for the review of new SSPs should be mainly at the campus level, by divisional Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget. Rigorous campus-based reviews could reduce the review period by as much as a year. No external review will be conducted by CCGA if the proposal is approved and rigorously reviewed at the campus level. The campus recommendations will be forwarded to

CCGA and UCPB, but CCGA will not re-review the proposal unless significant problems are identified. The role of Committees on Planning and Budget is to provide advice and analysis to the Graduate Councils and assure them that the proposed programs are truly self-supporting and that they will benefit the campus, and not just meet their own costs. Proposals should clearly indicate how they intend to use excess revenue, e.g., for TAs and/or financial aid. He noted that CCGA will issue separate guidelines regarding the conversions of existing, state-supported programs to self-supporting status.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed the dissemination of CCGA’s guidelines for self-supporting programs to divisional Graduate Councils and requested that the provost forward them to Graduate Deans and EVCs.

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

- **Mark Yudof, President**
- **Lawrence Pitts, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Patrick Lenz, VP, Budget and Capital Resources**

President Yudof stated that UCOP is developing a five-year plan beginning with the 2012-13 fiscal year. The aim is to provide stability for the University and predictability for students and their families and to demonstrate to the state government the impact of their funding decisions on tuition levels. The plan couples tuition to state support; as one declines the other rises. The plan posits various scenarios. The best case is premised on an 8% annual increase in state funding and 8% annual tuition increases and incremental growth in student enrollment based on state funding at \$2.5 billion. Since all scenarios assume tuition increases, the University may have to change how it allocates financial aid. He noted that any savings from reducing student body or the size of the faculty would be delayed for several years. In fact, the University could lose more money than it saved by reducing the faculty because it would bring in less research funds. President Yudof stated that he is committed to maintaining access and to providing faculty more competitive salaries.

Provost Pitts reported that UCOP is examining its own budget as well as all programs that receive central research funds for potential savings. Some centrally funded programs will be cut and campuses will decide which campus-based research programs they will continue to support. Any funds saved will reduce the amount that campuses must cut.

Vice President Lenz reported that the governor did not reach an agreement with the Republicans to place the tax extension on the June ballot. He expects that in the next few days the governor will develop “Plan B,” which will outline the consequences of an all-cuts budget. VP Lenz stated that the University can not continue to react; it needs a long-range budget plan with or without the state’s participation. The plan must be comprehensive in order to deal with the growing budget gap caused by unavoidable cost-drivers such as pension contributions and increased health care costs. In five years, the budget gap will be \$2.4 B. UC has identified \$900 million in savings, leaving a gap of \$1.5 B. The scenarios will be presented to the Regents in May with the hope that they will provide some strategic direction, and then a plan will be presented at a future meeting.

Comment: I am pleased that the University is establishing a budget plan; we need to recover the University’s autonomy from the budget process.

Q: What will happen to the budget between July and November?

A: Vice President Lenz stated that the governor could propose a budget contingent on the outcome of a November ballot measure. This would pose a problem for the University because we would have to assume the reductions in order to achieve the targeted cuts. Alternately, the legislature could pass an all-cuts budget with the provision that the cuts would be restored if the extensions did pass. In any case, there would be little impact in 2011-12, but enormous consequences for subsequent years.

Q: Former Republican Assemblyman Roger Niello has submitted a proposed statewide ballot initiative on pension reform and it has been reported that the governor is open to establishing a cap on pension payments, which would negatively affect the University's ability to retain faculty. Can you comment on this?

A: Vice President Lenz stated that it is unlikely that the ballot initiative will go forward, but the University will respond to any formal proposal if and when it is made.

Comment: If you cut central funding for research, multi-campus research endeavors will cease to exist. No chancellor will use the funds to support multi-campus research.

A: President Yudof responded that it is a legitimate function for UCOP to encourage cross-campus research endeavors, but in the short-term, this objective may suffer.

Q: Will the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources also be cut?

A: A few years ago, ANR was cut by 25% and therefore it was determined that they will be cut less than other programs. In addition, ANR functions benefit regions where Republicans dominate. They serve an important constituency while serving the University's public service mission and the interests of the state.

Q: Historically, Council has worked with the administration in support of the interest of the University as a whole. How can we work with you?

A: President Yudof responded that it would be helpful if the faculty supported the five-year plan, to get data showing how the faculty already has pitched in. It would be very helpful if faculty would contact their legislators to advocate for UC, and consider writing letters to the editor or op-ed pieces.

VIII. Ladder Rank Faculty Titles

A. Use of Non-Ladder Rank Faculty

ISSUE: UCEP recommended a set of best practices to maintain the quality of a UC education if the proportion of non-ladder rank faculty is increased in response to budgetary challenges. UCAP submitted thoughts on compensation for excellence in teaching or increased teaching.

DISCUSSION: UCEP Chair David Kay stated that UC must maintain the research orientation of undergraduate education. UCEP's letter outlines a list of preferences and best practices that follow from this imperative. The faculty must determine which parts of the curriculum are best taught by research faculty and which can be taught by non-ladder rank faculty, and find ways to increase the engagement of non-ladder rank instructors with departments, colleagues, and students so they have a long-term commitment to the institution. UCAP Chair Ahmet Palazoglu noted that UCAP's letter is similar to UCEP's but provides suggestions for ways to reward teaching by ladder-rank faculty. Recognition of teaching excellence in promotion cases is not uniform across campuses. Both

committees considered the addition of primarily teaching titles, but rejected this idea. Instead, they suggested using a mix of existing titles, as deemed appropriate by departments, offering incentives to ladder-rank faculty for temporarily increasing teaching loads, allowing senior ladder-rank faculty to focus more on teaching than on research for a specified period, and using emeriti in teaching roles. A member noted that while it would be preferable to favor lecturers with security of employment and Senate appointments, they require commitment of a permanent faculty FTE, and most departments would prefer to hire in the professor series. Would it be possible to change this provision in the APM? He also cautioned that greater use of lecturers as a budgetary solution may not be possible for campuses that already have a high proportion of lecturers vis-à-vis ladder-rank faculty. A member opposed the notion of providing salary increments to regular faculty for higher courseloads because it would impact research and could be construed negatively by the public. A member stated that the only title that has no expectation of research is Unit 18 lecturers. A member stated that reward for meritorious teaching already is codified in APM210, although campus CAPs may not provide sufficient recognition.

ACTION: Council approved forwarding the UCEP and UCAP letters to the Powell Implementation Task Force and to the Joint Senate-Administrative Task Force on Salary Scales for consideration.

B. Senate Membership Task Force

ISSUE: The Senate Membership Task Force examined the essential principles underlying Academic Senate membership and assessed the degree to which current practices reflect those principles. It recommended: not extending the list of titles conferring membership in the Senate; reviewing the duties and responsibilities of non-Senate academic appointees and reclassifying them when needed within the divisions; retaining the historical separation of curricular authority for undergraduate and professional school education; and revising the list of administrative titles that automatically confer Senate membership. The Task Force report has now been reviewed systemwide. Council discussed the review responses.

DISCUSSION: A member stated that non-Senate faculty constitute 40% of the University. They have no voice and no way of defending their interests. Many are miscast in a title but are functionally indiscernible from a Senate faculty member. They can not request reclassification without inviting retaliation from their own department. Furthermore, CAPs do not automatically review titles for the appropriateness of series. This is not a problem only in the Health Sciences, but at Davis, Merced, and other campuses. Moreover, the University is moving toward increasing numbers of provisional faculty. It is an enormous problem and it is important that we address this. The report of the Task Force does not adequately do so. The member urged reconstituting the Task Force. Another member stated fears that the medical faculty will swamp the Senate with members who do not understand a central mission of the University—educating undergraduates. Another member suggested that there may be some measures that can be taken to offer non-Senate faculty protections and equalize their status. Another member suggested that the Task Force should have focused not on the question of whether non-Senate faculty should become Senate members, but on other ways to incorporate and protect them. A member commented that on her campus non-Senate faculty are invited to participate in Senate governance, but that they can not serve at the systemwide level. A member suggested cataloging what measures various campuses have taken to address this issue. Council members decided that more time was needed to discuss this issue and agreed to return to the discussion at its April meeting.

IX. Nomination of 2011-12 Vice Chair

ISSUE: In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 110 A.1](#), Council considered and nominated a candidate to become its 2011-12 Vice Chair.

DISCUSSION: This item was discussed in Executive Session; minutes were not recorded.

ACTION: Council nominated Professor Robert Powell of UC Davis as the 2011-12 Academic Assembly/Council Vice Chair and recommended the candidate to the Academic Assembly.

X. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

XI. Proposed Changes to Senate Regulations

Council did not have sufficient time to discuss this item.

XII. Approve April 13 Assembly agenda topics

ACTION: Council decided to convene the April 13 meeting of the Academic Assembly and approved the topics for discussion.

XIII. UCOPE White Paper on Funding for English Language Support Services

Council did not have sufficient time to discuss this item.

XIV. New Business

Council did not discuss any new business.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair

Minutes prepared by Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst