

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting
July 29, 2015**I. Consent Calendar**

1. Approve today's agenda items and their priority
2. Approve draft Council minutes of June 24, 2015
3. Proposed degree titles requiring Council approval per Compendium
 - a. UCB Master of Earthquake Engineering (MEE)
 - b. UCLA Master of Applied Statistics (MAS)

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officer's Announcements

- o **Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair**
- o **Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair**
- o **Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director**

UC Transfer Pathways Website and Press Conference: On July 1, UCOP unveiled a [website](#) detailing the systemwide transfer preparation pathways for 10 majors approved by faculty on UC campuses. President Napolitano introduced the pathways at a joint press conference with UC Senate and intersegmental higher education leaders on July 7. The Senate office has scheduled October meetings of groups from 11 additional majors: English Literature, Film Studies, History, Philosophy, Business Administration, Communications, Political Science, Psychology, Computer Sciences, Electrical Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering. UCEP will also be discussing a policy and process for the systemwide review of a campus's future proposed change to a major requirement that affects an established pathway.

Revised APM 210-1-d: On July 1, the Provost [issued](#) modifications to APM section 210-1-d [recommended by the Academic Council](#). The new language clarifies the intent of existing APM sections governing faculty merit and promotion and strengthens the principle that diversity activities are a component of excellence at the University of California.

Council members agreed that after three years of debate, the Senate should wait at least five years before considering new revisions to APM 210-1-d. Council also expressed support for giving UCAAD a role in evaluating the effectiveness of the new language.

Faculty Salary Increases: Effective July 1, the salaries of all UC faculty will increase by at least 1.5%, and potentially more depending on how their campus decides to distribute the remainder of a 3% pool of money set aside for that purpose. UCOP has directed campuses to apply 1.5% of the pool as an across-the-board increase to total salary and the remaining 1.5% to address issues of equity, compression, inversion, and exceptional merit. Campuses have until the end of 2015 to implement the flexible portion of the increase, retroactive to July 1. Several Council members reported that they are in active consultation with their administration about plans for doing so.

July Regents Meeting: At the July Regents meeting, Vice Provost Carlson presented the results of a comparative [study](#) of general campus faculty total remuneration conducted by Mercer

Consulting in 2014, which indicated that UC faculty have lost ground relative to faculty at the “Comparison 8” group of institutions since 2009, the time of the last study, and that UC benefits no longer make up for a longstanding gap in cash compensation. Discussion at the Regents was brief, however, and the Board took no action to address the problem. Chair Gilly also noted to the Regents that UC competes on a global basis for the best faculty, and that 61% of tenured faculty who leave UC take a position at a private institution.

Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy Revision: UC issued an interim revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence to meet the July 1 deadline for a policy revision that meets the minimal requirements of the federal Violence Against Women Act. Meanwhile, the University has undertaken a comprehensive policy revision, which will address faculty [concerns](#) raised during the systemwide review this past spring.

Enrollment Funding Plan: State officials are discussing an enrollment funding plan proposed by the state Assembly that would provide UC with \$25 million for the enrollment of 5,000 new undergraduate CA residents over the next two years. The plan under discussion also asks UC to use Nonresident Supplemental Tuition revenue to cover the balance of the \$50 million cost to enroll those students and does not provide funding for additional graduate student enrollment.

III. Joint Statement of the UCLA Emeriti Affairs Committee and Faculty Welfare Committee Regarding Announcement of a Third UCRP Pension Tier

Council reviewed a statement endorsed by the UCLA Senate Executive Board asking the systemwide Senate leadership to convey to the President faculty concerns about a plan to implement new pension options for UC employees hired after July 1, 2016. The statement notes that retirement options with a significantly lowered cap on the Defined Benefit portion of future UC pensions will greatly disadvantage UC in recruitment, and that the lack of consultation with the Senate in the development of the agreement contrasts to the process that led to the creation of the 2013 UCRP Tier, which included a two-year period of analysis and consultation with the Senate and campus leadership.

Chair Gilly noted that the multi-year budget agreement with the Governor is contingent on UC’s implementation of new pension options that include the PEPRA cap. She said the President has assigned a 12-person Task Force to design and develop the plan options. It will include four Senate representatives: 2015-16 Senate Chair Dan Hare, 2015-16 Senate Vice Chair James Chalfant, 2015-16 UCPB Chair Shane White, and 2015-16 UCFW Vice Chair Lori Lubin. Vice Chair Hare noted that the Task Force will focus on ways to protect pension competitiveness, including the possibility of giving some employees access to a hybrid plan that combines a DB plan containing the PEPRA cap with a supplemental Defined Contribution Plan.

Discussion: Several Council members noted that the agreement has harmed UC’s ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty and impinged the University’s autonomy. The closed-door negotiating process that led to the unilateral approval of the agreement has also harmed shared governance and set a bad precedent. It was also noted that the agreement is much better than what the Governor had originally proposed, and that the ill effects of the PEPRA cap could potentially be remedied by a hybrid plan. It was noted that current Senate members are very concerned about the future of the University even though they will not benefit from nor be disadvantaged by pension changes affecting future employees.

ACTION: It was agreed that Council will review a draft statement over email conveying the concerns and urging the Task Force to ensure that the current value of UC retirement benefits is preserved and strengthened as the new retirement option is introduced.

IV. Consultation with Senior Managers

- **Aimée Dorr, Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**
- **Jagdeep Baccher, Chief Investment Officer**

CFO Division: CFO Brostrom summarized the status of several CFO Division initiatives intended to improve UC's financial situation.

- *UCRP Borrowing:* UCOP is waiting for the results of an experience study before finalizing a plan to use internal borrowing to augment the state's contribution to UCRP.
- *Liquidity:* Several groups in the CFO division are developing a plan to help campuses move short term assets from STIP to TRIP, to optimize liquidity and generate additional investment revenue.
- *Fiat Lux:* UC is reviewing options for expanding Fiat Lux, its captive insurance program, into medical malpractice insurance and other areas.
- *P200:* UC is expanding P200, its systemwide procurement program, which helps UC save money by leveraging the University's systemwide buying power and optimizing purchasing contracts and practices.
- *UC Path:* Testing of UC Path—the systemwide HR, payroll, and benefits system—is proceeding well. UC Path is scheduled for implementation at UCOP in November, followed by other campuses on a staggered basis over the next two years.
- *Merced 2020:* The CFO Division is working with the Regents on the details of a financing plan to support the construction of new facilities on the Merced campus.

Budget Framework: Provost Dorr shared UC's timeline for the implementation of 14 programmatic initiatives outlined in the budget agreement with the state. Most of the projects fall under Academic Affairs and include a role for both the Senate and academic administrators. Some will require the significant engagement of campus Senates and/or the systemwide Senate to be achieved. UCOP has assigned at least one internal Responsible Accountable Official and staff point person to each area, and is also identifying point people on each campus. The state has established specific timelines for some projects and will be monitoring progress and requesting reports according to those deadlines. Not all projects will apply the same way on all campuses. It is a high stakes effort; failing to implement the agreements will make it more difficult for UC to secure state support in the future.

A Council member noted that UC's ability to implement some projects—for example, increasing community college transfer—may be affected by variables beyond the University's control. It was noted that the initiatives generally align with UC's goals, but they also represent an unprecedented level of micromanagement in the academic enterprise.

Office of the CIO: Professor Amy Myers Jaffe, Executive Director of Energy and Sustainability at UC Davis joined Chief Investment Officer Baccher to discuss UC's efforts to incorporate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) principles into a sustainability-based investment strategy for UC. UC's asset managers are identifying key areas within ESG factors that align

with UC's values, assessing how those factors will influence investment markets, and using ESG criteria to screen potential investments for future risks—for example, how environmental risks might affect a company's income. UC is also testing various sustainable indices to see how they perform relative to others.

CIO Baccher noted that the June 30, 2015 market value of UCRP assets reflected a net investment return of 4.5% from the prior year, outperforming both CalSTRS and CalPERS. Active management produced 2.2% of that growth, making 2014-15 one of UC's best years for active management outcomes.

V. UCORP Letter re: America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2015 (HR 1806)

Council reviewed a letter from UCORP expressing concerns about the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2015 (H.R. 1806), particularly the uneven distribution of funding increases and cuts to National Science Foundation (NSF) programs, which negatively affect certain disciplines such as geoscience and social science.

Chair Gilly noted that President Napolitano has asked UC's Office of Federal Governmental Relations for more information about the status of the bill.

VI. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Issues

1. Proposed Modifications to Senate Regulations 417 and 621

BOARS is recommending modifications to two Senate regulations—[SR 417](#), addressing UC applicants who complete coursework at a college while enrolled in high school, and [SR 621](#), addressing the standardized examination credit students may present to the University. Both are intended to update and clarify the language of the regulations.

ACTION: Council approved circulating the modifications for systemwide Senate review.

2. Recommendation to Postpone Implementation of New Berkeley Admissions Policy

Council discussed a recommendation from BOARS to the Berkeley Senate division that Berkeley delay implementation of its new freshman admissions policy for one year, so that the policy would become effective for fall 2017 applicants to UC Berkeley. BOARS has asked Council to endorse its position.

BOARS Chair Aldredge noted that BOARS wants more time to understand the implications of the policy. BOARS has not found the policy itself to be inconsistent with systemwide policy, but it is concerned about its impact on freshman admission processes at other campuses. For example, campuses that use Berkeley scores will need time to adjust their own processes to account for the new three-category score system (“yes,” “possible,” “no”). There is also concern that Berkeley's new policy on letters of recommendation is unclear, conflicts with existing messages on the systemwide UC Application and websites, and could have a differential impact on underrepresented students. Some communications vehicles do not advertise that letters are optional in the first year, although BOARS was told that verbally.

Berkeley Division Chair Papadopoulos noted that Berkeley faculty were pushing for policy changes to address increased selectivity and application workload, improve the read process, and make finer distinctions between students with the highest scores. Berkeley conducted several rigorous analyses and determined that letters of recommendation will help ensure that application readers have information to make reliable assessments. Chair Papadopoulos regrets not including BOARS, but Berkeley did not finalize the policy until mid-April, and did not think it raised systemwide issues. Moreover, Berkeley found little in past practice to suggest that BOARS' involvement was needed. The policy encouraging applicants to submit two letters of recommendation is not a radical change; all of Berkeley's comparison schools use letters, and Berkeley already asks for them in augmented review. Berkeley wants to find a resolution, has offered various compromises, and is concerned that faculty maintain their authority over admissions issues.

Council members discussed the components of a possible compromise. It was agreed that Berkeley will implement the new scoring system as outlined in its policy and commit to sharing scores and other information to help other campuses. It was agreed that for 2015-16, Berkeley will not solicit letters of recommendation at the time of application. Berkeley will solicit letters of recommendation only from students ranked as "possible" admits through the predictive index, as well as from any applicants ranked "possible" later in the review process. The Berkeley website will reflect that letters will not be solicited at the time of application and will only be requested of a select pool of applicants, and always on a voluntary basis for 2015-16.

ACTION: Council approved the compromise plan. Chair Gilly will communicate the details to the President's Office.

VII. UCEP Letter re Compendium Review Process for Hybrid Undergraduate-Graduate Degree Program

UCEP is asking for the Compendium to include a role for systemwide bodies, and UCEP, in the review of "hybrid" degree programs. One example of such a program is the "3+3 BA/JD" program between UC Santa Cruz and Hastings College of the Law that enables UCSC students to earn a bachelor's degree and law degree in six years instead of the usual seven.

ACTION: UCEP Chair Larrabee will bring the issue to the next meeting of the Academic Planning Council.

VIII. UCOPE Letter re Replacing Chair of AWPE Committee

Council reviewed a request from the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) to endorse a plan to replace the longtime chair of the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Committee upon his retirement from UC. UCOPE is recommending that the retired chair continue as AWPE chair for two years while a successor is recruited.

ACTION: Council endorsed UCOPE's plan as outlined in the letter.

IX. University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) Issues

1. Proposed Amendments to Bylaw 140

UCAAD is proposing to change its name to the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity.

ACTION: Council approved forwarding the proposed change for systemwide Senate review.

2. Letter on Faculty Equity Advisors

Council reviewed a letter from UCAAD summarizing its discussions and recommendations about the use of Faculty Equity Advisors (FEAs) across the UC system. Earlier in the year, UCAAD surveyed campuses to gather information about the roles and responsibilities of FEAs, training, reporting, and oversight procedures for FEAs, and compensation. UCAAD is recommending that the five campuses without FEAs institute an FEA model on their campuses with the help of systemwide funding support. UCAAD has also expressed interest in working with UCAP and UCFW on the issue.

It was noted that UCAP is concerned about the fact that according to UCAAD's report, on three campuses (UCB, UCI, and UCSD), FEAs have the authority to "approve search short list[s] before campus visits are allowed." (On a fourth campus, UCLA, the FEA's role in searches is "advisory only.") UCAP has been unable to find any provision in the APM or in UCOP policy statements that gives extra-departmental administrators the authority to approve or reject short lists before campus visits are allowed. It was suggested that UCAAD and UCAP work on this constitutional issue next year.

ACTION: Council agreed to share the UCAAD letter with Vice Provost Carlson and discuss the issues again at a fall Council meeting.

X. Senate Work Plan for Programmatic Objectives in the UC Budget

The Senate is finalizing a plan to ensure faculty involvement in the development and implementation of 14 academic initiatives included in the budget agreement between UC and Governor Brown. Senate leaders have been identifying specific initiatives in which Senate divisions and Systemwide committees should be involved or consulted, and have asked Senate chairs to identify appropriate review bodies and experts on each campus. The Senate will often rely on administrators to compile data, but Senate committees will need to approve anything resulting in a curricular change using established campus procedures. Senate leaders have asked BOARS and UCEP to lead efforts requiring systemwide involvement

Council members expressed general support for the plan.

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