

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Minutes of Meeting
November 23, 2015****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Today's agenda items and their priority
2. Draft Council minutes of October 28, 2015
3. Master of Public Affairs at UC Berkeley
4. ICAS Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen
5. Approval of December 9, 2015 Assembly Teleconference Agenda

ACTION: Council approved the consent calendar.

II. Senate Officer's Announcements

- **Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair**
- **Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Vice Chair**
- **Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director**

November Regents Meeting: The Senate has been asked to nominate a UC faculty representative from a School of Medicine to the reconstituted Regents Committee on Health Services, as passed by the Regents on November 19 and described in [Regents Bylaw 12.7](#). Council will discuss the nomination process as an item of New Business. The Regents also approved a \$1 billion project to double the size of the Merced campus by 2020, a preliminary 2016-17 UC budget, a plan to borrow funds to contribute to UCRP, and a plan to enroll 10,000 new California resident undergraduates over the next three years, including 5,000 in 2016-17. UCOP estimates that 500 additional faculty will be needed to meet the new enrollments.

Regents Work Group on Principles of Intolerance: Chair Hare is a member of a Regents Work Group led by Regent Island that is attempting to craft a set of UC principles against intolerance that specifically address anti-Semitism as well as the need to protect free speech and academic freedom. The Work Group has met twice and is expected to release a recommendation in early spring.

Equity for Access Program: The interim vice president for research and graduate studies has responded to the [Academic Senate review](#) of a set of [Draft Guidelines](#) for a pilot program that allows UC to accept equity stakes in exchange for access to University facilities or services provided by campus "incubators". He invited the Senate to participate in the revision of the Guidelines to address issues raised by campuses. He also clarified that UCOP was asking the Senate for input into the effectiveness of the Guidelines as a framework for implementing the pilot program, not for input into whether the incubators themselves should or should not exist. Council will consider how to proceed at a future meeting.

Discussion: Council members expressed concern about the capacity of the UC system to absorb 10,000 new enrollments without additional faculty, staff, and infrastructure (classrooms, lab space, and housing). If an appropriate proportion of new resources is not provided, the overall

educational experience for students could suffer. It was noted that UC is already admitting more than the top 12.5% of CA public high school graduates as required by the Master Plan.

III. Update on Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR)

○ Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Council formed ACSCANR in 2011 to increase the Senate's shared governance role in matters concerning the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) and the Agricultural Extension Station (AES). ANR is a systemwide division housed at UCOP that consists primarily of Specialists in Cooperative Extension located on several campuses, farm advisors and other Cooperative Extension staff in county offices, research stations, and various systemwide programs.

Senate leaders are unsure that ACSCANR remains the most effective means for the Senate to participate in ANR policy issues. Some ACSCANR members want to revitalize the committee, while others suggest that relevant systemwide committees, or a UCPB Task Force, could take over some or all of its charge. There are several important issues under discussion that argue for maintaining a Senate role through ACSCANR or an alternative mechanism, including 1) a proposal to change the source of ANR's \$70 million in state appropriations from campus funding streams assessments to funds taken "off the top" in the UC budgetary process, and 2) a proposal to give Cooperative Extension specialists equivalent status to ladder rank faculty. ANR's new vice president may be open to involving ACSCANR in more meaningful consultation.

It was agreed that Council should discuss at a future meeting a set of options for the ongoing involvement of the Senate in ANR issues.

IV. Update on the Retirement Benefits Advisory Task Force

○ Rachael Nava, Chief Operating Officer

○ Dwaine Duckett, Vice President, Human Resources

○ Gary Schlimgen, Executive Director, HR Retirement Programs and Services

The Task Force has been evaluating options for a new retirement plan for UC employees hired after July 1, 2016 that will meet a state mandate to cap pensionable salary at the PEPRA limit while also seeking to maintain UC competitiveness. The Task Force is considering options that would 1) supplement a capped Defined Benefit plan with a Defined Contribution plan for some employees, and 2) provide at least some employees with a stand-alone Defined Contribution plan option.

UCOP understands the budget agreement to allow UC to offer a supplemental benefit to a select group of employees. Some senior administrators presume this group will be faculty; however, the faculty members on the Task Force want any supplemental benefit to apply to all groups of employees with individuals over the PEPRA limit, rather than to a particular group. The Task Force is also aware that much of the savings under the new tier will accrue over time, and that UC will need to negotiate new retirement options for all union-represented UC employees. At least one union has already expressed opposition to a DC plan over concern that it will encourage employee turnover and harm patient care. Concerns have been raised that there will be a mass

movement of employees to a DC plan, which would damage UCRP, but UCOP considers this scenario unlikely, based on similar experiences at other institutions.

Chair Hare noted that the Task Force will hold its final meeting on December 11 and is expected to submit a report with recommendations to the President by December 15. The Senate will see the report on January 15 for a 30-day expedited review. It is expected that key Senate committees will have the opportunity to deliberate over email and inform a Council discussion on January 27. The Regents will discuss the President's recommendation in March.

Discussion: Council members noted that it is simpler and fairer to offer the same plan to all employees, and that UC needs a competitive base compensation package to continue attracting and retaining excellent faculty and staff. A less competitive pension plan will end up costing the university more in recruitment and retention.

V. Consultation with UC Senior Managers

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President Chief Financial Officer**
- **Debora Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources**

On November 19, the Regents approved a major bylaw revision that streamlines the governing structure of the medical centers through a new Health Services Committee. The Committee will be comprised of six Regents, the Governor, the UC president, the senior vice president for Health Services, a clinical faculty member from a School of Medicine, and four outside advisors. It will provide delegated oversight over strategic plans and budgets, compensation, and other major transactions and initiatives. The Regents also approved business terms that will allow Merced to proceed with its 2020 capital plan and an RFP for a “design-build-finance-operate-maintain” delivery model for new facilities to double the size of the campus by 2020. Finally, the Regents approved a 2016-17 operating budget for the University that includes a plan to enroll 10,000 new California resident undergraduates over the next three years.

Discussion: Council members noted that campuses are beginning to plan for the new enrollments; however, students are increasingly concerned about their impact on access to on-campus housing and classes, class size, and overall educational quality. UC should be clear about how the plan will impact the student experience. It was also noted that Senate committees want more information about budget and enrollment plans as they are being developed, and about how campuses intend to use funding UCOP is asking them to set aside for “reinvestments in quality.”

UC senior managers noted that the plan to enroll 10,000 new resident undergraduates over three years accelerates an existing UC plan to add 10,000 students over four years. The figure currently includes transfers but not graduate students. The \$25 million state allocation for the enrollment of 5,000 students in 2016-17 is permanent and ongoing. The enrollment of 2,500 additional students in years two and three is contingent on additional state funding, but the state has not indicated that it will alter its \$10,000 per student marginal cost allocation in those years. The Regents are aware of the concerns about the effect of new enrollments on academic quality, but they feel strongly about expanding access to residents. UCOP is working with campuses on their enrollment plans and issues like housing, recognizing that there must be an ongoing dialog

about the resources needed to implement the plan. UCOP is also exploring mechanisms to increase housing, including external financing solutions and a new fixed income housing fund.

UCOP understands that campuses have particular needs and is not mandating that campuses use their share of the \$50 million for “reinvestments in quality” in a certain way, although UCOP has suggested that campuses may wish to use some of the funding to hire additional faculty and/or support graduate students. UCOP will continue to provide as much budget information as possible to the Council and Senate leadership, but much of the consultation about enrollment planning must necessarily occur at the campus level. It was noted that the President has authorized an acceleration of budget rebenching by one year and a buy-out of the existing systemwide over-enrollment of 7,500 students over a two-year period.

President Napolitano also noted that she recently met with the [Afrikan Black Coalition](#), which comprises the leadership of the Black Student Unions on each of the campuses and some community members, to discuss concerns about diversity, racism, recruitment, mental health resources, divestment from the prison system, and other issues.

The President noted that she will review the Retirement Options Task Force report and recommendations over the December holidays. She expects to have a preliminary recommendation by January 15 that the Senate can consider as it conducts its review.

○ *Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs*

Faculty Salary Increases: Last year the President called for salary increases equivalent to 3% of compensation, and asked campuses to apply 1.5% of the pool as an across-the-board increase to faculty salaries and 1.5% to address four discretionary areas: equity, inversion, compression, and exceptional merit. UCOP is now asking campuses to report how they distributed the discretionary 1.5% in each of the four areas across four categories of academic appointees. Provost Dorr asked Council members for advice about what the reports should include.

Council members noted that administrators should report on how they involved the Senate in decisions about the four discretionary issues. They also noted that 3% does little to fix UC’s widening total remuneration gap, and that UC’s peer-based merit and promotion system is the best in the world for judging merit. To the extent that the system remains tied to relevant systemwide salary scales, UC preserves an important link between the scales and excellence. If UC wants salary to be truly performance based, it should focus salary actions on the published salary scales.

Budget Framework Initiative: UCOP is hosting a systemwide meeting of engineering majors to discuss their participation in an initiative to reduce the number of upper division units required for a major. Engineering majors tend to require a higher number of upper division units than other majors, partly to meet requirements set by accreditors, but campuses meet accreditation requirements in different ways, and UCOP sees the initiative as an opportunity to share best practices for building excellence and efficiency simultaneously.

C-ID: A question was raised about why the Senate needs to be involved in decisions about the Course Identification Numbering system. Provost Dorr noted that C-ID provides a way to ensure that UC faculty who teach a course that is proposed to share a C-ID number with a CCC course

agree that the content of the two courses are aligned. Those decisions should not be left to administrators.

VI. UC Budget Audit

- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer**
- **Debora Obley, Associate Vice President for Budget & Capital Resources**

UC is undergoing an audit that was initiated by the Legislature last spring after the release of UC's five-year budget stability plan. It has four areas of focus: 1) the impact of nonresident enrollment and the "compare favorably" standard for nonresident enrollment; 2) Expenditures, including executive compensation and the use of state revenues and nonresident tuition; 3) budget oversight processes at UCOP and the campuses; and 4) the "budget rebenching" process underway to rebalance per-student state funding across campuses. The results of the audit are expected in late March 2016. The audit team has committed to discussing preliminary findings with UC in early March.

UCOP is concerned that the audit expects UC to provide an unrealistic level of specificity about how it spends different pools of funds. Like any university—and, moreover, the state—UC blends funding from different sources into pools. Although UC is able to explain how a particular pool of money is spent, it is difficult, if not impossible, for UC to identify how a specific dollar funds a particular expenditure.

Faculty who receive a request should be mindful about providing clear and accurate information, as any information provided will be in the public record.

VII. Executive Session

VIII. Update on Alternative Credits and C-ID

- **Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair**
- **Tracy Larrabee, UCEP Chair**

The chairs of BOARS and UCEP reported on their committees' recent discussions about the use of alternative credits and the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), and recommended next steps.

C-ID: BOARS and UCEP both discussed the merits of the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), its use at CSU and the California Community Colleges (CCC), and the possibility of piloting its use for courses included in approved UC Transfer Pathways. UCEP believes C-ID could reduce course articulation workload, help educate colleges about UC's academic expectations, and provide additional transparency to students navigating the transfer path. UCEP also discussed concerns about the lack of a process to collect and present information about the instructional mode (online or in-person) of courses with C-ID numbers, but found no evidence to suggest that the instructional mode of a CCC course affects transfer student preparation or their UC outcomes. BOARS notes that some UC campuses already use C-ID in a limited capacity to reduce articulation workload, and that UC faculty should be closely

involved in the development of course descriptors (should UC agree to participate in C-ID) to ensure the descriptors are appropriately detailed and aligned with UC expectations.

Council members generally agreed that there is value in adopting C-ID numbers for as many UC Transfer Pathway courses as possible, and if appropriate C-ID numbers can be identified for courses in a particular Transfer Pathway. It will also be important for UC faculty to participate in the development and review of course descriptors at the beginning of the process, rather than after an agreement about a descriptor has been reached. It was suggested that BOARS and UCEP work together to produce a written document listing pros and cons of various approaches.

Alternative Credits: BOARS and UCEP both discussed the state's request to UC to review existing policies related to granting credit for [College Level Examination Program \(CLEP\) exams](#). UC has not accepted the exams since 1980. The exams are used at CSU, and a small number of UC competitors award credit for a limited number of exams at certain score thresholds. Both committees are recommending a faculty review of a subset of the 33 CLEP exams, perhaps those associated with impacted courses or the UC transfer pathways. BOARS suggests that work groups of faculty from all nine campuses evaluate the exams. Evaluators should determine whether exams cover in sufficient breadth and depth the content of a lower division UC course or courses in a given department. BOARS also believes that only non-matriculated students should be able to earn alternative credits. It was noted that adopting the exams will require substantial buy-in from the faculty on all campuses. It was noted that fewer than 200 total CLEP exams were taken by CCC students last year, providing a sample that is too limited for use in analyzing the success rate of students who have taken the exams. It was agreed that UCEP and BOARS will work together to select an initial group of five subject matter areas for which CLEP exams can be evaluated for possible credit.

IX. Joint Committee on Sexual Violence, Assault, and Harassment

- **Dan Hare, Academic Council Chair**
- **Sheryl Vacca, Senior Vice President, Compliance and Audit**

A new Joint Committee co-led by Chair Hare and Senior Vice President Vacca is examining systemwide and individual campus policies and practices for reporting, investigating, and adjudicating claims of sexual misconduct involving faculty and other academic personnel. The Committee was formed in the wake of a well-publicized case involving a tenured Berkeley faculty member with a history of sexual misconduct, and statements from administrators expressing confusion about possible avenues for imposing discipline.

The Committee is taking an inventory of policies and practices to determine what variations exist across campuses. It will evaluate written policies and recommend changes, if warranted, to increase consistency and transparency in existing processes—including the effectiveness of procedures leading up to the Privilege and Tenure process and the relationship between the Privilege and Tenure process and the Title IX process. The Committee is not charged with developing new policies.

The Committee is holding meetings at UC Irvine and UCOP in January to gather input from groups of faculty, students, and administrators. Campus delegates from those groups are now

being identified. Each campus will be invited to send three faculty delegates. Council will review the Committee's initial recommendations in February.

X. Systemwide Senate Review Items

1. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 417 and 621

Council discussed feedback received during the systemwide review of BOARS' [recommended modifications](#) to [Senate Regulation 417](#), addressing UC applicants who complete coursework at a college while enrolled in high school. Two additional modifications were suggested by Senate reviewers. The additional changes were deemed acceptable, as they are not substantive but help to clarify the intent of the regulations.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the modifications to Senate Regulation 417. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations 621

Council discussed feedback received during the systemwide review of BOARS' [recommended modifications](#) to Senate Regulation 621, clarifying the standardized examination credit students may present to the University.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the modifications to Senate Regulation 621. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140

Council discussed feedback received during the systemwide review of UCAAD's proposal to add "Equity" to its name. UCAAD's new name would be the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity. The change is intended to better reflect UCAAD's current role.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the modifications to Senate Bylaw 140. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. New Business

Senate Representative to Regents Committee on Health Services: Chair Hare asked Council to consider a process for nominating a candidate to serve as the Senate representative to the revised Regents Committee on Health Services. It was agreed that Council will request nominations of candidates from the campuses through the Assembly and select the final nominee. It was agreed that candidates must be members of the Senate who hold a clinical appointment at a UC School of Medicine. The successful candidate also will be an ex-officio member of the UCFW Health Care Task Force.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: Dan Hare, Academic Council Chair