

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting
Monday, November 24, 2008

I. Announcements

- **Mary Croughan, Academic Council Chair**
- UCD and UCSF Chancellor searches: The committee received over 100 nominations for the UCD Chancellor position. The membership of the UCSF search committee will be announced soon.
- The University will launch a national search for Provost.
- Report on November Regents meeting: A) The eligibility proposal was discussed. The president favors a GPA threshold for Entitled to Review of 3.0 weighted/capped, which is the current standard. The changes in eligibility requirements would be the elimination of the SAT subject tests and increasing ELC from 4% to 9%. B) The 2009-10 draft budget was presented. Unlike past budgets, it reflects the actual costs of running the University, and includes the faculty salary plan and graduate student funding, which have been the Senate's top two priorities. It also includes a number of SMG market equity adjustments approved last year. Chair Croughan suggested in her Chair's remarks at the November Regents meeting that given the budget situation and the fact that Year 2 of the faculty salary plan was not implemented, SMG members should decline these raises. The budget also included student fee increases, but the Regents amended it to delete this item. The argument was that the University should submit a budget to the state requesting the full cost of educating students, and should not automatically assume a student fee increase. C) TFIR/UCFW are working on a letter in response to Regents' item F10, which addresses the valuation of the retirement program and changes in the IRS rules on covered compensation (Appendix E). D) The Regents are planning to restart employer and employee contributions to the retirement fund in July. The state asserts it is not legally obligated to provide retirement matching funds, as it does for CALPERS. E) The Regents seriously discussed curtailing enrollment growth.
- Agenda items for next Council meeting are due by 12/10/08. Comments on the EAP business plan are due by 12/5/08 and comments on compliance measures for the sexual harassment prevention training are due on 12/11.

II. Update on Council Requests

1. Annual pits production report. The Senate received the first annual report from the President on plutonium pit production, as it requested. Production has been lower than projected. Last year 7 pits were made, and an additional 5 were made but were not approved. In the prior year, 10 pits were made.

III. Consent Calendar

1. **Approval of the October 22, 2008 Minutes**
2. **Forward proposed revisions to the policy on rehiring UC retirees to the President**
3. **Approve December 10, 2008 Academic Assembly Notice of Meeting**
4. **Cancel January 14, 2009 Academic Assembly meeting in accordance with [*Senate Bylaw 110.A.3*](#)**

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.

IV. Approval of the Agenda.

ACTION: The agenda was unanimously approved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

V. Membership of UCRS Board

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

ACTION: Council unanimously supported the proposed creation of a new UC Pension Benefits Board and endorsed UCFW's letter.

VI. UCPB Resolution on a New Capital Funding Strategy

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

ACTION: UCPB's Chair withdrew the resolution. Council endorsed a) sending the capital funding strategy for systemwide review, and b) sending a letter to the administration regarding how to coordinate Senate review on issues that are time sensitive or urgent.

VII. UCFW Statement on UC Budget

Minutes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

ACTION: Council unanimously endorsed sending a letter to the President thanking him for including the Senate's top priorities—funds for the faculty salary plan and graduate students and for restarting contributions to the retirement fund—in the draft 2009-2010 budget.

END OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

Interim Provost Grey

- The Chancellors' presentation at the Regents meeting led to a discussion about enrollment planning for next year.
- Daniel Dooley was named Interim Senior Vice President for External Relations and is highly respected in Sacramento. He also serves as VP of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources.
- Enrollment will continue to grow, even if the University curtails its growth. It is important to note that this year's senior class is the smallest of all current classes. So if UC admitted the same number of freshmen that it did last year, workload will still increase.

EVP Lapp

- UC is facing \$65 million in additional budget cuts in the special session of the legislature. A new session, with a new group of legislators, will convene on December 1st. UC has no indication of the outcome of the budget negotiations. The longer the budget is delayed, the

more options are foreclosed to UC in dealing with the impact of the cuts. A decision on potential fee increases for the 2009-10 academic year must be made by the end of December.

- The Chancellors addressed the Regents regarding how the cuts will affect the campuses. It was a very compelling discussion.
- President Yudof will be meeting individually with all of the Chancellors to discuss where the budget cuts will be taken. It is important for the president to understand and be able to articulate the specific effects of the cuts, to make sure that the decisions made on the campuses are as consistent as possible, and attempt to protect the instructional mission as much as possible.
- The president presented the draft 2009-10 budget to the Regents. In the past, presidents have asked for the amount of funding they thought UC could get. President Yudof presented a budget reflecting what UC actually needs to run the University. It's an increase of \$815.4 M, or 15.1% more than last year.
- An enrollment plan will be presented to the Regents at their January meeting.
- The governor is contemplating an economic stimulus package and has asked UC for capital projects that could be included.

Q&A

Q: What is under consideration in the enrollment plan?

A: Interim Provost Grey noted that the chancellors would like to freeze enrollment of new freshmen, but the president is concerned that any cut or cap would disproportionately impact under-represented minorities. The President has asked Chancellors to provide data on past applicant pools to determine whether increasing enrollment of community college transfer students could mitigate this impact. A group of faculty and administrators will continue a discussion of curtailing enrollment. EVP Lapp noted that some Regents would prefer to see how much money is provided in the governor's budget for enrollment growth, but the University can not wait too long because admissions decisions must be made beginning in December.

Q: Could the University consider setting enrollment targets prior to receiving a final budget based on past budgetary allocations? The University could set enrollment targets for different levels of funding, and thus plan for all possibilities.

A: Interim Provost Grey replied that previously, enrollment planning was done by the budget office. Currently, an enrollment management work group with representatives from various offices in OP is being formed to systematically plan ahead and consider the consequences of various budget scenarios.

Q: Thank you for issuing a press release warning that freshman enrollment may be curtailed and for issuing a budget that reflects the University's true fiscal situation. What has been the response to this release?

A: EVP Lapp responded that the University has not received much feedback thus far.

Q: In the past, President Yudof has been reluctant to curtail enrollment growth because of fears of the political cost to the University. Has he reassessed this since CSU made its decision public?

A: EVP Lapp reported that after speaking with the chancellors, the president realized that we must start to limit continuing growth. Last year, enrollment cuts may have been more politically difficult. But everyone understands that budgets are under extreme pressure in this economic crisis. The president speaks with Chancellor Reed frequently and also will be working with incoming community college President Jack Scott.

Comment: It is important to include graduate students in the discussion of enrollment growth. Some UC campuses are trying to expand the percentage of graduate students, who cost more, but who are funded at the same level as undergraduates.

Q: Previously, the president mentioned pursuing a lease-revenue bond to fund capital projects. Is the self-funded bond issue on the Regents' agenda a new and different strategy?

A: EVP Lapp explained that a lease-revenue bond for \$842 million to support capital projects is in the University's budget proposal for capital planning. The capital funding strategy on the Regents' agenda mostly addresses seismic issues. The Regents directed the president to survey the campuses and to bring buildings up to seismic safety. The total amount needed for academic buildings (excluding self-supporting and non-academic projects such as Memorial Stadium) is roughly \$2.1 billion. Although the proposal was on the Regents' agenda, the discussion was postponed due to time constraints. The Office of the President is considering other ways of funding this need, as well.

Q: Is the \$10 million allocated for graduate students in the 2009-10 budget "new" money or is it a charge to the campuses to redirect funds to graduate students? We are hearing that campuses are resisting redirecting the money that is in this year's budget to graduate students. How can we guarantee that the graduate students will get these funds? Also, is the University contemplating mid-year fee increases?

A: EVP Lapp responded that when the president made that commitment, he thought the budget would remain flat. Since then, UC has incurred an additional \$33.1M cut and expects another \$65 M cut, and that decision may have to be revisited. Provost Grey is working with the EVCs to identify what campuses have done to help graduate students. Different campuses will have different capacities to redirect the funds. The funds in the 2009-10 budget are monies that the University is requesting from the state for graduate student support and are not a redirection of operating funds. The University is considering all options to raise revenues, including mid-year fee increases.

Q: The Senate is pleased that there is a firm commitment to restart retirement contributions by July 1st. What will happen if the unions do not agree to this?

A: EVP Lapp responded that the University is exploring its options.

Q: Has the University made any progress in assessing the true cost of educating an undergraduate?

A: EVP Lapp noted that project will take quite some time. It will vary by type of student, campus, and discipline.

Q: Is the University considering accepting a greater percentage of non-residents to raise revenue?

A: Interim Provost Grey stated that campuses differ in their capacities to attract non-residents. He noted that the Master Plan poses obstacles to increasing non-resident enrollment, particularly at highly selective campuses. But the University will look at all options.

Comment: Due to budget uncertainties, UC Merced is becoming paralyzed; it can not move forward on hires, or other major decisions to continue its expansion, since it has no financial safety net.

Q: Historically, UCOP has denied that budget cuts impact educational quality. The accountability report signals more openness to this notion. How can UC continue to attract the best students, while emphasizing that budget declines are threatening quality?

A: Interim Provost Grey noted that despite the erosion of state support, UC remains one of the highest funded public education systems per student. Also, applications are climbing because students are opting for less expensive public education institutions. While UC will not lack highly qualified students in the short term, the long-term problem of inadequate budgets to maintain quality must be tackled.

Q: UC Riverside is still expanding its enrollment and infrastructure. What are the prospects for capital projects in the near future?

A: EVP Lapp noted that in addition to working with the governor's office on a potential state stimulus package, the University is working to be included in a stimulus package at the federal level. She is optimistic that UC's long-range capital needs may be funded as part of such efforts.

Q: Has there been any thought to increasing fees for certain fields, like engineering and the sciences, similar to the higher fee levels at professional schools?

A: Interim Provost Grey stated that the administration has not considered this. He noted that the University is advocating that the state fund some students at professional schools at a higher faculty FTE per student because accreditation bodies require lower student/faculty ratios.

Comment: In the accountability report, we should not trade replicability for accuracy. In particular, the faculty salary data used does not accurately reflect reality.

A: Vice Provost Greenstein stated that he is aware that other data is more accurate, but it is proprietary. The University is trying to come to an agreement to use that data without violating privacy concerns or the terms under which it is released.

IX. General Discussion

X. Accountability Framework

ISSUE: President Yudof asked for public comment on UC's draft Accountability Framework. Divisional and committee responses were submitted prior to the meeting.

DISCUSSION: Vice Provost Greenstein and Anne Machung thanked the Senate for undertaking a review in a short time frame. Vice Provost Greenstein noted that the framework will continue to evolve over many years, and that they are aiming for an annual publication in May. He stated that the authors specifically chose goals that were measurable and uncontested; the goals were derived from the Master Plan, the Regents, and the Long Range Guidance Team. The data were all drawn from public, published sources so that others can reproduce it. They also chose indicators that are used nationally in accountability efforts. While the authors cannot respond to every comment, they will digest all of them. The final draft must be ready on April 1 for publication in May. After that, the authors will grapple with the many substantive suggestions for restructuring the report for next year. These comments also will help shape the sub-reports, which will be more detailed examinations of specific subjects, such as faculty retention and recruitment, diversity and compliance.

XI. QB3 Five-Year Review

ISSUE: CCGA, UCORP, and UCPB submitted their recommendations regarding the five-year review of QB3.

DISCUSSION: Council members noted that the reviews largely do not address cross-campus affiliations among graduate programs, which was one of the rationales for establishing the institute. The reports also fail to provide quantitative evidence that the collaborations have produced gains beyond what the individual faculty members would have produced on their own. Finally, Council members stressed that the lessons of the first Cal ISI review regarding how to review these unique entities were not incorporated in this one. Despite these failings, Council members felt that the recommendations should be forwarded to the provost.

ACTION: Council endorsed sending the Compendium committees' recommendations to the provost, with one abstention.

XII. Davis Division Fee-Waiver Proposal

ISSUE: The Davis Division submitted a proposal to grant the dependents of Senate faculty members a 50% reduction in undergraduate fees.

DISCUSSION: The Davis Division Chair noted that the proposal had been amended to include all faculty, not just Senate faculty. It was noted that it should be referred first to UCFW. UCFW's chair asked whether council members favored limiting the benefit to faculty, or including staff. She noted that if limited to faculty, it would be considered a taxable benefit by the IRS. It also presents an equity issue vis-à-vis staff. Including staff would cost more, but past proposals have always included them. Several Council members strongly supported including staff. A member asked why the Senate should pursue this again when similar previous proposals failed. Other members countered that it could be a good will gesture on the part of the University, and that it is important to continue to ask for things that enhance recruitment and retention. Several Council members suggested exploring alternatives, including pre-tax educational accounts, or a pre-tax account to which the University would contribute matching funds. Another objected that faculty without children would not benefit.

ACTION: Council requested that UCFW examine the fee waiver proposal, including gathering information on the suggested alternatives, and report to Council in January.

XIII. Data Reporting in NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates

ISSUE: UCAAD reports that the NSF has proposed suppressing small cell sizes in reporting race and gender data in the Survey of Earned Doctorates because of privacy concerns. UCAAD has drafted a letter opposing this policy.

DISCUSSION: UCAAD's chair noted that the Council of Graduate Deans has already opposed the policy and that there is a deadline of December 1st to submit comments. Members noted the critical importance of such data in promoting diversity in higher education. Council members felt that the letter would have greater impact if it were signed by the President or Provost.

ACTION: Council unanimously voted to request that the provost write a letter to the NSF opposing the suppression of race and gender data in the Survey of Earned Doctorates.

XIV. Reconstitution of the Anderson Graduate School of Management at UC Riverside

ISSUE: As the lead Compendium committee, CCGA recommends the reconstitution of UC Riverside's Anderson Graduate School of Management, granting it the authority to confer a BS in Business Administration.

DISCUSSION: CCGA's chair noted that UCPB and UCEP had some reservations regarding the program's use of lecturers until ten faculty FTE have been recruited, and deferred to those committee chairs to determine if they were comfortable with recommending it. UCPB's and

UCEP's chairs responded that their committees would approve the proposal, contingent on getting responses to the questions posed in their letters. UC Riverside's division chair reported that most of the ten FTEs have been filled. A Council member cautioned that if the School is allowed to change its name to a College, the Senate would no longer have oversight.

ACTION: Council approved the reconstitution of AGSM, contingent on receiving responses to the questions posed in the Compendium committees' letters; it did not approve the proposed name change.

XV. UCAAD Concerns about Diversity and UCOP Restructuring

ISSUE: UCAAD submitted a letter expressing concern about the effects of UCOP's restructuring on diversity research and implementation efforts. The letter requests: 1) that a UCAAD representative be appointed to the Regents' Study Group on the University Diversity Campus Implementation Team; and 2) the replacement of qualified staff at UCOP to continue diversity analyses and monitoring.

DISCUSSION: Several committee chairs noted similar concerns about the restructuring of Academic Affairs. Chair Croughan noted that there will be opportunities for Senate input through our committee meetings and Council.

ACTION: Council unanimously supported forwarding UCAAD's letter to the president.

XVI. New Business

1. Retreats with EVCs and Chancellors. This year there will be one retreat with the EVCs and one with the Chancellors. We need to determine topics and dates.
2. Council will invite up to three Regents as guests at Council meetings this year.
3. Stewardship and performance review of Senior Management. This issue was deferred from 2007-08. It will be on the December agenda.
4. Chancellor Birgeneau is promoting a differential fee structure for UC. The Senate is on record opposing such stratification. Chair Croughan will send a statement to the president reiterating Council's opposition. Council can develop a formal position statement in December.

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