

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
BERKELEY \* DAVIS \* IRVINE \* LOS ANGELES \* MERCED \* RIVERSIDE  
SAN DIEGO \* SAN FRANCISCO \* SANTA BARBARA \* SANTA CRUZ**

**NOTICE OF MEETING  
MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Wednesday, April 13, 2011**

**10:00 am – 4:00 pm**

**UCOP – Oakland**

**1111 Franklin Street Lobby Conference Room**

|              |  |           |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| <b>I.</b>    | <b>ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>II.</b>   | <b>MINUTES</b>   |           |
|              | Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of December 1, 2010     | 2         |
|              | Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, December 1, 2010                    | 8         |
| <b>III.</b>  | <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</b>                                    | <b>9</b>  |
|              | ▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Assembly Chair                            |           |
| <b>IV.</b>   | <b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT</b>                                | <b>9</b>  |
|              | ▪ Mark Yudof, President  |           |
|              | ▪ Lawrence Pitts, Provost and Executive Vice President               |           |
|              | ▪ Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources         |           |
| <b>V.</b>    | <b>SPECIAL ORDERS</b>  |           |
|              | A. 2011-12 Assembly Meeting Schedule [information]                   | 9         |
| <b>VI.</b>   | <b>REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]</b>                          |           |
| <b>VII.</b>  | <b>REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES</b>                                |           |
|              | A. CCGA's Guidelines for Self-Supporting Programs [information]      | 9         |
|              | ▪ James Carmody, CCGA Chair  |           |
|              | B. Report from UCPB [information]                                    | 12        |
|              | ▪ James Chalfant, UCPB Chair   |           |
|              | C. Report from BOARS [information]                                   | 12        |
|              | ▪ Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair  |           |
|              | D. Academic Council [ACTION]   |           |
|              | ▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair                             |           |
|              | 1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the 2011-12 Assembly | 13        |
| <b>VIII.</b> | <b>UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT</b>                         | <b>15</b> |
|              | ▪ Joel Dimsdale, UCFW Chair  |           |
| <b>IX.</b>   | <b>PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]</b>                                  |           |
| <b>X.</b>    | <b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]</b>                                    |           |
| <b>XI.</b>   | <b>NEW BUSINESS</b>  |           |

## **I. Roll Call of Members**

**2010-11 Assembly Roll Call April 13, 2011**

### **President of the University:**

Mark Yudof

Ulysses Jenkins  
Tahseen Mozaffar  
Charles Zender

### **Academic Council Members:**

Daniel Simmons, Chair  
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair  
Fiona Doyle, Chair, UCB  
Robert Powell, Chair, UCD  
Alan Barbour, Chair, UCI  
Ann Karagozian, Chair, UCLA  
Evan Heit, Chair UCM  
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR  
Joel Sobel, Vice Chair, UCSD (alternate for Frank Powell)  
Robert Newcomer, Vice Chair, UCSF (alternate for Elena Fuentes-Afflick)  
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB  
Susan Gillman, Chair, UCSC  
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS  
James Carmody, Chair, CCGA  
Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD  
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UCAP  
David Kay, Chair, UCEP  
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCFW  
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, UCORP  
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

**Los Angeles (8)**  
Paula Diaconescu  
Malcolm Gordon  
Jody Kreiman  
Timothy Lane  
Duncan Lindsey  
Susanne Lohmann  
Purnima Mankekar  
Joseph Nagy

**Merced (1)**  
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo

**Riverside (2)**  
Thomas Morton  
Albert Wang

**San Diego (5 – 2 TBA)**  
Timothy Bigby  
Lorraine Pillus  
Peter Wagner

**San Francisco (4)**  
Farid Chehab  
David Gardner  
Deborah Greenspan  
Wendy Max

**Santa Barbara (3)**  
Ralph Armbruster  
Gayle Binion  
John Foran

**Santa Cruz (2)**  
Joseph Konopelski  
Marilyn Walker

**Secretary/Parliamentarian**  
Jean Olson

### **Berkeley (5)**

Steven Beissinger  
Ralph Catalano  
Mary Ann Mason  
Bernard Sadoulet  
Theodore Slaman

### **Davis (6)**

Richard Grotjahn  
Joel Haas  
Joseph Kiskis  
Brian Mulloney  
Terence Murphy (absent)  
Krishnan Nambiar

### **Irvine (4)**

Luis Aviles

## MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

December 1, 2010  
MINUTES OF MEETING

**I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, December 1, 2010. Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons presided and called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. In accordance with Senate Bylaw 120.C.1, Chair Simmons requested approval to change the order of business in order to accommodate Henry Powell, Chair of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC. He proposed beginning with items VI.A. and continuing with VII.A before calling roll or approving the minutes. Hearing no objections, he proceeded to items VI.A. and VII.A. Following those discussions, Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed that there was a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes. The minutes will reflect the order of business as noticed.

**II. MINUTES**

**ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the June 16, 2010 meeting as noticed.**

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

Chair Simmons announced that the final report of the Commission on the Future will be on Regents' agenda for endorsement at their special meeting in December. He also reported that in response to AB2302, which requested that UC study major pre-requisites to reduce obstacles for transfer students, Provost Pitts is hosting meetings of faculty in five disciplines across the system. The first meetings of math and biology faculty have occurred and the faculty discovered a great deal of agreement on lower division requirements. Meetings of computer science, psychology and history faculty will occur in the next few weeks.

**IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST**

State budget. Provost Pitts noted that the incoming governor is just starting to meet with advisers, but there is a real possibility of mid-year budget cuts because of a \$6 billion budget gap. He stated that the University needs a multi-year strategy to manage its finances if state funding does not increase.

Rebenching. Provost Pitts stated that the president has asked him to begin a process to "rebench" general fund allocations that will mitigate historic inequities in funding among campuses. Currently, campuses are reimbursed per student according to a baseline formula established in the early 1990s, which resulted in differentiation based on the percentage of the graduate student population at that time, among other factors. He stated that he will convene a committee beginning in January 2011 to discuss principles for allocating state general funds and then develop financial models. The committee will be composed of approximately 15 people, including 3 or 4 Senate members, several EVCs, Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget, and staff with expertise in capital projects.

Indirect Cost Recovery. Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Steven Beckwith made a presentation to the Regents on the revenue the university loses on indirect cost recovery. Some of this is due to the low ICR rate the university receives from federal grants and contracts, and some is due to the fact that some large foundations pay very low or no indirect costs. UC plans to pursue a better rate with the government and join with other universities to address the issue with major foundations.

**V. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]**

**VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

**A. Oral Report on the Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for UC (Discussion)**

Henry Powell, Chair of the Special Committee, made the following remarks. The UC Commission on the Future was established at a time of fiscal turmoil. The Senate was deeply concerned about its implications for shared governance, as many of the recommendations involved issues under Senate purview. The Senate kept its divisions and committees informed and solicited comment on recommendations as we received them. As a result, the Senate's perspective and voice helped to shape the discussion at the final Commission meetings. The Commission referred many of the recommendations to the Senate for further development. The Commission recommendations, while providing valuable food for thought, are a series of unrelated, incremental solutions to the immediate budget crisis, and do not constitute a long term vision of the University.

Subsequently, Chair Simmons asked me to convene a Special Committee on a Plan for UC to make a comprehensive assessment of the state of the University in both the long term and the short term, to anticipate the impact of the fiscal crisis and outline prospective solutions that will mitigate the crisis while maintaining the quality and eminence of the University in the long term. The Committee is comprised of Senate members of the Commission Working Groups who bring to the table their considerable expertise. The Special Committee met twice by teleconference and once in person and submitted an interim draft to the Academic Council in November. It will meet again in person in early January to finalize the draft. Council will consider it at its January meeting and hopefully will refer it to the Assembly's February meeting.

The Special Committee's report begins by setting out the principles and values that have made UC the premier public institution of higher education in the nation, and insists that any choices must be informed by these principles. It then discusses trade-offs that must be considered and makes recommendations aimed at maintaining UC's educational and research stature. The Council recommendation to the Commission and the UCLA Statement on UC Values focused on particular, temporary solutions to the immediate budget crisis, namely, downsizing the faculty and limiting capital projects. The Special Committee will take into consideration these solutions, as well as the divisional and committee responses to them in its final report.

However, the Special Committee's report is broader. It prioritizes maintaining affordable access to the University for the state's demographically diverse citizenry. It emphasizes the crucial role of graduate students in the research enterprise. And it suggests other, longer term solutions.

There is an opportunity in every crisis, and the Special Committee is exploring how we can optimize the resources that we have, including facilitating revenue generating activities and partnerships. Such ideas include coordination with UC Extension in undergraduate education, facilitating faculty entrepreneurship, and making UC Press a more profitable enterprise by embracing such trends such as e-book publishing.

It also is discussing structural changes to achieve cost savings, such as leveraging the ten campus system to facilitate cross-campus registration for graduate and undergraduate students, pursuing efficiencies in the structure of the undergraduate program by simplifying major requirements, and creating a new position for postdoctoral scholars that would allow them to gain teaching experience and contribute to the teaching mission of the University while relieving faculty workload should enrollments increase. It should be noted that none of these measures or any combination of them can replace the funding provided by the state and that it is imperative that UC effectively communicate UC's critical importance to the social and economic well-being of the state and all of its citizens.

Members of the Assembly expressed support for the principles articulated in the report, but cautioned that they must be implemented on a campus by campus basis. Campuses are at different stages of development and should not be inadvertently disadvantaged by across-the-board decisions. For example, downsizing should not occur in a reactive way, but should be done at the campus level in consultation with the Senate. A member clarified that the disestablishment of programs is determined at the campus level, but that the discontinuance of any program does not imply the termination or layoff of tenured faculty; the campus is obliged to find them other positions on campus. The report should clarify this point. CCGA's chair stated that his committee supports the idea of hiring our own graduates as post-doctoral fellows and using them to teach in lieu of Unit 18 lecturers. A member commented that the report should distinguish between graduate and undergraduate students in its discussion of non-resident tuition, and clarify the definition of "programs." He also was surprised that the report does not take a position on the increasing role of self-supporting programs. Chair Simmons responded that these issues are on the Special Committee's agenda when it meets in early January.

## **VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### **A. Academic Council**

#### **1. Strategic Planning for the University (Discussion)**

Chair Simmons stated that the report of the Special Committee, as well as the responses to the systemwide review of the Academic Council recommendation to the UC Commission on the Future and the UCLA Statement of UC Values were discussed at the November Council meeting. Council asked the Special Committee to incorporate all of the material received as part of the systemwide review into its final report; the responses will inform an ongoing process of creating a faculty-led strategic plan for the University. Council further decided to convene a small task force to evaluate the financial impact of the Special Committee's recommendations. The task force consists of Council members who participate in monthly budget calls with the provost and other administrators. It includes division chairs Ann Karagozian (UCLA), Bob Powell (UCD), Alan Barbour (UCI), Mary Gauvain (UCR); and committee chairs Jim Chalfant (UCPB), Joel Dimsdale (UCFW), and David Kay (UCEP). The task force will quantify the impact of the

proposals being made and devise implementation strategies. Once its report is completed in late spring, it will be reviewed systemwide, along with the report of the Special Committee.

## **B. Annual Reports (Information)**

Annual reports of the standing committees are required to be submitted to the first meeting of the Assembly each academic year for information. Annual reports are included in the Call to this meeting.

## **VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT**

### **1. President's Proposal on Post-Employment Benefits (Information)**

Chair Simmons reported that the Regents will take action on post-employment benefits at a special meeting on December 13. He reviewed the major points of the plan and added that the degree of consultation is an example of shared governance at its best. He noted that the next challenge will be to help the campuses find the funding for the employer contribution. A funding plan will be presented at the March Regents' meeting. Each division should develop a mechanism to work with administrators to address the budgetary challenges; some campuses already have established joint committees to do so.

### **2. Council Resolution on Faculty Salaries (Action)**

Provost Pitts stated that \$87 million was set aside in 2011-12 budget for salary increases, but that the campuses were asked to do modeling to see if the increases could take effect earlier. However, he noted that concerns about the political consequences of providing salary increases on the heels of an 8% fee increase. If funds are allocated for salary increases, the options for disbursing them include an across-the-board increase for all faculty, allocating the funds to raise the salary scales, or allowing the Chancellors and EVCs to use the funds for recruitment and retention. Provost Pitts highlighted trade-offs among these approaches and said that he looks forward to hearing the views of the Senate on this issue. Chair Simmons stated that raising the salary scales would make a statement that the University values and wants to protect the scales and the peer-reviewed salary system. The Council resolution is a hybrid of the first two options. It recommends providing 2% across-the board increase (referred to as a "range adjustment") in 2010-11, and a subsequent (2011-12) 3% range adjustment and 2% market adjustment to raise the salary scales.

Provost Pitts commented that in Year 1 of the previous faculty salary plan, the funding was used to augment the scales, and a greater portion was allocated to the lower steps. To compensate those with off-scale salaries, a number of EVCs provided raises using their own budget resources. He noted it is doubtful that campuses would have the ability to do this again. He said that providing across-the-board increases both raises the scales and funds off-scale salaries. But if no money is provided for recruitment and retention, the EVCs raid other parts of the operational budget for this purpose.

A member stated that we need to strategically bolster the scales in order to build the future of the university. She noted that mid-career faculty are the most likely to submit retention cases and that the university also must be able to successfully recruit junior faculty. A member commented

that if the scales are closer to market, there will be less need for money for recruitment. Also, having viable salary scales would be better than dealing each year with outside offers and higher than market recruitments. The merit system decreases the pressure on faculty to get outside offers because they can expect steady salary increases. Another member expressed concern about options that would further increase the gap between the newly hired and long serving faculty; it would be preferable to apply any available funds to the salary scales. An across-the-board increase means that most of the funds would go to full professors. Several members concurred. A member argued that we need to protect the merit system, which is at the core of UC culture and is the basis for UC's success as an institution. He stated that the scales are on the brink of becoming obsolete and we must rescue the scales now, or the institution will be fundamentally changed. Provost Pitts replied that the merit and promotion system will not be dismantled; the issue is how to determine salaries. He noted that 80% of faculty are off-scale. A member asked whether there is a separate budget item for merit increases. If there is, then the issue is whether we put the money toward fixing the scales or we give it to the EVCs to use at their discretionary. Chair Simmons confirmed that there is a separate \$27 million budget item for merit increases. A member asked if there is data on putting funds into the scales in Year 1 of the faculty plan in terms of its effect on recruitments and retentions. Provost Pitts responded that there was a slow-down in hiring at that time, so the effect is unclear.

A member stated that given that the budget situation is in flux, it is premature to act on the Council motion, but spoke in favor of amending the scales. A member countered that regardless of the budget situation or public perception, Council's proposal was unanimously supported, and is based on principles and a lengthy analysis of a joint committee; therefore Assembly should endorse it. The administration is free not to follow the recommendation. A member countered that salary issues should be discussed by a much broader segment of the faculty. A member responded that he is in favor of continuing the discussion, since it is unlikely that the Council resolution could be implemented this year.

A member spoke in favor of using the funds for the merit pool. This would protect the peer-reviewed salary system, in which merit and compensation are tied together, and it would avoid the potential negative consequences of an across-the-board increase. Another member suggested phasing in the increases over a period of three years as faculty are reviewed for merit. Provost Pitts said that the funds would provide higher merit increases (5-6% rather than 2.5%) for three years. Other members suggested using the funds to off-set employee retirement contributions or provide a cost of living increase.

A member moved that the Assembly endorse the three Council recommendations. A substitute motion to postpone was made. It was clarified that if the motion to postpone succeeds, the resolutions will be referred back to Council for additional consideration. If the motion to postpone fails, then the original motion will be voted upon.

**ACTION: The Assembly voted to postpone the original motion and refer it to the Academic Council for action in light of ongoing budgetary developments and the opinions expressed at the Assembly. (29 in favor, 9 against, 1 abstention)**

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest: Daniel Simmons, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 1, 2010

DRAFT



**Appendix A – 2010-2011 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 1, 2010**

**President of the University:**

Mark Yudof (absent)

Charles Zender

**Academic Council Members:**

Daniel Simmons, Chair  
Robert Anderson, Vice Chair  
Fiona Doyle, Chair, UCB  
Robert Powell, Chair, UCD  
Alan Barbour, Chair, UCI  
Ann Karagozian, Chair, UCLA  
Evan Heit, Chair UCM  
Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR  
Frank Powell, Chair, UCSD  
Bob Newcomer (alt. for Elena Fuentes-Afflick, UCSF)  
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB  
Susan Gillman, Chair, UCSC (absent)  
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS  
James Carmody, Chair, CCGA  
Francis Lu, Chair, UCAAD (absent)  
Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, UCAP  
David Kay, Chair, UCEP  
Joel Dimsdale, Chair, UCFW  
Phokion Kolaitis, Chair, UCORP (absent)  
Brent Haddad (alternate for James Chalfant, UCPB)

**Los Angeles (8)**

Paula Diaconescu  
Malcolm Gordon  
Jody Kreiman  
Timothy Lane  
Duncan Lindsey (absent)  
Susanne Lohmann (absent)  
Purnima Mankekar (absent)  
Joseph Nagy

**Merced (1)**

Susan Amussen (alternate for Ignacio Lopez-Calvo)

**Riverside (2)**

Thomas Morton  
Albert Wang

**San Diego (5 – 1 TBA)**

Timothy Bigby  
Sandra Brown (absent)  
Lorraine Pillus  
Peter Wagner (absent)

**Berkeley (5)**

Daniel Boyarin  
Robert Jacobsen (alternate for Steven Beissinger)  
Thomas Laqueur  
Mary Ann Mason  
Bernard Sadoulet

**San Francisco (4)**

Farid Chehab  
David Gardner  
Deborah Greenspan  
Wendy Max

**Davis (6)**

Richard Grotjahn  
Joel Haas (absent)  
Joseph Kiskis  
Brian Mulloney (absent)  
Terence Murphy  
Krishnan Nambiar

**Santa Barbara (3)**

Rolf Christoffersen (alt. for Ralph Armbruster)  
Gayle Binion  
John Foran

**Santa Cruz (2)**

Joseph Konopelski  
Marilyn Walker

**Irvine (4)**

Luis Aviles (absent)  
Ulysses Jenkins (absent)  
Tahseen Mozaffar

**Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Jean Olson

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

- Daniel Simmons, Academic Assembly Chair

**IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT & SENIOR MANAGERS**

- Mark Yudof, President
- Lawrence Pitts, Provost
- Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources  
Slide presentation available [here](#).

**V. SPECIAL ORDERS**

**A. 2011-12 Assembly Meeting Schedule (information)**

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.b.](#), the following dates for the 2011-12 Assembly meetings were set in consultation with the President of the Senate and the Academic Council: December 7, February 15, April 11, and June 6.

**VI. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**

**VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

- A. CCGA's Guidelines for Self-Supporting Programs [information]**
- James Carmody, CCGA Chair

March 23, 2011

**DANIEL SIMMONS  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

**Re: CCGA Memo to Divisional Graduate Councils: Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs**

Dear Dan:

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has recently seen an increase in the number of submissions of proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs). Given the State of California's financial difficulties and the University's resulting financial constraints, CCGA expects to see a significant increase in the volume of new SSPs being proposed for the indefinite future.

A new SSP policy has been in development for some time, and a draft of the new policy was submitted to the Senate for review late in 2010. A revised draft is currently being worked on by both the administration and the Senate, and the new policy is likely to be approved by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. The attached following guidelines for Senate review of new SSP proposals describe the different stages of the review process.

CCGA respectfully requests that Academic Council:

- 1) Endorse the draft guidelines;
- 2) Forward the draft guidelines to local divisions; and
- 3) Request that the Provost disseminate copies to Graduate Deans and EVCs on the campuses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about these guidelines.

Sincerely,



James Carmody, Ph.D.  
Chair, CCGA

Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director  
CCGA Members

**CCGA Memo to Divisional Graduate Councils:  
Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs  
March 2011**

CCGA has recently seen an increase in the number of submissions of proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs (SSPs). Given the State of California's financial difficulties and the University's resulting financial constraints, CCGA expects to see a significant increase in the volume of new SSPs being proposed for the indefinite future.

A new SSP policy has been in development for some time, and a draft of the new policy was submitted to the Senate for review late in 2010. A revised draft is currently being worked on by both the administration and the Senate, and the new policy is likely to be approved by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. The following guidelines for Senate review of new SSP proposals describe the different stages of the review process.

Campus Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs

Each of the 10 UC campuses has its own unique culture, and the SSP Policy is intended to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate all of these cultures. Divisional Senate review should focus on the degree to which a proposed new SSP embodies and reflects the values of the campus and the specific needs of the target student body.

In addition to evaluating all new proposed SSPs under the criteria set out in the Compendium and CCGA Handbook, Graduate Councils shall consider the potential impact of the addition of an SSP on a department or school's established degree programs.

Proposals for new SSPs shall provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the SSP to ensure that faculty will continue to provide at least the current level of support to and commitment of energy to existing academic graduate programs, especially those programs leading to the granting of the doctoral degree.

Proposals for new SSPs shall provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed. The explanation shall explicitly discuss teaching assignments in SSPs in relation to the usual workload of concerned faculty members and whether teaching in the SSPs will be on an on-load or off-load basis; the explanation shall be accompanied by a copy of any campus policies that deal with off-load teaching and with teaching in SSPs specifically (CCGA strongly recommends that each campus develop and maintain such policies).

Graduate Councils are ill-equipped to consider the financial aspects of proposed new SSPs in the context of the broader planning and budget considerations facing campuses and the university as a whole; consequently, all new SSP proposals shall be submitted to the campus Planning & Budget for comment. P & B comments shall be considered by Graduate Councils and the Graduate Council's view of P & B comments shall be communicated to CCGA following approval of the proposed program. CCGA will, in turn, seek the advice of UCPB in evaluating all proposed new SSPs.

#### Graduate Program Reviews: Self-Supporting Programs

SSP policy requires that all SSPs be reviewed along with all other graduate programs during regularly scheduled graduate program reviews, which typically recur on a 7-8 year cycle. SSPs shall bear their full share of the cost of regularly scheduled graduate program reviews, including costs to the Academic Senate.

Graduate program reviewers shall be tasked explicitly with evaluating the impact of SSPs on academic graduate programs. Graduate Councils shall consider the suspension of admissions to any SSP that has been found, in the course of a graduate program review, to have had an adverse effect on academic graduate programs.

Given the sensitivity of SSPs to market forces, it may be advisable for Graduate Councils to conduct their own reviews of SSPs more frequently.

#### The Meaning of "Self-Supporting" in Self-Supporting Programs: Phase-in Periods

The SSP policy allows for a phase-in period during which a SSP may not be able to recoup its full costs. Any funds used to support an SSP are funds that are not being devoted to the support of existing programs. Graduate Councils, in consultation with P&B, should request that departments and schools demonstrate on an annual basis that SSPs are in fact recouping the full cost of their operation. Graduate Councils shall report the degree to which SSPs are succeeding in recouping their full costs to CCGA at the end of each fiscal year. In the case of SSPs that show a pattern of failing to recoup their full costs (such as incurring losses in two years out of three, for example), Graduate Councils shall consider suspending admission to the program(s) in question.

CCGA will, in the absence of exceptionally compelling arguments, decline to approve new SSPs with phase-in periods in excess of two years.

## Uses of Self-Supporting Program Income in Excess of Cost

The process for reviewing proposed new SSPs described in this memo focuses on preserving the strength and potential for future growth of existing academic research programs, particularly those leading to the PhD degree. CCGA recommends that Graduate Councils conduct ongoing discussions with campus administrations on how SSPs might contribute financially to the campus beyond full-cost reimbursement since the value and viability of these programs rests on significant, long-term, state-supported investment in University academic programs and research. In the context of such discussions, Graduate Councils should consider proposals for new SSPs with a view to their potential for offering fiscal support to state-supported graduate research on campus.

## Expedited Review of Proposal for Self-Supporting Programs

CCGA recognizes that the new SSP policy will increase the volume of new proposals in need of timely review. Programs that might once have been proposed as state-supported programs are likely to be proposed as self-supporting programs in the coming years. The current two-year review period for new degree programs may restrict the opportunities available to some departments and schools. CCGA has, therefore, decided to conduct an expedited review of SSP proposals on a case by case basis when, in the assessment of CCGA, such an expedited review is warranted. In order for CCGA to be able to grant a proposal an expedited review, the proposal will need to meet the following criteria:

The proposed degree requirements and curriculum must have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny at the campus level:

The proposers must solicit reviews from appropriate UC faculty members from other campuses or appropriate professionals. Such reviews must address the review criteria detailed in the CCGA Handbook. Proposers must address issues raised by the solicited reviews and make appropriate adjustments to the SSP proposal. When proposers first formally submit proposals to Graduate Councils for review, they should be accompanied by a narrative explaining how the proposers selected reviewers and responded to the issues they raised. Solicited letters that merely endorse the proposed SSP will be ignored by CCGA.

Graduate Councils must provide detailed accounts of their consideration of “the potential impact of the addition of an SSP on a department or school’s established degree programs” (see Paragraph #2 of “Campus Review of Proposed New Self-Supporting Programs” above).

## **VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [CONT’D]**

### **B. Report from UCPB [information]**

- **James Chalfant, UCPB Chair**

### **C. Report from BOARS [information]**

- **Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair**

## **D. Academic Council**

- **Daniel Simmons, Chair**

- i. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2011-12 Assembly  
[action]**

Senate Bylaw 110.A., which governs the election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly, states: “The Assembly elects a Vice Chair who is a Senate member from a Division other than that of the incoming Chair, to assume office the following September. The Academic Council submits a nomination. Further nominations may be made by the Assembly members from the floor, and on written petition by twenty-five Senate members. The Vice Chair also serves as Vice Chair of the Academic Council. The following year the Vice Chair becomes Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council. Neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair may serve as a Divisional Representative.” In accordance with this bylaw, the Academic Council is submitting its nomination of Professor Robert Powell for the 2011-12 Vice Chair of the Assembly. Professor Powell was selected as the Council’s nominee at its March 30, 2011 meeting. Professor Powell’s qualifications and personal statement are as follows.

### **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

#### **Robert Louis Powell**

Professor & Chair, Department of Chemical Engineering & Materials Science  
Professor, Department of Food Science & Technology  
Bainer Hall, University of California, Davis, CA 95616

#### **Education and Training**

The Johns Hopkins University - Mechanics and Materials Science B. Engr Science - 1972;  
Mechanics & Materials Science - Master of Science in Engineering - 1973  
Mechanics & Materials Science - Doctor of Philosophy - 1978  
McGill University – Department of Chemistry Post-Doctoral Fellow – 1978-79

#### **Professional Experience**

University of California, Davis, California  
Chair, Department of Chemical Engineering & Materials Science – 7/02 to Present  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate – 7/08 to Present  
Professor of Food Science & Technology – 7/00 to Present  
Professor of Chemical Engineering & Materials Science - 7/90 to Present  
Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering - 7/84 to June 6/90  
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri  
Assistant & Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering - 7/79 to 7/84

#### **Academic Senate Committees and related duties**

University of California - Systemwide  
1989 - 1990, 91-92 Member, Committee on Research Policy  
1995 – 1996, 01-02 Member, Committee on Planning and Budget  
2008 – present Member, Academic Council  
2008- 2009 Member, UC Davis Chancellor Search Committee  
2009 Member, Task Force on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency  
2009 – present Member, Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI)

2010 - Member, Senate / UC Office of the President Leadership Team  
 University of California, Davis Campus  
 1984 - 1985 Departmental Representative to University's Representative Assembly  
 1985 - 1987 Member, Regent's Scholarship Committee  
 1988 - 1989 Member, Research Committee  
 1989 - 1992 Chair, Research Committee  
 1992 - 1993 Member, Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review (CAPBR)  
 1985, 1986, 1991, 1993  
 1996-98, 2002-09 Chancellor's Fall Conference Participant  
 1993 - 1994 Chair, CAPBR  
 1993 - 1994 Member, Executive Council of the Academic Senate  
 1993 - 1994, 96-99 Member, Chancellor's Academic Positions Allocation Workgroup  
 1993 - 1994 Member, Academic Planning Council  
 1996 - 1998 Member, Budget Process Steering Committee  
 2000 - 02, 04 Member, CAPBR  
 2003 - 06 Member, Vice Chair (04-05), Chair (05-06) Committee on Committees (elected)  
 2005-2008 Member, Executive Council, Davis Division - Academic Senate  
 2006-2008 Vice Chair, Davis Division - Academic Senate  
 2006-present Member, Committee on Planning and Budget  
 2008 - present Chair, Davis Division - Academic Senate  
 2008-present Chair, Executive Council, Davis Division - Academic Senate  
 2008 - present Member, Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors  
 2009 Member, Budget Advisory Committee  
 2009 Co-Chair, Budget Advisory Committee Subcommittee: Administration  
 2010 Co-Chair, Search Committee for Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor  
 2010-present Member, Oversight Committee for UC Davis Organizational Excellence

**Senate Issues – 2011- 2013**  
**Robert Powell**

The overarching issue that faces the University of California and hence is at the heart of nearly every Senate discussion is the budget. Nearly every discussion for any foreseeable future will be in the shadow of the continuing crisis that the State and thereby UC face. The Senate must focus its efforts on ensuring that academic excellence is kept as our foremost goal. The Senate must take a leadership role in articulating the need to focus on graduate education and research as the key parts of the mission of UC that has made us the leading public university in the world.

**Faculty remuneration.** The dedication and patience of our faculty have been tested far beyond what anyone would deem as reasonable. The Senate leadership must continue to be steadfast in pursuing a fully funded program that will put our salaries on a par with those our peer institutions. We must seek competitive benefits for our current and emeritus faculty that ensures access to excellent health care, while continuing our efforts to provide for competitive pension benefits.

**Funding Streams.** The Academic Council must share information about the implementation of the funding streams budgeting model. Key questions to be addressed include how the medical centers are handled and are resources reaching the campus units where the activity is.

**Rebenching.** Efforts to recalibrate the allocation of the base state budget promises to be one of the biggest internal budgeting challenges ever undertaken by UC.

**Systemwide.** Funding streams, rebenching and the campus – specific approach to the enrollment management of nonresident and California - resident undergraduates will lead to less centralization. The Systemwide Senate leadership play a key and nearly unique role and must ensure that a strong sense of the UC as one university is maintained.

**Enrollment.** Increasing the number of nonresident undergraduates is one of the most obvious means of bringing new resources to campuses. Coordination of these efforts could greatly increase our overall competitiveness for top students. The Senate should be involved in strategic decisions that could lead to California residents being displaced in our haste to increase revenue.

**Non-traditional approaches to degrees.** Increasingly we see proposals for self-supporting programs or changing a program to a professional degree. These issues will continue as auxiliary units like University Extension seeks to claim new ground for offering programs.

**Flexibility.** A challenge for the Senate is the trade-off between offering campuses flexibility and asserting the need for Systemwide action. There is clearly going to be a need for principles that guide the work of the Academic Council. As we have this year, we must continue to take leadership roles and seek to identify emergent issues. The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair cannot tackle all of these issues. Their task is to empower committees, especially committee chairs, and bring them into a partnership with the Senate staff. Every fall at UCD, my first task as Divisional Chair has been building the Executive Council into a team: getting people to know one another and ensuring a voice for everyone at the outset. I work on issues with small groups of chairs and I also let it be known that I am available to meet with all committees. I have also engaged department chairs in meetings with Senate chairs to discuss issues related to personnel, research, graduate and undergraduate education. For me it is about communication, making sure that people know that the work they do is important, empowering committees and knowing the limits of what I can do.

**VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [information]**

- Joel Dimsdale, UCFW Chair

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**