UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

NOTICE OF MEETING
TELECONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, April 10, 2013
10:00 am - 1:00 pm

To participate in the teleconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place.
If you are off-campus, you may call 1-866-740-1260 and key in access code 9879467#.

I. Roll Call

2012-13 Assembly Roll Call April 10, 2013

President of the University:
Mark G. Yudof (absent)

Academic Council Members:
Robert Powell, Chair
William Jacob, Vice Chair
Christina Maslach, Chair, UCB
Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair, UCD
Mary Gilly, Chair, UCI
Linda Sarna, Chair, UCLA
Peggy O'Day, Chair, UCM
Jose Wudka, Chair, UCR
Guy Masters, Chair, UCSD
Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF
Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair, UCSB
Joe Konopelski, Chair, UCSC
George Johnson, Chair, BOARS
Ruth Mulnard, Chair, CCGA
Manuela Martins-Green, Chair, UCAAD
Harry Green, Chair, UCAP
John Yoder, Chair, UCEP
Daniel Hare, Chair, UCFW
Mike Kleeman, Chair, UCORP
Bernard Minster, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)
Daniel Boyarin
Whitney Davis
Allen Goldstein
Jennifer Johnson-Hanks
Jeffrey Perloff
Patricia Zambryski

Davis (6)
Trish Berger
Theodore DeJong
Richard Grotjahn
Ahmet Palazoglu
Saul Schaefer
Jeffrey Williams

Irvine (4)
Elliott Currie
Christopher Leslie
Carrie Noland
Craig Walsh

Los Angeles (8)
Malcolm Gordon
Jennifer Krull
Timothy Lane
Alan Laub
Susanne Lohmann
Joseph Nagy
Monica Smith
Richard Steinberg

Merced (1)
Wolfgang Rogge

Riverside (2)
Richard Luben
Bahram Mobasher

San Diego (5)
John Hildebrand
Eduardo Macagano
Douglas Magde
Jan Talbot
Eric Watkins

San Francisco (4)
Farid Chehab
David Gardner
Janice Lee
Robert Nissenson

Santa Barbara (3)
Ralph Archuleta
Claudio Fogu
Louise Fradenburg

Santa Cruz (2)
Donald Brenneis
Joel Ferguson

Secretary/Parliamentarian
Jean Olson

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUNE 6, 2012
MINUTES OF MEETING

I.   ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met via teleconference on Wednesday, June 6, 2012. Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. 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.

II.   MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the April 11, 2012 meeting as noticed.

III.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

   A. **Report on the Memorial to the Regents.** Chair Anderson reported that the faculty voted overwhelmingly (93%) in favor of a Memorial calling on the Regents to support specific ballot measures and legislation to increase state revenues and/or prioritize funding for higher education. The president will convey the results to the Regents at their July meeting. While there is no specific provision for higher education in the governor's ballot measure (Proposition 30), the revenues raised would free up general funds that would otherwise be allocated to K-12 under the provisions of Proposition 98. Chair Powell noted that UC fared relatively well vis-à-vis other agencies in the governor's budget proposal. However, if Proposition 30 does not pass, the University will be subject to a $250M cut in the current fiscal year. If Proposition 30 passes, the University will be substantially better off than if it fails.
   B. **Apportionment of Representatives to the 2012-13 Assembly.** Chair Anderson reported the number of representatives per campus to the 2012-13 Assembly.

IV.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

President Yudof reported that he is in favor of the governor's ballot measure to enhance revenue and hopes to get the Board of Regents to endorse it. He noted that despite the financial turmoil, UC has a good record of faculty retention, the number of Nobel laureates and other honorees have increased and the University of California is still a great university.

President Yudof reported that the Berkeley Chancellor search is progressing. However, it is challenging, given the compensation that UC can offer. During the recent chancellor search at UCSD, we treated the current salary as a base and provided a 5% increase over that using non-state funds. I may consider creating endowments on campuses for this purpose. One of the candidates for chancellor at UCSD would have had to have taken a $135K pay cut to come to UC. That's not competitive and makes it difficult to recruit.

Q: Can you describe the progress on online education?
A: Faculty are developing 25 core courses through UCOE. One of the main benefits of UCOE is the development of a common platform. Frankly, the campuses are doing more on online education than OP.

Q: What is your view of the Thirty Meter Telescope?
A: I am very supportive of the TMT. It is a great project that will serve our top-notch astronomers. Securing NSF participation is critical because our foreign government partners want to see US involvement.

Q: The University has undertaken rebenching, which predated the state audit. It is our single best response to criticism of UC for increasing the non-resident student population. Why are we moving so slowly?
A: We are doing everything we can internally. This is a major effort to address the quality issue.

Q: What is your view of the Birgeneau proposal to establish a campus board of directors?
A: We just discussed this at the Council of Chancellors meeting. In its present form, I can not support it. The positive aspect of the proposal is that such a group would know the campus well. But campus boards will not solve our three major problems: tuition, expenditures, and compensation. There may be ways to delegate authority to the campuses through advisory boards. However, Florida did this and it resulted in lawsuits filed against the Board of Regents by the campus boards. Having multiple local boards does not serve the Community College system well, either.

Q: What is your view of the future of ANR?
A: I am a big supporter of ANR. I know that some of my colleagues think it is funded too amply. While I am not opposed to carefully examining budgets, I spend a lot of time throughout the state, and ANR's presence and significance in the state is enormous. UC's agricultural advisory commission has been a very good ally. Its members have access to Republican legislators and advocate for the University.
Comment: The amount of the tax going to the Agricultural Experiment Stations off the top has grown substantially. Although ANR made significant progress on budget transparency, the broader University community still does not know enough. The Senate would like to help ANR make the case that they are essential to the state.

V.   SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]

VI.   REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII.   REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A.   UCP&T Proposed Revision to Senate Bylaw 337.

Chair Anderson clarified that this particular bylaw section does not apply to disciplinary cases; there is a separate procedure. Because dismissal can be a consequence of a disciplinary hearing, there is a need to clarify that early termination is a result of incompetence to carry out one's duties.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously approved the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 337.

B.   BOARS Proposal on Transfer

BOARS Chair William Jacob reported that the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 476 are a result of two years of work by BOARS. BOARS proposes adding two additional pathways to transfer admission to the existing pathway: (1) Completion of a UC Transfer Curriculum (in the relevant major) and (2) completion of an approved Associate Degree for Transfer (in the relevant major) from a California Community College. Last year, BOARS reviewed current transfer policies with the admissions directors and monitored the progress of SB 1440, which requires CSU to admit students who have completed an AA or AS transfer degree with a 2.4 GPA or better to at least one campus and to guarantee 60 semester

units of credit in the student's major toward a BA. CSU and CCC have agreed upon model curricula for 300 degrees for transfer. UC is not required to accept transfer degrees, but BOARS decided to guarantee review of applications of students who complete transfer degrees and who meet a GPA determined by the campus to which they apply. He emphasized that the UC Transfer Curricula will be defined by departments. In response to the systemwide review of the proposed revisions to SR 476, BOARS will modify the Implementation Guidelines by adding the phrase, "choosing applicants with a high likelihood of timely graduation." This will resolve the problem of transfer students who do not take difficult courses such as Calculus II in order to keep their GPAs high, but who then are unprepared for UC-level work. Each department at every campus will discuss what they value in their transfer applicants and will collaborate with their admissions departments through their admissions committees to determine the appropriate mix of courses required of transfer degree applicants. They can choose to require only the completion of IGETC, or they can choose to require a transfer curriculum. This revision satisfied UCSD, which had objected to the original version. The current version of the proposal is broad enough to accommodate all the needs and perspectives of varied departments. Chair Anderson said that a UC Transfer curriculum gives us the opportunity to require different course preparation than CSU. If we do not set our own criteria, students will apply with an AA degree based on CSU's criteria. A member asked if they expect the change to increase applications significantly. Chair Jacob replied that there is no way to estimate its impact. However, if it causes a flood of applications, campuses can increase the minimum GPA. The intent is to produce better prepared applicants. However, he expects that the vast majority of transfer students will qualify under the original pathway.

MOTION: A member suggested the following amendment: "The minimum acceptable grade point average will be set by each division and must be at least 2.4 and can not exceed 3.0." Chair Jacob accepted the amendment and the motion carried by voice vote.

ACTION: The Assembly unanimously approved the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 476 as amended, above.

C. **Academic Council [ACTION]**
1. **Nomination and election of the 2012-13 UCOC Vice Chair**

Chair Anderson clarified that Professor Sutter is currently vice chair of UCOC and will automatically become chair. However, the Assembly must vote to elect the 2012-13 vice chair.

ACTION: The Assembly voted unanimously to elect Professor Martha Conklin, UC Merced, to serve as 2012-13 UCOC vice chair.

2. Discussion of University Committee on Computing and Communications
   - **Robert Anderson, Academic Council Chair**
   - **Anthony Joseph, UCCC Member and past Chair**

Chair Anderson stated his concern that UCCC has not been functioning well, stemming from its broad mandate to examine computing. He noted that it was established at a time when computing was rare and the internet did not exist. It was beginning to take on an important role, but was not ubiquitous. Now computing has become a substantial part of other committees' mandates. For example, UC Online Education is appropriately in UCEP's purview. UCORP and UCPB often engage issues of technology. Second, the committee has been sparsely attended and some divisions have even declined to appoint members. Third, the committee's actions have been limited and it has not taken on systemwide technology issues that could be in its portfolio. For these reasons, the Academic Council recommended that UCCC be abolished, and UCOC agreed, on the condition that the specific parts of UCCC's mandate be reassigned in the bylaws to other committees.

Professor Anthony Joseph, a former UCCC chair, spoke on behalf of UCCC. He stated that the committee is passionate about their role in oversight of information technology. He noted that in his five years of service on UCCC the committee discussed IT security, policies for online social discourse, and best practices for IT. He stated that the committee's role is more important than ever because of numerous systemwide IT initiatives, such as the shared computing pilot project, which it strongly opposed. He said that moving UCCC issues to other committees is problematic, as they are already overwhelmed and may lack expertise. The UCOP IT Leadership Council addresses some issues, but their focus is on administrative computing, not research, and those administrative decisions impact faculty and therefore should have faculty input. He also noted that the ITLC has not consulted with UCCC until recently. He also addressed the issue of poor participation in UCCC by noting that the lack of empowerment led to a lack of participation. However, this is an opportunity to revisit the UCCC's bylaw and strengthen the committee's role.

Several Assembly members spoke in support of maintaining the committee in order to have systemwide Senate input on IT matters. We may lose the opportunity to have input by disbanding the committee. Chair Anderson noted that there is active Senate involvement on the privacy and security committee, but not by UCCC, nor has UCCC taken the initiative to lead on other key issues. A member commented that it is important to have Senate representation early in policy deliberations. Many committees comment from their own perspectives, but a single committee may not understand the whole picture.

A member questioned the extent to which we need a separate committee since technology pervades the University. For example, the subject of online education is largely being led by UCEP, with input from UCPB and BOARS. The issue is broader than just technical computing issues. Also, the Senate convenes special committees when particular expertise is required. For example, it recently established a Blue Ribbon Panel to assess the evaluation of UCOE comprising experts in the field of evaluation. A member noted that UCM does not have a computing committee, so their research committee reviewed the shared services pilot program. What does UCCC do that can not be done by other committees? Professor Anthony replied that the difference is in the speed of innovation in computing. UCCC attempts to forecast computing infrastructure needs for the future.

Members suggested restructuring the committee membership, rewriting its bylaw, and having ex officio membership from the other standing committees on UCCC. Professor Anthony replied that UCCC would welcome that.

ACTION: Assembly referred the item to Council with instructions to consider the formation of an information technology committee as an alternative to UCCC. The motion carried by voice vote.

3. Academic Graduate Student Support [DISCUSSION]
   ▪ **Rachael Goodhue, Chair, Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support**

Rachael Goodhue, Chair of CCG and of the Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS), stated that the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents asked the Senate to work with the administration on a report on academic graduate student support. The Academic Council formed a Task Force to develop a report, along with the report of the joint Senate-Administrative Work Group on Graduate Student Issues, which will be presented to the Regents in July. CAGSS is composed of three members of CCGA, UCORP and UCPB and three graduate student representatives.

CAGSS worked with UCOP to analyze data regarding admissions, applications, enrollment, and employment of graduate students and collected stories of problems regarding graduate support at the grass-roots. It identified three key issues: net stipends, increasing tuition, and non-residential

supplemental tuition. Stipends are unattractive compared to other institutions. The larger the net stipend gap, the lower the percentage of enrollments. On average, UC's net stipend is $2,169 below students' top non-UC institution. This affects UC's yield, our competitiveness in attracting the students we admitted. Are net stipends for continuing students adequate? Increasing tuition affects net stipend funds. In addition, as the cost of a graduate student employee rises, it is less desirable for faculty to hire a GSR as opposed to a post-doc. GSR employment has remained constant, while post-doc employment has grown over the past couple of years by 4%. Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST) can distort admissions decision, as it is far more expensive to admit an international student if faculty or departmental funds are used to support that student through tuition support. A survey of 27 AAU-member public institutions showed that only two charge NRST to research grants. The Task Force recommends: (1) Affirming the Senate's 2006 Memorial to the Regents on non-resident tuition. At that time, the Regents took two steps to mitigate the effects of NRT by freezing it at 2007-08 levels and exempting international students from paying it for three years after advancement to candidacy. The Task Force suggests leveling the playing field by requiring international students to pay only one year of NRT, as we do for domestic non-residents. In this way, programs would be able to make admissions decisions based on merit. (2) Ending the practice of charging NRT to research grants. (3) Eliminating systemwide time limits on employment. (4) Allocating additional resources for net stipends. It would cost relatively little to equalize the treatment of international and domestic non-residents (approximately $15M).

4. Discussion with Administrators by Invitation of the Academic Council

a. Robinson-Edley Report on Campus Responses to Protests

- **Charles Robinson, Vice President and General Counsel**
- **Christopher Edley, Berkeley Law Dean and Special Advisor to the President**

VP Robinson stated that the report jointly authored by himself and Dean Edley focuses on protestors who are members of the University community with grievances that administrators can address. They recognize that there may be cases in which anarchists or non-affiliates have grievances that are not well-articulated and that the report does not address such circumstances. Rather than performing a fact finding function which is being done in other ways, the report aims to make recommendations for the future. They began with a broad outreach effort, meeting with various constituencies on all nine undergraduate campuses, as well as with experts in campus policing. The draft report was published and discussed at the May Regents meeting. Once comments responding to the draft are incorporated, the report will be published in final form in July.

The report highlights the importance of thinking about civil disobedience, protests, policing, prevention, and response to protests in the context of academic values. It recognizes civil disobedience as a legitimate type of protest. While there may be consequences to civil disobedience, they should be measured and commensurate to the threat to the academic mission of the university. The applicability of general policing to the campus context is debatable and the University community's purpose and values must be reflected in the way the University handles protests. The University must focus on preventing disruptive protests in the first place and respond to the underlying issues motivating the protest. There should be vehicle to engage substantively and effectively on those issues so that protest is not viewed as a first resort. Relationship building in advance of protests is an important theme, as well as communication not only with the leaders of the protest, but with the university as a whole. The use of force should be a last resort. The report also delineated the range of police responses that are available. The force response continuum depends upon circumstance and context so we did not try to prescribe details. While the report recommends strongly against the use of pepper spray, it is not proscribed because there are circumstances in which it may be the most appropriate non-lethal use of force.

Campuses are already doing much of what the report recommends; every chancellor has learned from these incidents and has changed policies. One question raised was who is in charge during a major incident. The report recommends that administrators be accountable and be in charge with appropriate deference to the experience of the police with respect to the tactics chosen. Chancellors are ultimately responsible, but should delegate a senior administrator who preferably is a member of the faculty and who has credibility among the students and faculty.

Q: In the past the police have used force when it is not appropriate. The report does not provide guidance on when it is appropriate. Also, it is essential that students be warned if administrators decide to use the student discipline process as an alternative to the use of force by police. The draft report does not require prior warning. Student disciplinary hearings sometimes are conducted without attention to rights and do not work in cases of sexual assault.
A: The report proposes that each campus create guidelines on the use of force and forward them to OP. We think it is better to use the student disciplinary process than to bring charges through the District Attorney's office. Thank you for the suggestion on prior warning.

Q: Would you consider using a civilian security force and depend on city police forces when needed?
A: We considered this option, but the campuses are substantial communities of over 60,000 people. There will be times when they need protection. Also, it is important that the police officers are accountable to the chancellor, not the mayor. We can train them in ways that reflect academic values. Finally, campus police deal with situations that require sworn officers, such as enforcing restraining orders.

Comment: I commend the recommendation that avenues of communication need to be improved. The administration at my campus insists that avenues of communication already exist, such as ombudsmen and public comment time at the Regents. I would like to see more substantive proposals about the responsibility of administrators and the use of mediators.

Comment: The recommendation for post-event review by a few people at UCOP is inadequate. The review should be under the control of student/faculty boards.
A: The evidence shows that civilian review boards do not work well. A state law (Police Officer's Bill of Rights) also is a barrier to external review of events. Many jurisdictions have adopted an "auditor model" of accountability, which is what the report proposes by UCOP review. Any such review must be independent of campus leadership.

Q: To what extent have student leaders contributed to the report?
A: VP Robinson replied that they met with the student leadership several times and asked student organizations to submit comments on the draft. The UCSA has endorsed the report and the incoming student Regent, Jonathan Stein, wants it implemented immediately. The report will also be reviewed systemwide.

Comment: The report states that mass arrests incite violence and recommends that this practice be eliminated. But orderly mass arrests are possible and have historically been part of protests. It is police procedures and conduct that has changed, not civil disobedience.

b. Update on State Budget

- **Patrick Lenz, Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources**

Vice President Lenz reported that his office has been working with the Department of Finance, but the budget process is unclear. Several issues remain unresolved, including how they will treat tuition or a potential tuition buyout ($124M). VP Lenz' office has proposed a multi-year budget and transferring the lease revenue debt service to UC so that the University could refinance it under better terms in order to

free up $80M. The governor has recommended that the Cal Grant standard be brought down to Pell Grant standard beginning in 2013-14. It would garner the state $43M in savings, half of which would come from UC. It would increase the average student debt load from $17K to $30K unless UC was able to buy out the difference. If the revenue measure on the ballot does not pass, then it would be difficult for the University to address any shortfall and it may have to abandon the Blue and Gold program. However, prior to the May budget revise, the state Assembly rejected every proposal on Cal Grants, making a statement about the priority of financial aid.

Q: Have you revisited enrollment?
A: The number of unfunded students is anywhere between 24,000 and 36,000, depending on how you count, due to the recent budget cuts. We CSU has cut enrollment, but we can't get consensus from the campuses to reduce student enrollment. We need to be more strategic.

Q: What is the long-term outlook on the legislature contributing to retirement funds?
A: There has been a lot of progress in this area. When Governor Schwarzenegger's budget provided $20M for UCRP, the legislature not only removed the funds, it put into statute a provision that precluded any general funds from going into UCRP. We got that reversed and the legislature has admitted that they have a fiduciary obligation because they made contributions prior to 1990, if not a legal obligation, and that this obligation is the same as for CSU and other state employees. $52M is allocated in this year's budget and it is imperative to protect it because it establishes a precedent.

VIII.   UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX.   PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI.   NEW BUSINESS

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Robert Anderson, Academic Senate Chair
Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 6, 2012

President of the University:
Mark G. Yudof

Academic Council Members:
Robert Anderson, Chair
Robert Powell, Vice Chair
Robert Jacobson, Chair, UCB
Linda Bisson, Chair, UCD
Craig Martens, Chair, UCI
Andrew Leuchter, Chair, UCLA
Susan Amussen, Chair UCM
Irving Hendrick (alt. for Mary Gauvain), UCR
T. Guy Masters (alt. for Joel Sobel, Chair, UCSD)
Farid Chehab (alt. for Robert Newcomer, Chair, UCSF)
Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB
Susan Gilman, Chair, UCSC
William Jacob, Chair, BOARS
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, CCGA
Margaret Conkey, Chair, UCAAD
Katja Lindenberg, Chair, UCAP
Jose Wudka, Chair, UCEP
William Parker, Chair, UCFW
John Crawford, Chair, UCORP
James Chalfant, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)
Steven Beissinger
Harsha Ram (alt. for Daniel Boyarin)
Paula Fass (alt. for Ralph Catalano)
Allen Goldstein
Jeffrey Perloff
Patricia Zambryski

Davis (6)
Trish Berger (absent)
Theodore DeJong (absent)
Richard Grotjahn
Joseph Kiskis
Krishnan Nambiar
Saul Schaefer (absent)

Irvine (4)
David Kay (alt. for Christopher Leslie)
Tahseen Mozaffar
Carrie Noland
Charles Zender

Los Angeles (8)
Malcolm Gordon (absent)
Ninez Ponce (alt. for Jennifer Krull)
Timothy Lane (absent)
Alan Laub (absent)
David Lopez (alt. for Susanne Lohmann)
Joseph Nagy
Monica Smith
Richard Steinberg

Merced (1)
Robin DeLugan (alt. for Wolfgang Rogge)

Riverside (2)
Jodie Holt
Bahram Mobasher (alt. for Thomas Morton)

San Diego (5)
John Hildebrand
Judith Varner (alt. for Douglas Magde)
Gershon Shafir (alt. for Lorraine Pillus)
Peter Wagner
Eric Watkins

San Francisco (3)
Norman Oppenheimer (alt. for David Gardner)
Wendy Max (absent)

Santa Barbara (3 -1 TBA)
John Foran (absent)
Vicki Scott

Santa Cruz (2)
Marilyn Walker
Joseph Konopelski

Secretary/Parliamentarian
Jean Olson

III.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
▪ **Robert Powell**

IV.   ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST
▪ **Aimée Dorr**

V.   SPECIAL ORDERS
A.   **Consent Calendar [NONE]**
B.   **Annual Reports [2011-12]**

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE: The Academic Council is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate and acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters. It advises the President on behalf of the Assembly and has the continuing responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of Universitywide concern.

During the 2011-12 year, the Academic Council considered multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Its final recommendations and reports can be found on the Academic Senate website. Matters of particular import for the year include:

BUDGETARY ISSUES

Council engaged in continued discussion of UC's internal budgetary reforms, known as Funding Streams and Rebenching. In Council's March 2011 response to the administration's Funding Streams budget initiative, it expressed concern that the "rebenching" of state general funds should occur as soon as possible, and that an enrollment management system should be devised to counter certain incentives of Funding Streams. In August 2011, it forwarded a set of resolutions based on the report of Council's Implementation Task Force, which provided an approach to rebenching and was distributed to the President's Budget Rebenching Committee for consideration. The Rebenching Committee met throughout the fall and concluded its work in March. In May, Council wrote a letter to President Yudof urging completion, release and systemwide review of the report of the Rebenching Budget Committee. In late June, the report was released and Council distributed it to be reviewed in the fall of 2012. Council simultaneously distributed a summary of the main points of the rebenching report and an outline of next steps written by two of the Senate members of the committee. In July, Council unanimously endorsed a document outlining principles and recommendations for enrollment management in the context of rebenching, and approved the formation of a task force of the Academic Council to address issues of enrollment management.

In April, Council forwarded to the president a Memorial to the Regents requesting that they authorize public advocacy "in support of specific measures that will increase state revenues and specific measures that will prioritize funding for public higher education." 93% of faculty members who voted on the Memorial recommended this course of action. In May, Council unanimously approved asking the president to convey to the Regents that Council urged the Board to endorse Proposition 30, the ballot measure proposed by the governor. In July, the president presented the Senate Memorial to the Regents in the context of his recommendation that they endorse California ballot measure Proposition 30; they subsequently endorsed Proposition 30.

A subset of Council members also participated in regular teleconferences held by Provost and EVC Pitts to brief them on budget issues.

FACULTY WELFARE

The Senate reviewed UCAAD's salary equity study. Many respondents objected to the methodology and/or stated that the divisions have their own approaches to grappling with this issue. In June, Council endorsed UCAAD's proposal that individual campuses study the extent of any salary inequities on the campus and propose strategies to correct them, with plans of action for developing a study to be reported to UCAAD by

November 15, 2012.

The Senate conducted a systemwide review of the report of the joint Senate-Administration Faculty Salaries Task Force. In April, Council passed three motions in response. While Council members agreed that raising faculty salaries is vital to maintaining UC's competitiveness, it was divided on whether salary increases should be contingent on the availability of additional resources and how any increases should be distributed.

ADMISSIONS

In December, Council endorsed BOARS' resolution affirming existing UC policy on admissions guarantees. It also endorsed a resolution that campuses should evaluate and select resident and nonresident applicants according to the same criteria and that admitted nonresidents should compare favorably to admitted California residents at each campus. In March, it endorsed BOARS' resolution to ensure the integrity of the Eligibility in Local Context program.

In February, Council recommended that students be given the opportunity to self-identify as LGBT on Student Intent to Register forms and all forms completed by matriculated students, but not on admissions documents.

The Senate reviewed a proposal from BOARS that would add two new pathways for transfer in addition to the existing pathway. The two new paths are recognition of SB 1440 AA/AS degrees, and a UC transfer curriculum. After further revisions by BOARS, Council forward it to the Academic Assembly. The Assembly approved the proposal and a revision to Senate Regulation 476, which defines transfer pathways.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

In January, Council considered revisions to the existing policy on self-supporting graduate degree programs proposed by the administration. Responses to the review of the policy raised broad concerns about the impact of self-supporting programs on the University's core educational mission. Concerns included the need for stricter criteria for the establishment of SSPs, issues of faculty workload and fiscal viability, program quality, and the potential of new self-supporting programs to drain resources from existing state-supported programs. In March, Council unanimously endorsed guidelines that CCGA developed for use by campus Graduate Councils and Committees on Planning and Budget in reviewing proposals for new Self-Supporting Programs. In June it endorsed CCGA's guidelines for the conversion of existing graduate degree programs from state-supported to self-supported status and from self-supported to state-supported status.

At the request of the Chair of the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents, the Academic Council established a Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support. In June, Council unanimously endorsed the recommendations of the Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS), including: (1) waiving Non-resident Supplemental Tuition (NRST) for doctoral students, or, as alternatives, increasing the number of years NRST is waived for international doctoral students or foregoing future tuition increases for international academic doctoral students; (2) not charging NRST to research grants; (3) eliminating the systemwide limits on the number of terms a student may be employed as a graduate student instructor (GSI); and (4) allocating additional resources for net stipends for academic doctoral student support. The report, along with the report of a joint Senate-administration Task Force on Graduate Education Competitiveness, will be presented to the Regents in the fall.

In July, Council wrote to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges objecting to WASC's request for data on graduate programs in anticipation of changes to their requirements for program reviews. Council stated that the data requirements listed in the draft regulations do not provide useful measures of graduate program quality and success and that UC and professional accreditation program review processes are rigorous means of ensuring program quality.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

In June 2011, Council endorsed UCEP's recommendation that it appoint an independent "blue-ribbon panel" of experts to review and report periodically to the Senate on the progress and results of the evaluation of the Online Instruction Pilot Project. In September, Council approved a charge. In May, Council endorsed disclaimer language required by BOARS' on marketing materials of campus-affiliated programs offering courses to non-matriculated students. In June, Council recommended that UCOP grant UCOE a moratorium on repaying its loan so that it can focus its attention on programmatic issues and ensuring quality, rather than accommodating non-matriculated students.

In October, Council issued a response critical of aspects of the proposed revisions to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation review handbook and urged WASC to maintain its tradition of local determination and assessment of institutional learning goals. In January, Council again wrote to WASC stressing its position that reliance on external peer review should be the primary tool for validating the quality of undergraduate programs, rather than abstract metrics. It included a white paper on the subject by UCEP, and a proposal for adapting UC's existing program review process to meet WASC's accreditation review requirements.

In the fall, UCEP Chair Wudka submitted a proposed revision to SR 610 for systemwide review to clarify that "residency" in the regulation refers to courses approved by the relevant UC Senate bodies, rather than physical presence on campus. The campuses responded that physical presence should be a requirement to qualify for residency. In response, UCEP revised the wording to give campuses flexibility to clarify physical presence rules and to accommodate online courses. In May, Council referred the proposed amendment back to UCEP for further revision.

In July Council endorsed UCEP's proposed changes to the Compendium's section to clarify the procedures for undergraduate program discontinuances for programs with unique titles or those that are the last of their kind in the UC system, and recommended adoption by the Academic Planning Council.

RESEARCH ISSUES

In June, Council endorsed UCORP's Research Mission statement. It also endorsed the recommendations of the Principles, Processes, and Assessments of Universitywide Research (PPA) Task Force, the drafting of which UCORP significantly influenced.

In April, Council commented on the external review of the UC Observatories (UCO), after consultation with UCPB, UCORP and the astronomy faculty. Also in April, Council issued a statement of support for the academic freedom of researchers who work on controversial subjects to pursue their work free from harassment. Council recommended that the funds generated by the University's management of the national laboratories be allocated to research projects identified through the Laboratory Fee Research Program.

GOVERNANCE

In November, Council unanimously adopted four statements regarding UC's response to campus protests.

In January, Council voted to ask UCOC to consider dissolving UCCC on the grounds that its charge is obsolete, and to inform UCCC of this recommendation. UCOC subsequently recommended that UCCC be disbanded, contingent on Council establishing a work group to assign the parts of its charge to existing standing committees. In April, Council voted unanimously to recommend to the Academic Assembly that UCCC be disbanded and to establish a work group to determine which parts of UCCC's charge should be assigned to other standing committees. In May, Council proposed amendments to the bylaws that reassigned UCCC's charge to standing committees and voted unanimously to forward the proposed revisions to the Assembly for consideration at its June 2012 meeting. The Assembly referred the matter back to Council, with instructions to consider formation of an information technology committee as an alternative to UCCC.

In March, the San Francisco division announced that full-time faculty in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series at the Associate and Full Professor levels at the San Francisco campus would be considered Senate members effective July 1, 2012 based on the division's interpretation of Standing Order of the Regents 105.1. Council appointed a committee to devise a charge for a task force to attempt to address some of the concerns of the San Francisco division. Simultaneously, Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Powell requested that UCR&J consider the issues arising from the division's announcement. UCR&J issued a draft ruling in June and a final ruling in July stating that UCSF's proposed action is inconsistent both with the Standing Orders of the Regents and with Senate bylaws regarding membership. The ruling will be reported to the Academic Assembly at its next meeting.

SENATE TASK FORCES AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Senate members participated on the following task forces and special committees:

- Joint Senate/Administrative Work Group on Rebenching
- UC Online Education Advisory Committee and Work Groups
- Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force on Salary Scales
- Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support
- Joint Work Group on Academic Graduate Student Issues
- Provost Search Committee
- UCSD and UCB Chancellor Search Committees

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS AND INITIATIVES

After completing a systemwide review, Council responded to the Faculty Diversity Working Group report. It strongly recommended restoring funding to the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and increasing the stipends for its fellows, and emphasized that provosts, deans and department chairs play a critical role in achieving diversity in faculty recruitment. It commented on other best practices identified in the report, and recommended that no changes be made to APM 210 pending further discussion in the fall.

REVIEW OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL (APM)

Based on responses to a systemwide review, Council strongly opposed, as written, the proposal for a new section of the APM, APM 668, which would allow academic departments to use non-state funds to provide additional salary for general campus faculty, similar to the health sciences compensation plan. However, Council recognized the need to find ways to ways to better compensate faculty and improve retention.

Council discussed the proposed revisions to APM 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan), and responded with specific concerns. Academic Personnel submitted a revised version to the Senate for a targeted review. In response, UCFW submitted a letter reiterating their concern that deans would have too much power over the advisory committee. Vice Provost Carlson then circulated a proposal to amend the revision so that deans would appoint no more than half of the members. Council unanimously endorsed the proposed revision of APM 670 as amended by Vice Provost Carlson.

In January, Council requested that the administration develop a proposal to rescind certain subsections of APM 133, which, in part, restrict UC campuses from hiring in certain academic titles a faculty member denied tenure by another UC campus, and circulate the proposal for systemwide review.

Council also responded to proposed revisions to APM 200 and 205 on the recall of retired academic employees. Council approved technical revisions to APM Sections 035 and 190, Appendix A-1, to ensure consistency with existing federal and state law. Council responded to proposed revisions to APM 530 and 710-11, objecting to language in APM 530 that unnecessarily restricts the criteria for University sponsorship of foreign faculty members. Council also responded to proposed changes to APM 010, 015 and 016. It strongly supported the addition of language to APMs 010 and 015 as an essential clarification of academic freedom in light of recent court cases, but opposed the proposed revisions to APM 016.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

The Regents
The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair executed their roles as faculty representatives to the Regents throughout the year, acting in an advisory capacity on Regents' Standing Committees, and to the Committee of the Whole. In addition, Regent Ruiz attended the May Council meeting.

ICAS

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates is a group representing the faculty Senates of the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California. The group was particularly active in advocacy efforts and participated in ongoing efforts to ease transfer between the CCCs and CSU or UC.

SENATE POSITIONS ON STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION

- Council forwarded to Senior Vice President for External Relations Dan Dooley UCOLASC's letter objecting to the Research Works Act (HR 3699), which would prohibit open access mandates for federally funded research, overturning NIH's public access policy. The letter also supported The Federal Research Public Access Act, which would make federally funded research papers publicly available within six months of publication in a journal.
- The Senate opposed AB 2132, which would have required that UC adopt tenure policies to reward service activities.

5

- The Senate strongly opposed SB 721 (Lowenthal), which would have required the higher education segments to adhere to three educational goals defined by the legislature, with oversight by the Legislative Analyst's Office.
- The Senate opposed SB 1052 and SB 1053 (Steinberg), which would have established, without providing funding, the California Open Education Resources Council and a California Digital Open Source Library.
- The Senate opposed SCA 22, which proposed a constitutional amendment to limit out-of-state freshman enrollment to no more than ten percent of each year's incoming class at each UC campus.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Robert Anderson, Chair
Robert Powell, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:
Robert Jacobsen, Berkeley
Linda Bisson, Davis
Craig Martens, Irvine
Andrew Leuchter, Los Angeles
Susan Amussen, Merced
Mary Gauvain, Riverside
Joel Sobel, San Diego
Robert Newcomer, San Francisco
Henning Bohn, Santa Barbara
Susan Gillman, Santa Cruz

Senate Committee Chairs:
William Jacob, BOARS
Rachael Goodhue, CCGA
Margaret Conkey, UCAAD
Katja Lindenberg, UCAP
Jose Wudka, UCEP
William Parker, UCFW
John Crawford, UCORP
James Chalfant, UCPB

Council Staff:
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director
Todd Giedt, Associate Director
Clare Sheridan, Senior Policy Analyst

<div align="center">**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)**
2011-2012 ANNUAL REPORT</div>

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) met twice in Academic Year 2011-2012, to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 130. Highlights of the Committee's activities and accomplishments are noted in this report.

Proposed Revisions to Definitions of Academic Freedom and Faculty Code of Conduct
In 2010, UCAF proposed amending APM 010-Academic Freedom and 015-Faculty Code of Conduct to reflect the right of faculty to freedom of speech in shared governance. The committee agreed on the importance of taking this step following discussions about rulings in several legal cases. The proposal to revise APMs 010 and 015 was submitted to the Academic Council and was sent out for systemwide review in fall 2010. Senate committees and Divisions supported the proposed changes, and the proposal was submitted to the Office of the President for a formal administrative review, including a review by the Office of General Counsel. In March 2012, proposed revisions to APMs 010, 015 and 016 were sent out for a second systemwide review which was completed in June 2012. The feedback from the review was considered by Council on June 27, 2012. A majority of Senate agencies strongly supported the addition of language to APMs 010 and 015 as an essential clarification of academic freedom in the light of the *Garcetti* decision. A minority opposed the language because the rationale for its necessity was not presented and/or because they found the phrase "when acting as a member of the faculty" to be confusing and ambiguous. Council supported modifying APMs 010 and 015, as recommended, provided that (1) the ambiguous phrase "when acting as a member of the faculty" is deleted and (2) the comma following "publication" is changed to a semi-colon. Council recommended that Academic Personnel issue a brief summarizing recent court decisions and explaining the impetus for proposing language to protect faculty when they speak on matters of institutional policy and governance.

Privacy and Security Initiative
UCOP's Privacy and Security Initiative began in 2010-11 following a number of security breaches of personal information. UCAF was first briefed on the initiative in March 2011, and in March 2012 the committee was advised that the overarching policy was being finalized by the Task Force. Vice Chair Gundersen was able to report that academic freedom issues have been taken into consideration. The final version of the policy was not available this academic year to be reviewed by UCAF.

Research Using Animal Subjects
UCAF moved forward with finalizing a statement developed last year condemning the use of violence against researchers using animal subjects and in other controversial areas. The "Statement in Support of Faculty Harassed by Opponents of their Research" was endorsed by the Academic Council at its meeting on April 25 and submitted to President Yudof and Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Beckwith. Council urged support for academic freedom and for the pursuit of research free from harassment, and condemned acts of violence and intimidation directed against them. This statement, which can be used as a model for letters to the editor and other public statements, also serves to educate the public and policy-makers about the importance of controversial research in advancing science and the public good.

In addition to the statement, the committee decided that a public education component is needed to show what has been achieved as a result of the controversial research. UCAF is interested in finding an organization to sponsor and raise funds for public forums where controversial types of research are discussed. The committee had preliminary discussions about the pros and cons of having debates, and whether UCAF can organize these forums or if committee members should work on this at their campuses. Vice Chair Gundersen and the UCI and UCSD representatives agreed to work on a subcommittee to pursue planning of the educational workshops next year.

Legal Fees for Faculty Accused of Misconduct in Research
In November, UCAF was joined by David Birnbaum, Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel of the Regents, to discuss a draft policy for chancellors on how to deal with whistleblowers and what the considera-

tions would be if a faculty member requested reimbursement. The policy was reviewed by the Council of Chancellors, individuals in the Office of the President and campus' counselors. The guidelines cover a variety of issues such as sexual harassment as well as academic freedom. UCAF submitted a memo in December 2011 indicating that the guidelines are reasonable. However, a review by the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCP&T) found the draft guidelines inadequate and suggested revisions to address its concerns. At its meeting on June 27, the Academic Council unanimously agreed with UCP&T's concerns and recommendations. The Senate will work with the Office of General Counsel to resolve this issue.

Best Practices for Responding to Protest Activity
In late 2011, protests at UCLA, UCD and UCB resulted in confrontations between the demonstrators and police. During these incidents, police used pepper spray, batons and Tasers against protestors who were primarily students. These incidents raised questions regarding the various campus police departments' preparation and protocols used for managing protests and the policies for use of force. Chair Rehm and Vice Chair Gundersen were asked by the Office of General Counsel for input on best practices for responding to protest activity. In March, UCAF reviewed a statement of rights and a set of guidelines for responses, and OGC submitted a draft report, Response to Protests on UC Campuses, to President Yudof in May.

Proposed Open Access Policy
The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication asked UCAF to provide informal feedback on a proposed open access policy for UC. An effort to implement such a policy five years ago was unsuccessful but there has been renewed interest in having a policy at UC. Other universities have since passed open access policies similar to the one proposed for UC now. Scholarly publishers are failing to make work available in open access to a satisfactory extent and passing the policy at UC will have a tremendous affect on the publishing industry's practices. UCAF members agreed that without the opt out policy there would definitely be academic freedom issues. The proposed policy will be sent out for an official systemwide review.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Rehm, Chair (SF)	Cameron Gundersen, Vice Chair (LA)
Harold Pashler (SD)	Jean Brodie (SC)
Gregory Pasternak (D)	Carole Uhlaner (I)
Erik Menke (M)	David Steigmann (B)
Thomas Morton (R)	Mohana Amirtharajah (SF)
Jessica Rubaii, graduate student (SC)	

Bob Anderson ((B); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bob Powell ((D); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Committee Analyst

2011-2012 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four meetings during the Academic Year 2011-2012 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135 to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Proposed Revisions to APMs 010, 015 and 016
UCAP considered proposed revisions to APMs 010, 015 and 016 in October 20111 during a Management review and in May 2012 during a complete Systemwide review. The proposed changes respond to an Academic Council request to create an explicit protection for faculty freedom to speak on matters of institutional policy following a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court that permitted public employers to discipline employees for criticizing agency decisions (Garcetti). The proposed change to APM 016 is proposed by the Administration to add an expectation that faculty will comply with University policies to the existing expectation that faculty will comply with rules and regulations. In its response to Council in June, the committee requested clarification from the Office of General Counsel about why it would like to add the phrase "when acting as a member of the faculty" to the APM and indicated that interpretation of this vague phrase could be problematic.

Proposed Revisions to APM 668
In October, UCAP discussed proposed revisions to APM 668, the negotiated salary plan, and identified a number of concerns. Members were concerned that at some point there will be pressure to use grants to compensate outstanding faculty and that faculty who bring in numerous grants will be able to negotiate a higher salary simply for this reason. Another issue is that the plan could potentially widen the gender gap. There were also concerns about inequities even within the same department and about exacerbating differences and widening the gap between grant rich and grant poor disciplines. The plan could create two salary structures, one which is not transparent in addition to the merit based structure that UCAP would like to maintain.

Another concern was that this policy would negatively impact the academic culture by causing faculty to further shift their priorities away from service and teaching, so there should be safeguards to ensure that an appropriate balance is maintained. It is unclear who would review the annual negotiation required by the plan since faculty are not evaluated annually. Another type of CAP could be established to provide oversight and look at salaries. UCAP was also concerned that APM 668 will take pressure off of the system to fix the salary scales. In the event that implementation of this program is unavoidable, UCAP members made various suggestions, for instance, that there could be a way to allow for revenue sharing, and that the chancellors should set a strict limit on the Y component.

UCAP submitted a memo to Council expressing the committee's concerns in October and in February, Academic Assembly voted against APM 668. In January, Vice Provost Carlson reported that Academic Personnel was in the process of analyzing comments received in response to the review of APM 668, and noted that there is concern about what the proposed changes would mean for the role of CAPs.

UCAAD Salary Equity Report
The salary equity report was put together by the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity and reviewed by UCAP in October. This comprehensive report on the analysis across 72 different units shows that UC has not made progress in achieving salary equity for women and underrepresented minorities.

The committee noted that there is no mechanism in the CAP or salary structure to correct the inequity. Another issue is the CAPs at some campuses do not look at salary while others do. This issue has been clouded since the scales fell apart, creating an opportunity for unfairness. One question is whether minorities are being systematically discriminated against with respect to the off-scale component, although exploring this would take much more data.

In light of the data available, the committee concluded that UC should look at distributing whatever resources are available to the campuses to reduce the inequities and also suggested other strategies. Money to adjust salaries could come from UCOP since this class of underpaid faculty is located throughout the system. UCAP also suggested that a targeted decoupling increment could be used for this class to adjust salaries or that UCOP could provide the chancellors with funds to use at their discretion for equity adjustment. While the committee felt that UCAAD could take the lead in suggesting remedies that address past problems as well as future issues, it was agreed that UCAAD is not familiar with the details of how CAPs look at salaries. UCAAD could meet with the chairs of each CAP to help develop strategies to address salary equity issues regardless of whether or not the CAP looks at salary data. During its meeting of May 8, 2012, the committee examined data on faculty salaries prepared by Academic Personnel which prompted further discussion about salary inequities within the UC system. In a June letter to Council, UCAP recommended that each campus determine the full extent of its salary inequity problem and propose strategies to correct the inequities.

APM 210
APM 210 was not under formal systemwide review this year. However, UCAP discussed it during several meetings after the University Committee on Academic Freedom questioned language in the policy about promoting research on diversity and concluded that this language appears to favor one type of research over another. UCAP discussed the clarity or confusion resulting from language in APM 210 regarding assessing contributions to diversity. A source of confusion for the committee was whether APM 210 introduces a "fourth leg" to be evaluated when a faculty member is reviewed for a merit increase (in addition to research, teaching, and service) or whether APM 210 in fact does not do this. At some campuses, departments do not monitor diversity-related activities and these activities are not indicated on the biobib, while other campus CAPs, in contrast, provide places on the biobib to discuss diversity contributions and recognize these contributions consistently. CAPs that consider diversity may look for contributions that exceed the norm and highlight evidence of a contribution in the final report.

Some members of UCAP strongly asserted the APM's language is satisfactory and that the issue is lack of understanding that diversity is not a fourth leg. Since CAPs consider diversity activities on a campus by campus basis, the current language allows for local interpretation by each CAP. A larger number of members of the committee argued strongly that the language in APM 210 could be interpreted to mean that research that highlights inequalities is a special type of research and does not make it clear whether CAPs are being asked to give extra credit to faculty in this field. They would like UCAP to work on a rewording of section 1.d of APM 210. In a letter to Council in June, UCAP proposed revising the language on criteria for appointment, promotion and appraisal to exclude the reference to research that highlights inequalities.

The majority opinion of UCAP was that whether or not APM 210 is ultimately modified, faculty who focus on diversity in their academic field should not receive a bonus simply because of this focus. Members also agreed that CAPs have an understanding of what constitutes good or bad research. Members suggested that awareness and training are needed, and that one way this could be done is through outreach to chairs and deans to discuss how credit might be considered. Equity advisers at the campuses could provide training on APM 210 within the review process.

In March, UCAP was joined by the chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, Meg Conkey. Chair Conkey indicated that UCAAD has heard feedback from a number of committees that

are concerned about implementation of APM 210 and that there is an interest in discussing best practices related to diversity at the campus CAPs and committees on diversity. In contrast to UCAP's concerns, UCAAD is concerned about whether faculty know they can add activities related to diversity explicitly, and also with where in the biobibs attention is paid to APM 210. Additionally, UCAAD would like to have even more places in the biobib to report activities related to APM 210. It is anticipated that UCAP and UCAAD will have another discussion about APM 210 in the upcoming academic year.

Report of the Faculty Diversity Working Group
The Faculty Diversity Working Group was one of five established under the President's Campus Climate Task Force and it issued its final report in April. UCAP's discussion and feedback about the report was influenced by the issues the committee has raised regarding APM 210. Members agreed that it is important to emphasize that UCAP is committed to diversity and to preserving equity at all levels. While diversity remains a problem that should be improved, the committee members did not agree with many of the strategies recommended by the Working Group. In its June response to Council, the committee conveyed its belief that the chancellors, executive vice chancellors and deans are best positioned to make a real difference in improving diversity. Diversifying the faculty should be done through funding grants programs or creation of special initiatives; diversity should be kept separated from the review process. Committee members felt that CAPs can best contribute to improving diversity by placing a premium on mentoring and service that promotes diversity and by being attentive to the various challenges related to maintaining diversity. Support for some of the Working Group's recommendations is contingent upon the revisions to APM 210 discussed above.

Faculty Salaries Task Force
UCAP members were asked to provide comments in response to the Faculty Salaries Task Force report in March. Chair Lindenberg was a member of the Salary Equity Task Force which devised a five year plan to improve the faculty salary scales although it is not clear where any money would come from to implement the plan. Most UCAP members agreed that the strategies in the report are a reasonable start to fixing the scales, and there was support for giving campuses flexibility. It is important to fix the scales, especially intercampus differences, but the committee recognizes that one solution will not fix all of the problems. Although UCAP members felt that the plan is a good first step, the committee was concerned that it will fall short and does not resolve salary differences between faculty at UC and the comparison eight institutions. UCAP conveyed its feedback to Council in a March letter.

Proposed Open Access Policy
The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication asked the committee for informal feedback of a proposed open access policy for UC. Several years ago, UC attempted to approve an open access policy but this effort was not successful. Other universities, including Harvard, have since passed their own policies that address some of the criticisms of UC's failed policy. There is currently a greater understanding of and interest in open access at UC. The main goal is to make research more widely and freely accessible to the public, which is something publishers do not do because of the subscription model. UC campus libraries, including the California Digital Library, are at the limit of being able to pay for research publications. The policy would also create an infrastructure for a repository for making those works available which already exists through eScholarship. One question UCAP was asked to consider was what kind of effect this policy would have on promotion and tenure. UCAP submitted a letter to Council in July expressing support for the proposed policy.

Changes in Publication Venues
The topic of changes in publication venues has come up in previous years at UCAP. Faculty are publishing in non-traditional venues and this creates different issues depending on the discipline. As publishers are disappearing, some faculty in the book disciplines are turning to self-publishing. The question is how the personnel review system should handle this. The venue issue is related to the amount of publications

expected of people and how this impacts decisions about advancement. As more journals are introduced it becomes difficult to evaluate their impact and it is also hard to determine the prestige of any new journals. Since the issue of the change in venues will continue to affect the work that CAPs do, the committee agreed with the idea of appointing systemwide groups of faculty, not necessarily UCAP members, to develop systemwide guidelines to deal with these issues. In April, UCAP submitted a letter to Council suggesting the creation of working groups to look at the issue of changing venues and perhaps generate recommendations to address the changes in the context of the faculty review process. One working group should be comprised of faculty in the humanities, arts and social sciences and the second group comprised of science and engineering faculty. UCAP will continue to discuss this issue during the 2012-13 academic year.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:
- Proposed Revisions to APMs 200 and 205
- APM 670
- UCSD's Proposed Affiliation Agreement with the California Western School of Law
- APM 430
- National Association of Scholars "A Crisis of Competence" Report

Campus Reports
UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to reports about issues facing local committees and comparison of individual campus practices

Survey of CAP Practices
UCAP updated its annual survey of local CAP practices and experiences. The survey covers a wide range of topics, including the type and number of files reviewed by CAPs; CAP support, resources and member compensation; final review authority; CAP's involvement in the review of salary and off-scale increments at the time of hiring or in retention cases; and the use of ad hocs. UCAP considers the survey to be an important resource that helps the committee identify areas in which campus practices might be brought into closer congruence. This year, members agreed that the survey should be conducted every other year. The survey will next be updated in 2014.

UCAP Representation
UCAP Chair Katja Lindenberg represented the Committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements
UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Susan Carlson, Vice Provost, Academic Personnel; Nancy Tanaka, Executive Director, Academic Personnel; Janet Lockwood, Manager-Academic Policy and Compensation, Academic Personnel; and Mathew Xaview, Data Coordinator, Academic Personnel.

UCAP occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair Bob Anderson and vice-chair Bob Powell about issues facing the Senate and UC, and the Senate executive director Martha Winnaker about Senate office procedures and committee business.

UCAP is grateful to all of them for their very helpful and knowledgeable input.

UCAP is also extremely grateful to Brenda Abrams, whose help and good advice are especially noted. Her historical memory and general knowledge were invaluable. (UCAP Chair Lindenberg added this note and enjoins Brenda from removing this in spite of the fact that she is a signatory to this document.)

Respectfully submitted,

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2011-12 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 145, to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The BOARS chair also charged two subcommittees – Transfer and Articulation and Evaluation – with reporting to the parent committee about specific topics. One hour of each regular committee meeting was set aside for subcommittee break-outs; the subcommittees also met between meetings via teleconference. BOARS also collaborated closely with consultants in the UCOP Office of Admissions, and met jointly with the campus admissions directors in July. The major activities of BOARS and its subcommittees, and the issues they addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

ASSESSING THE NEW FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS POLICY

At the start of the year, BOARS worked with staff from the Office of Admissions and the Office of Institutional Research to develop research questions and propose data analyses that would help BOARS evaluate outcomes from the Freshman Admissions Reform Policy taking effect for the fall 2012 freshman class. Throughout the year, data gradually emerged about student cohorts who applied to UC, were admitted, and who submitted Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs), which attempted to capture changes resulting from the new policy. BOARS reviewed both systemwide and campus-specific data for each of these pools, and compared outcomes to the past for such indicators as GPA and SAT score, residency status, ethnicity, First Generation College status, and the student's high school API ranking. BOARS also considered the characteristics of student cohorts who did and did not take the newly optional SAT Subject Exams and their likelihood of admission; applicants and admitted students from the expanded Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pool and new Entitled to Review (ETR) pool; the effect of the ELC designation on admissions outcomes for CA resident applicants from public high schools; a logistical regression simulation predicting how the cohort of residents applying to UC in 2011 under the old admissions model might have fared under the 2012 Entitled to Review criteria; and data comparing the credentials of different residency groups based on academic index score, unweighted GPA, and test scores.

UC received 126,455 applications for freshman admission (unduplicated count) for fall 2012, a 19.1% increase over 2011; including 93,379 applications from California residents, a 9.8% increase over 2011. Much of the large overall increase can be attributed to a significant rise in non-resident applications (50% domestic non-resident and 66% international), but given the relatively unchanged high school graduation rate, it is possible that the new ETR category and reduced testing requirement encouraged more CA residents to apply to UC.

80,289 of total applicants and 61,433 of the 93,379 CA resident applicants (66%) were admitted to a campus to which they applied (additional applicants received referral or wait-list offers). 56,231 of the 93,379 CA resident applicants met the criteria for an admission guarantee; 26,869 met the ETR criteria, and 10,204 did not meet either. The number of guaranteed applicants is

larger than was anticipated when the policy was designed due to a higher than expected number of students who met the statewide index but who were not ELC.

81,281 of approximately 399,050 total 2012 California public high school graduates (20%) applied to UC. 59,579 of these applicants (14.9% of total public CA high school graduates) received an offer of admission, which shows that UC is meeting and exceeding its Master Plan obligation to select from the top 12.5% of California high school graduates. BOARS believes UC needs to advertise this fact widely. It is testament to the University's deep and ongoing commitment to California that it can honor the Master Plan and expand access in the current financial environment, and at a time when the other two public higher education segments are contracting access.

Overall, the pools of applicants and admitted students had a similar academic profile, and were slightly more diverse socioeconomically, compared to 2011. 48% of total applicants in the ETR pool were admitted, and a large proportion of the underrepresented students admitted to UC were in the new ETR and ELC-only pools, particularly the new ELC 5-9% group. BOARS cautions that it is difficult to determine the precise reason for these outcomes, as several policies changed simultaneously this year; however, BOARS believes the outcomes provide evidence that the policy is meeting the faculty's original goals of removing unnecessary barriers and broadening access to California students who might have been shut out in the past, while maintaining academic quality.

The outcomes also raised several questions and concerns. When the policy was originally conceived, it was projected that the 9x9 guarantees would provide a guarantee to about 10.5% of the CA public high school graduating class, and that an additional 2% would be admitted under the ETR criteria, to bring UC to the 12.5% figure expected under the Master Plan. However, UC admitted 12.1% of public high school graduates who met the 9x9 guarantees, which grows to 14.9% after adding those admitted through ETR. Of California public high school admits, 4.7% were in the statewide-non ELC pool alone, which means that the number of applicants with the Statewide guarantee but not the ELC guarantee was far greater than projected. BOARS will be reviewing options for recalibrating the statewide index in light of the outcomes, to align UC with Master Plan expectations.

A second concern for BOARS is that few students were admitted from the ETR and ELC pools at the most selective campuses. The policy's goal of bringing new talent to UC is perhaps most clearly manifested in the expanded ELC pool, and in the pool of students who are entitled to review but not part of the statewide or ELC guarantee. To address this concern, BOARS proposed giving all UC campuses, not only Merced, the opportunity to consider talented applicants with an ELC guarantee in the referral pool. BOARS later modified this plan to include all referral pool students, including ELC referrals. Campuses are being encouraged (but not required) to select students in the referral pool for admission or wait lists.

A third BOARS concern is the continued ability of the campuses to meet the workload demands of the policy. BOARS alerted the President about specific campus concerns when he met with the committee in December, and BOARS will continue to monitor the personnel and funding situation of campuses and advocate for appropriate funding, as necessary. These concerns were reiterated in July by the Admissions Directors, who noted that the large number of international applications has increased the evaluation workload alongside substantial changes in leadership.

In June 2011, BOARS adopted a clarification to its July 2009 principles for the admission of non-residents, which states that non-residents admitted to a campus must "compare favorably" to California residents admitted to that campus. The intent was to create more opportunity for campuses to admit non-residents (prior policy expected non-residents be in the upper half of the admit pool) and to reassure Californians that residents are not being turned away to make room for less qualified but higher paying non-residents. The "compare favorably" language reflects the complexity of comparing residents and non-residents, as campuses often do not have the same information for non-resident applicants about local context and achievement as they do for residents. In fall 2011, BOARS studied admission and enrollment outcomes from multiple perspectives to determine the extent to which campuses were implementing the compare favorably rule. Although there have been significant changes, and the non-resident applicant pool is now more closely aligned to the resident pool in many variables, BOARS found no need for alarm. BOARS expects that as the non-resident pool expands, campuses should be able to meet resident targets and remain in full compliance with the BOARS criteria. This appears to be the case for fall 2012 admits, although a final analysis is not available at the time of this report.

Another, more general BOARS concern, independent of the new policies, is that as State funding declines, UC could lose its capacity to meet its historic commitment to residents outlined in the Master Plan. BOARS does not participate in setting enrollment targets, but does hope that campuses will meet resident targets that sum to the University's Master Plan obligations, and will enroll non-residents on top of those targets according to the availability of space and the compare favorably rule.

TRANSFER ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

In June, the Academic Assembly approved two new transfer admission pathways following a systemwide Senate review of BOARS' proposal for major-based transfer admissions. The Assembly's amendments to Senate Regulation 476 mean that UC transfer applicants from California Community Colleges will be entitled to a comprehensive admissions review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three sets of courses: a yet to be developed UC Transfer Curriculum, in the relevant major, with a minimum GPA set by each campus; an "SB 1440" Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree for Transfer from a California Community College in the relevant major, with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; or the current pathway specified in Senate Regulation 476 C.

The policy is intended to be parallel to the "entitled to review" feature of the new freshman admission policy taking effect for students entering UC this fall. It also responds to State legislation (Assembly Bill 2302) that encourages UC to align its transfer requirements with Senate Bill 1440, which requires the California Community Colleges to develop major-based Associate Degrees for Transfer that guarantee degrees-holders admission to CSU as juniors and a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 upper division units at CSU. BOARS opposed offering any similar guarantees—focusing instead on giving holders of Transfer AA/AS degrees a comprehensive review in admissions.

BOARS believes the policy will help clarify the transfer process for California Community students interested in UC, and also improve their preparation for UC-level work. It will communicate a positive message to community college students that if they pick a major, prepare for it, and show a strong case for being able to complete their declared majors in a timely

fashion, they will be fully considered for transfer to UC. BOARS hopes the policy will encourage campuses to consider a transfer applicant's major choice and specific preparation for the major in selection decisions, and will encourage greater alignment in lower division transfer requirements for similar majors across UC campuses. By retaining the current path, BOARS addressed concerns expressed by some departments and divisions that requiring extensive major preparation would disadvantage some applicants, and could hamper their ability to meet admissions targets.

Following the Assembly's approval of the new pathways, BOARS approved a modification to the transfer selection criteria in the Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions that asks campuses to choose "applicants with a high likelihood of timely graduation," as well as a specific plan and timeline for implementing the new transfer paths. The implementation plan asks each department or program to collaborate with their campus Admissions Office and committees over the next two years. They will develop a UC Transfer Curriculum detailing the specific lower division preparation a student needs to have to be considered for admission into the major as a transfer during the first year, and then develop selection criteria for students applying to their major or program by the end of the second year. Beginning in fall 2014, campuses will evaluate and select transfers for fall 2015 admission according to those criteria, and in fall 2015, the first transfers admitted through the two new paths will arrive at UC.

ONLINE EDUCATION

▪ *New Policy for 'a-g' Review of Online Courses*

In May, BOARS approved a new policy for the approval of online courses and providers to satisfy the 'a-g' pattern required by high school students for UC eligibility. The policy replaces BOARS' 2006 policy, which had developed a large backlog of applications, and had been criticized as cumbersome and in need of change to adapt to the rapidly evolving world of K-12 online education. Under the new policy, online course publishers will submit their courses to the California Learning Resource Network (CLRN) for review against the California Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards, and a set of Standards for Quality Online Courses established by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL). A course meeting an 80% threshold, including 15 required "power standards," can be submitted to UC Doorways for final 'a-g' review. In addition, virtual schools seeking to offer 'a-g' courses will be required to submit a new school survey with evidence of regional accreditation and alignment with iNACOL's Standards for Quality Online Programs. UC intends to implement the policy for the course update cycle beginning February 2013, after resolving a few additional questions and details.

▪ *Statement on K-12 Online Learning*

In May, BOARS also approved a *Statement on K-12 Online Learning*, which summarizes the committee's major concerns about online education and the quality measures BOARS is seeking in an online course or program – including access to content experts, instructor support, and proctored exams. Schools and districts will also be required to complete a Certification of Compliance indicating that they meet the quality measures articulated in the Statement.

▪ *UC Online Education Project*

The BOARS and UCEP chairs collaborated on Senate and administrative polices and regulations for the UC Online Instruction Pilot Project (UCOE) related to eligibility, admissions, course approval, and enrollment. BOARS' general support for the UCOE project was tempered by concerns about access for low-income students and UCOE's plans to enroll large numbers of non-matriculated students into its courses, particularly high school students. BOARS wanted to ensure that students enrolling in UCOE courses have the necessary prerequisites, preparation, local support, and mentoring services necessary to succeed. In May, BOARS sent a memo to the Academic Council expressing concern about a UCOE marketing plan that identified students at affluent public high schools and private high schools as the primary potential target audience for UCOE courses. The memo asked UCOE to adjust the marketing plan to reflect concerns regarding equal access, and to develop a business and marketing model that includes a return-to-aid component.

IMPLEMENTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS

BOARS discussed the transition four campuses were making to the single score individualized ("holistic") review system recommended by the Regents in their January 2011 *Resolution on Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions* (Regents Policy 2108), and a joint report the BOARS chair and the Office of Admissions will submit to the Regents in September on Comprehensive Review, which will detail the progress of and outcomes from this transition and from the new admissions policy. Six UC campuses now use a single-score holistic review system, although applications receive an individualized read in the selection process at all campuses. BOARS found little change in the diversity of the admit pool after one year—in other words, moving to holistic review is not an instant panacea for diversity as some had hoped. In fact, while socio-economic diversity increased at several campuses using holistic review this year, it declined at others. It is too early to define the overall impact of the change, as campuses are learning to implement the new process, and will make adjustments over the next few years. Campuses appreciate Berkeley's and UCLA's willingness to share scores. Score sharing has been an important factor in the review process at some campuses, helping to define best practices and forecast enrollment. However, each campus sets its own selection criteria, and it is now clear that score sharing will not reduce the cost of review, as each campus needs to fine-tune its evaluation in the band where decisions are made.

Campuses are implementing holistic review because they view it as a fairer system, although some have chosen not to implement a single-score review system because they believe that their current systems are producing solid outcomes using different strategies. All campuses admission policies are consistent with the Comprehensive Review Guidelines and the Regents Policy on Individualized Review. BOARS notes that as with the freshman admissions policy, diversity gains are not necessarily the result of specific policy changes, and should be considered in the context of the state's demographic changes and the larger and more diverse resident and non-resident applicant pools.

In May, UCLA released a report on Holistic Review in Freshman Admissions authored by UCLA Professor Robert Mare, which examines fall 2007 and 2008 holistic outcomes at that campus, where holistic review was first implemented in 2006. The report finds that holistic scoring at UCLA is proceeding according to the criteria set by the UCLA Admissions Committee. In the Executive Summary Mare writes, "Academic achievement and other personal qualities that contribute to a stimulating, diverse campus environment govern holistic ranking. In Regular Review, which is carried out by qualified members of the education community in the southern

California region in conjunction with UARS staff, the importance of academic merit is paramount and I find no important differences along lines that depart from the prescribed ranking criteria." BOARS believes this solid, independent review of the UCLA holistic review practices demonstrates that UC's implementation of single score review is headed in the right direction.

USES OF READ SHEET AND SCORE SHARING

All campuses now have access to the same local context (school-based) data in "read sheet" form that UCLA and UCB receive, as well as holistic review scores from UCLA/UCB. Several campuses are incorporating these data into their review processes, and others are considering how they might use them in the future. Score sharing is helping campuses improve review processes, project enrollment, compare comprehensive review outcomes, and in some cases, devote more time to the individualized review of applicants with lower scores, although final admissions decisions continue to be made locally. Eventually, each campus will develop its own individualized review process, and BOARS believes it is better not to push for a specific mode of implementation, but to allow campuses to maintain systems that reflect their unique values. Prior to the Regents' January 2011 *Resolution on Individualized Review*, UCOP expressed hope that score sharing might increase the efficiency of admission processing and would make it possible to implement a single systemwide UC score. BOARS found little evidence that score sharing will save money. Although score sharing has helped improve the quality and timeliness of some admissions decisions on some campuses, it also involves additional work. BOARS found that a single systemwide score is unworkable due to the differences in culture, selectivity, and scoring methodologies on each campus.

RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF RESIDENTS AND NON-RESIDENTS

In December, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) outlining procedures for campuses to follow to ensure that non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus. Chair Anderson sent the resolution to President Yudof with a request that he transmit it to the campus chancellors.

RESOLUTION ON PROGRAMS OR POLICIES THAT GUARANTEE ADMISSION TO UC

In December, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) regarding programs or policies that guarantee admission to the University of California or a UC campus, stating that guarantees intended for freshman admission must be limited to California residents, and guarantees intended for transfer admission must be limited to students completing work at a California Community College. The Academic Council endorsed the resolution, and Chair Anderson transmitted it to the UC Provost.

RESOLUTION ON MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT PROGRAM

In March, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) urging UC to continue its management of the process by which high school students are determined to be Eligible in the Local Context (ELC), rather than rely on data supplied by high schools, and to delay any changes to the implementation of ELC at least until BOARS has had a chance to fully evaluate outcomes from the first year of the new freshman admissions policy. Council Chair Anderson transmitted the resolution to the UC Provost.

REQUIRED DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE FOR PROGRAMS OFFERING COURSES TO NON-MATRICULATED STUDENTS

In May, BOARS adopted disclaimer language for use in the marketing materials of campus-affiliated programs offering courses to non-matriculated student, including, but not limited to, University Extension, online academic programs, academic preparation programs, and English language courses. The Academic Council endorsed the language and asked the UC Provost to transmit it to the chief academic officers on each campus, including University Extension, and to the UC Online Education Project.

RESOLUTION ON MAINTAINING THE PRE-ADMISSION VERIFICATION PROGRAM

In June, BOARS passed a resolution calling on the University to continue the process by which it verifies data reported in the undergraduate application, and to extend that process to all applicants, including freshmen, transfers, U.S. citizens, U.S. permanent residents, and non-U.S. citizens.

ALLOWING LGBT APPLICANTS TO SELF-IDENTIFY ON THE UC APPLICATION

BOARS recommended that UC provide the opportunity for students to report their sexual orientation and gender identity on the Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) form and other forms required of admitted and enrolled students. In response to state legislation, BOARS had been asked to consider soliciting this information on the application form, but the majority of the committee did not think the application for admission would be an appropriate venue for collecting this information. UCAAD agreed with BOARS, and also recommended that the question of whether to collect the data on the application forms be revisited in a few years. The Academic Council endorsed the joint recommendation and asked the UC Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs to take steps to implement it.

REVISION TO SENATE REGULATION 424 B (2)

BOARS determined that an important qualifier in the language of Senate Regulation 424 B (2) was inadvertently omitted when the Regulations were modified in 2009 to align with the new admissions policy. Prior SR 424 wording capped at two the number of 10th grade honors-level courses that can be used to calculate the minimum GPA for freshman admission. BOARS submitted a proposed modification of SR 424 B reinstating the cap for the review and endorsement of the Academic Council and Assembly.

"EXCESS UNITS" CAP POLICY

In April, BOARS approved a modification to the Working Rules clarifying that the current 105 quarter/70 semester cap on the number of units UC will accept for transfer from a two-year college also applies to lower division units earned at a four-year institution, and that students who exceed the cap and have earned lower division units at both a four-year institution and a California Community College will no longer be barred from admission automatically because of "excess units". In addition, the policy encourages campuses to be flexible beyond current practice that allows students who meet the lower division cap and have up to 15/10 upper division units to be considered for junior-level transfer admission.

BOARS ARTICULATION AND EVALUATION (A&E) SUBCOMMITTEE

The A&E Subcommittee (George Johnson, Monica Lin, Steven Clark, Lynn Huntsinger, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, Abel Valenzuela, and Angela Arunarsirakul) was charged with reviewing issues around high school preparation, the "a-g" requirements, and selected courses submitted for "a-g" approval where faculty input is required. It met monthly during regular BOARS meetings

and also held additional conference calls to conduct business. The Subcommittee approved several new online providers and rejected others, and led the effort to develop and refine the new *Policy for A-G Review of Online Courses* and the *BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning* BOARS approved in May.

BOARS TRANSFER SUBCOMMITTEE

The Transfer Subcommittee (Bill Jacob, Shawn Brick, June Gordon, John Whiteley, Charles Akemann, Ralph Aldredge, Daniel Widener, and Adam Jackson-Boothby) met monthly. The Subcommittee led the effort to develop and refine the transfer admissions policy based on feedback from the systemwide Senate reviews and discussions with local committees. It also discussed policy provisions for denying "Mixed record" transfers (those with both CCC units and units from other four-year universities) with a large number of units, articulation issues, and Senate Regulations around lower division transfer admission that may be outdated.

RESPONDING TO LEGISLATION

On behalf of BOARS, Chair Jacob sent views to the Academic Senate's legislative analyst regarding several bills, including a proposed state constitutional amendment (SCA 22) that would limit non-resident enrollment to 10% at each UC campus; AB 2001, proposing a new K-12 student assessment system; SB 185, requesting UC to consider race, gender, and ethnicity as relevant factors in their admission policies; and SB 1458, proposing to restructure the current Academic Performance Index. BOARS monitored other relevant bills, including AB 130 (the Dream Act); SB 611 (funding for the UC Curriculum Institutes); SB 612 (subject matter projects); SB 532 regarding college credit for International Baccalaureate coursework taken in high school; and SB 721, which would give the Legislative Analyst's Office authority to define accountability metrics and goals for higher education in California.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

BOARS and the UC admissions directors held their annual joint meeting in July. BOARS and the directors discussed the transition to the 2012 admissions policy, views and concerns about the implementation plan for the new transfer admissions policy, non-resident enrollment, score sharing, financial challenges, and recruitment and outreach efforts of residents and non-residents.

OTHER BUSINESS AND BRIEFINGS

➢ In December, BOARS met with President Yudof to discuss the implementation of the new freshman admissions policy and holistic review, non-resident admissions, and BOARS' proposed transfer admissions policy.

➢ Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships Russell Rumberger joined two meetings to discuss the work of a U.S. Department of Education Technical Working Group to develop an evidence-based framework about the effectiveness of online learning and other educational technologies. He also reported on meetings with school superintendents and their concerns about a-g policy.

➢ BOARS discussed concerns about a high school that was advising students to skip Geometry as part of the "path to calculus," which prompted a letter to California high schools and the Superintendent of Schools noting that students who fail to take Geometry will not meet UC's area 'c' requirement or be eligible for UC/CSU beginning in Fall 2015. The letter indicates that high school students who have just completed 9th grade will need to complete the

Geometry requirement. BOARS added the Geometry requirement to area 'c' in 2009, so schools have had ample time to bring their programs into compliance.

➢ BOARS discussed new [federal guidelines](#) on the voluntary use of race to achieve diversity in colleges and universities, which include granting preference in admissions to high achieving graduates of low-performing schools.

➢ Chair Jacob and Senate leaders briefed BOARS at each meeting about Academic Council business and discussions regarding state budget cuts, the budget rebenching project, faculty salaries, and other topics.

➢ Chair Jacob regularly briefed BOARS about meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS members from the California Community Colleges and the California State University have been deeply involved in developing SB 1440 Associate of Arts and Science degrees for transfer. Their discussions at ICAS were important in informing the BOARS' transfer policy adopted by the Academic Assembly in June.

➢ Chair Jacob attended meetings at the California Department of Education in October and by phone in June regarding the implementation the Common Core State Standards (adopted by the California Department of Education in 2010.) He reported to the CDE that BOARS had updated the area 'b' (English) and 'c' (Mathematics) requirements and application templates to align with the Common Core Standards in 2011.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2012-13

BOARS will monitor implementation of the freshman admissions policy, the transfer admissions policy, holistic review, score sharing, online a-g submissions, and the funding of admissions functions on the campuses. In addition, BOARS will review options for recalibrating the statewide admissions index and discuss enrollment management.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Bill Jacob represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, and the Admissions Processing Task Force. He also attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) to discuss issues of shared concern to the UC, CSU, and California Community College faculty, including general education requirements, legislation affecting all three segments, and higher education advocacy. He presented a session on the new admissions policy at the annual meeting of the College Board in October and attended a meeting hosted by the CA Department of Education regarding the State's adoption of the Common Core standards and its decision to replace the California Standards Test with the Smarter Balanced test by 2014-15. Vice Chair George Johnson substituted for the chair Jacob at the Academic Council and served on the Admissions Processing Task Force. Charles Akemann represented BOARS on the Education Finance Model Steering Committee.

CONSULTATION WITH UCOP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS benefited from regular consultation with Interim Director of Admissions Kate Jeffery and Vice President for Student Affairs Judy Sakaki, who updated BOARS regularly about application, admission, SIR, and enrollment data for freshmen and transfers; financial aid policy; enrollment management; UC's participation in the Department of Defense Tuition Assistance Program, UC's messaging regarding SAT Subject Tests and non-resident enrollment, and efforts to fill vacant leadership positions in the Office of Admissions. Associate Admissions Director

Monica Lin attended each meeting to brief BOARS on the high school 'a-g' course certification process, the UC Curriculum Integration Institutes, and other topics. She also worked closely with the A&E Subcommittee to review online provider and course applications and develop the new online policy. Associate Director Shawn Brick attended each meeting to discuss transfer policy, initiatives and legislation, feedback from counselor conferences, and efforts to update the ASSIST website. He worked closely with the Transfer Subcommittee. BOARS also appreciates the work of Tongshan Chang and Erika Jackson from the Department of Institutional Research, who provided critical analyses of the new admissions policy; Vice Provost Daniel Greenstein, Professor Keith Williams, and Lisa Baird, who worked with the committee on the UCOE project; Vice Provost Russell Rumberger; High School Articulation Coordinator Nina Costales; and President Yudof, who took time out of his schedule to meet with the committee in December.

Thanks also to the faculty who attended meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Mindy Marks (UCR), Lee Bardwell (UCI), and Richard Rhodes (UCB).

Respectfully submitted,

William Jacob, Chair (SB)	June Gordon (SC)
George Johnson, Vice Chair (B)	John Whitely (I)
Charles Akemann (SB)	Daniel Widener (SD)
Ralph Aldredge (D)	Adam Jackson-Boothby, Graduate (R)
Michael Beman (M)	Angela Arunarsirakul, Undergraduate (LA)
Bonnie Halpern-Felsher (SF)	Robert Anderson, *ex officio*
Steven Clark (R)	Robert Powell, *ex officio*
Abel Valenzuela (LA)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Lynn Huntsinger (B)	

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
2011-12 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Pursuant to Senate Bylaw 150, in 2011-12 the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) oversaw the appointment of chairs and vice chairs for each of the standing committees of the Assembly; oversaw the nomination of Senate members to serve on ad hoc or ongoing joint Senate-Administration committees and task forces; and authorized the Chair of the Assembly to appoint active members of standing committees to serve on joint committees and task forces subject to UCOC approval.

UCOC met twice in person, once by iLinc video conference, and communicated regularly through its listserv to conduct its business. We report on the major issues and accomplishments of the year.

Appoint Chairs and specified Vice Chairs of the Senate's Standing Committees.
At its October meeting UCOC appointed a member to serve as a liaison to each standing committee. The liaison was tasked with gathering information from the chair, vice chair, and, where appropriate, members and committee staff on the committee's effectiveness in the current year. The liaison recommended one or more individuals to be considered for service as chair and, where required, vice chair of his/her designated committees in 2012-13. The committee reviewed these recommendations at its April meeting. Appointments to all but two required positions have been confirmed; UCOC continues to work on appointing the UCOPE chair and the UCEP vice chair.

Appoint members of Senate committees, subcommittees, or task forces that report to the Assembly. The ten divisional Committees on Committees nominated divisional representatives to the standing committees. Subsequently, UCOC appointed members for two-year terms, and appointment letters, which specify the term of appointment and describing the committee's charge, have been issued. The committee was also successful in fully populating the Online Instruction Pilot Project (OIPP) Blue Ribbon Panel.

Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR): UCOC replaced one member who resigned from ACSCANR due to her acceptance of a deanship, and was therefore ineligible to serve in this capacity per Senate Bylaw 128.D, which prohibits any Senate member from "holding an administrative position higher than department chair."

Appoint Senate Representatives to Ad Hoc and Joint Senate-Administrative Bodies.
Where appropriate, UCOC asked the standing committees of the Assembly to identify current committee members to serve on ad hoc and joint bodies whose charge matched or over-lapped those of the respective committees. In that spirit, UCOC nominated, appointed, or confirmed representatives as appropriate to serve on a number of joint Administration-Senate task forces and other groups. These included the C-ID Governing Committee, IGETC Standards Review Committee, OIPP Advisory Committee, Task

Force on Parking, UCEAP Governing Committee, the UC Code of Conduct Committee, the UC Center Sacramento Advisory Council (UCCS), the Advisory Board of the UC Student Health Insurance Plan (UCSHIP), and the Wave II Selection Committee.

Search Committees: UCOC nominated Senate participants for search committees for the Provost, the UC Berkeley Chancellor, and the UC San Diego Chancellor.

Chancellorial Reviews: UCOC nominated a slate of candidates for the Los Angeles and Santa Cruz Chancellorial Reviews.

Challenges: In fulfilling its responsibilities, UCOC was challenged by the volume and ad hoc timing of requests. UCOC continues to support a recommendation made by past chairs that it is far better to bundle requests for Senate nominations on predictable timelines, rather than repeatedly attempting to mobilize members from the ten divisions for one-off tasks. UCOC remains concerned that the proliferation of ad hoc and joint committees carries at least the potential to reduce the effectiveness of the Senate's standing committees in shared governance. Finally, the committee notes that finding Senate members to serve as standing committee chairs, vice chairs, and even members is becoming increasingly difficult, given expanding teaching loads and administrative burdens being placed on UC faculty.

Dissolution of the University Committee on Computing & Communications (UCCC): One issue that remains challenging for not only UCOC, but the Senate at large is the consolidation, dissolution, and/or expansion of standing committees or special committees of Academic Council. UCOC received a proposal from Academic Council that asked members to consider dissolving UCCC, as changes in the technology environment have cast doubt upon the continuing relevance of UCCC's charge. In addition, this committee suffered from irregular attendance and infrequent action items on its agendas. UCOC opined that other Senate standing committees could take up the slack vacated by UCCC, including BOARS, UCEP, and UCORP, among others. Towards that end, UCOC made a formal recommendation to Academic Council that UCCC be dissolved contingent on Academic Council appointing an ad-hoc committee to determine where the components of UCCC's charge should be located and how they should be allocated.

Editorial Committee: In addition to making two appointments to this committee, UCOC took pains to ensure that the appointment process conforms to that laid out by Bylaw 160, which states that membership of the Editorial Committee shall consist of twenty members, with at least one, but not more than four, from each Division, with Divisional representation not otherwise being a criterion for appointment. Towards that end, UCOC and Senate leadership also met with UC Press Director Alison Mudditt and the incoming Editorial Chair over the summer.

Oliver Johnson Award: UCOC selected John Oakley (UCD) and Sandra Weiss (UCSF) for the Oliver Johnson award and submitted their names to Academic Council. Both individuals were subsequently confirmed by Academic Council.

Respectfully submitted:

Stanley Awramik (Chair, UCSB)	Andrew T. Scull (UCSD)
Mitchell Sutter (Vice Chair, UCD)	Janice Humphreys (UCSF)
Susanna Elm (UCB)	Edwina Barvosa (UCSB)
Richard Tucker (UCD)	Elizabeth Abrams (UCSC`)
Roger Rangel (UCI)	Robert Anderson (ex-officio, Council Chair)
Craig Fox (UCLA)	Robert Powell (ex-officio, V. Council Chair)
Martha Conklin (UCM)	Todd Giedt (Senate Assoc. Director/Analyst)
Jang-Ting Guo (UCR)	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS

ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
The University Committee on Computing and Communications (UCCC) is charged by Senate Bylaw 155 to represent the Senate in all matters of instruction and research policy involving the use of information and communications technology and advising the president concerning the acquisition and use of information and communications technology. UCCC held two meetings and one teleconference during the 2010-2011 academic year. Highlights of the committee's actions are outlined below.

Shared Research Computing Project
The status of the Shared Research Computing Project (ShaRCS) was discussed several times this year. Objectives of the project included demonstrating the ability to effectively administer system wide resources and serve PIs and their equipment needs. The project has been running for one year and there was no clear information about the commitment for ongoing systemwide funding for the project after the pilot is completed in March. A detailed business model proposal to continue the project was developed by Information Resources and Communication based on best practices and experiences at other institutions that used similar models. Feedback from the campuses solicited in response to a request from the provost revealed that some campuses would be willing to commit resources if the project continued but other campuses were unwilling to invest in the project. As of February, a decision had been made to end the project. UCCC was informed that some of the individuals involved in this project are working together to put together a proposal for shared research computing that will take advantage of excess computing capacity at UC.

UC Contracts with Microsoft and Adobe
Shelton Waggener, the Associate Vice Chancellor & CIO at UCB, met with UCCC in November to describe programs developed by that campus that are intended to be available to all UC campuses. A common suite of tools will be available but faculty will not be required to use them. Current costs for a number of services is close to $300 and the new services will result in a savings of $100 and can be extended to students for an additional forty dollars. The pricing of the whole Adobe suite of software is $20. The cost for the entire Microsoft suite software will be one million dollars which includes the cost for students. The goal of the Microsoft license was to simplify purchasing, tracking and compliance. New models, options and offerings were explored and the ability to extend the license beyond the conventional three year term.

Disbanding UCCC
This year, the Senate considered whether the committee should exist or be disbanded. In addition to concerns about how engaged members are in committee activities, it was not clear that the charge to this committee establishes distinctive jurisdiction over a meaningful array of issues not already included in the charges of other committees. In January, Council voted to ask University Committee on Committees to consider dissolving UCCC on the grounds that its charge is obsolete. In April, UCOC voted to recommend that UCCC be dissolved contingent on Academic

Council appointing an ad-hoc committee to determine where the components of UCCC's charge should be located and how they should be allocated. Council forwarded this issue to the Academic Assembly, which referred the issue back to Council with instructions to consider the formation of an information technology committee as an alternative to UCCC.

Additional Business
UCCC devoted part of each regular meeting to reports on issues facing local committees.

Representation
The UCCC Chair, Joel Primack, was a faculty representative to the Information Technology Leadership Council and was an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications.

Acknowledgements
UCCC is grateful for the contributions made by its Office of the President's Information Resources and Communications (IR&C) consultants, Associate Vice President David Ernst and Systemwide IT Policy Director Stephen Lau.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Primack, Chair (SC)	Felix Wu, Vice Chair (D)
Paulo Chagas (R)	Sreenivas Jammalamadaka (SB)
Ida Sim (SF)	Anthony Joseph (B)
Maurizio Forte (M)	Shahrokh Yadegari
Vincent Alinodogan (Undergraduate Student Representative (SB)	

Chris Kelty ((LA); Chair, UCOLASC, *Ex-Officio*))
Bon Anderson ((B); Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bon Powell ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst

<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

2011-2012 ANNUAL REPORT

</div>

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met seven times in Academic Year 2011-2012 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 170 and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the "Compendium"). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

UC Online Education

UC's Online Education (UCOE) project continued to dominate UCEP's discussions throughout this academic year and the committee received regular updates on the project's status from the former Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination, Dan Greenstein and Faculty Advisor, Keith Williams (currently, interim director). The administration identified policy issues regarding the management of UCOE, a number of which fell under the authority of UCEP. Over the course of several months, the committee developed the Guidelines for Systemwide Courses to address the policy issues related to the approval and organization of any systemwide courses, including those supported by UCOE. Following this adoption UCOE submitted 4 courses for systemwide approval; of these the Committee approved 2, an additional course was approved subject to campus approval, and one course was not approved.

The guidelines address the enrollment of non-matriculated students and the types of credits they can be awarded. UCEP has concerns about maintaining UC quality in the UCOE courses and, in particular, the impact that large numbers of non-matriculated students will have on matriculated students in the course. An important issue that remained unresolved this year is how non-matriculated students' basic prerequisites will be determined. Additional unsettled questions include which campus will get credit for students taking courses at another campus, how Teaching Assistants will be paid and how the funds will be distributed to the campuses. An overarching concern for UCEP continued to be about the program's focus shifting from its original research orientation to a model to generate revenue from non-UC students.

The Blue Ribbon Panel recommended by UCEP last year convened in April 2012. The panel was given the broad charge of the evaluation team's plans and reports to help inform UCEP and the Council as they make their recommendations about the future conduct of on-line education efforts at UC. The Director of the UC Educational Evaluation Center at UCSB, Dr. Jon Yun, provided an overview of the evaluation of the online instruction project to the Panel. The panel members felt that Dr. Yun can conduct a good evaluation if he is provided with adequate resources. Both UCEP and the Blue Ribbon Panel were alarmed when UCOE notified them in June that a progress report on the evaluation would not be available until sometime after August 2012.

WASC Accreditation

In June 2011, UCEP learned that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) planned to revise its handbook and adopt the Lumina Foundation's degree qualifications profile. WASC reportedly had concerns about potential mandates, complaints about problems with for-

profits, burdens implied in the previous review process, and students who attend different institutions and are unable to determine if they are getting what they need. Lumina's degree qualification profile (DQP) is proposed to measure the quality of education in associates, bachelors and masters degree programs. Committee members agreed that the degree quality profile would not be a good tool for UC and Ralph Wolff, President of the Senior College Commission of WASC, was invited to meet with UCEP in November to discuss the DQP and other proposed changes to the handbook. Committee members shared their concerns with President Wolff, making the important point that UC has already done faculty driven work on assessing learning outcomes but the proposed changes will create an unnecessary burden. The president welcomed UCEP's feedback on how WASC can evaluate how institutions are establishing proficiency and build on what is already being done.

A December letter summarizing the discussion was approved by Council, forwarded to the WASC Commission and shared with the members of ICAS. In February, WASC acted to suspend implementation of the action taken in November 2011 regarding defining and assessing the five graduation proficiencies and withheld any further action on the issue of external validation until further consultation is conducted. President Wolff joined UCEP again in May and reported that the Commission was in the process of working through a variety of issues. A report on the feedback received by WASC was to be submitted to the Commission's policy and planning committee, which will meet in mid-June. The plan was for the Commission to identify one or more proposals to circulate to the region for more comment over the summer. President Wolff would like to meet with UCEP again in the fall to report on what has been done, and he stated that UC is the most faculty centered and driven institution around setting standards and would like UC to be a partner with WASC.

UC Education Abroad Program Strategic Plan
The Executive Director of the UC Education Abroad Program, Jean-Xavier Guinard, joined UCEP in February to discuss a new strategic plan. Last year, EAP started developing a strategic plan after talking to a number of stakeholders. The plan includes primary and secondary initiatives, as well as director's initiatives. The plan has three components that reflect UCEAP's vision: study abroad for all, academic excellence and best business practices. Director Guinard indicated that UCEP could assist with advocacy for EAP and for study abroad in general as a part of the undergraduate experience.

UCEP urged the program to make every effort to maintain accessibility for all students, which could help with the long term viability of EAP. UCEP was concerned about the need to provide students with proper advice, so they understand the articulation (or lack thereof) of the courses taken abroad with their home-campus programs. Finally, UCEP encouraged EAP to consider the possibility of targeting some host institutions for areas of excellence, which might facilitate integration and provide incentives for students to participate.

Last Degree of its Kind
UCEP discussed the issue of phasing out degrees that are the last of their kind. The Compendium differentiates between the title and the discipline but it does not clarify what needs to be done when the title of a program is unique, but the Compendium is not clear on whether programs labeled as the "last of their kind" refers to the title or the discipline; upon discussion UCEP opined that it should refer to the discipline, so that program whose academic content is not available elsewhere in the system should undergo system-wide review before being discontinued. UCEP brought this issue to Council and Council instructed UCEP, CCGA and

UCPB to create an ad-hoc joint committee to revise the confusing language in the Compendium. The ad-hoc committee submitted proposed changes to Council in July that aim at clarifying the discontinuance procedures for programs with unique titles (a very rare occurrence) and those that are "the last one of their kind" (a rare occurrence). In August, the Academic Council's recommendation that the Compendium be revised along the lines suggested by U C E P to clarify the discontinuance procedures for undergraduate programs with unique titles or those that are the last of their kind in the UC system was forwarded to the new Provost, Aimée Dorr. Academic Council requested that the recommendation be considered by the Academic Planning Council.

Senate Regulation 610 - Residence
In 2010-11, at the request of UCEP, the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction ruled on a close vote that "in residence" in SR 610 refers to courses approved by the relevant UC Senate bodies, rather than physical presence on campus. UCEP concurred with this interpretation, and submitted a proposed revision for systemwide review in the Fall of 2011 to clarify the intent of the regulation. In January 2012, Council discussed the responses to the review, a number of which raised objections, and suggested that UCEP redraft the revisions. UCEP submitted a new revision, taking into account the decisions from R&J, as well as the desire of several campuses to maintain physical presence as a requirement. The Committee voted in favor of replacing the word "residency" by "matriculation" and asked CCGA to discuss the revised wording in the regulations that refer to graduate students. Should UCEP and CCGA agree on the need to revise the regulation, the two committees will present the new language jointly to Council.

Senate Regulation 760 – Credit in Courses
UCEP discussed revisions to Senate Regulation 760 during several meetings. The change to SR 760 is in response to a new Department of Education requirement that all candidate and accredited institutions are required to comply with federal regulations concerning the definition and assignment of credit hours and that accrediting agencies are required to evaluate compliance as part of comprehensive reviews. The University of California has a system-wide regulation (SR760) that provides a very broad description of how credits are awarded, which, however, is too vague to meet the new requirements. Some divisions have adopted additional regulations that do meet the WASC requirements (in fact WASC uses the UC Berkeley regulations as an example - see http://www.wascsenior.org/resources/credithour).

UCEP discussed this issue and in June asked the CEP chairs for feedback on two possible lines of action. The first approach would be to notify the divisions about the new WASC requirement and urge them to adopt appropriate local regulations. This would give the divisions maximum flexibility. The second possibility is for UCEP to propose a modification to SR760 and so deal with the problem at the system-wide level. This approach would provide a broad basic standard for the whole system. The CEP chairs were asked which of the two possibilities would be preferable at their campuses.

UC Washington D.C. Center
Bruce Cain, the Director of UC Washington Center, joined UCEP by phone in April to report on the status of the Center. Director Cain would like to begin thinking about issues that will impact the Center in the longer term including what the center is trying to achieve and how it will support students interested in public service. The Center's Academic Advisory Committee would like UCEP's input on how to improve how the curriculum is organized, including what it would mean if campuses request a standardized curriculum. In June, UCDC submitted a set of courses

to the committee for systemwide approval. UCEP members agreed that the committee should examine the background of instructors and that the affiliation within the UC system or the other qualifications that make the faculty member appropriate should be provided in the future.

UC Science and Mathematics Teacher Initiative
In March, the Chair of the Academic Senate was contacted by the Chair of the Science and Math Initiative Executive Council following a decision by Provost Pitts to transform the CalTeach academic program into a competitive initiative. Chair Anderson asked UCEP to consider whether the new funding model will be advantageous for the program and how UCEP can help. The core funding that pays for staffing and for some of the key lecturers is threatened by the new model.

The committee learned of the successes of the program and was concerned that the program should find itself in such a difficult funding situation. In a May memo to the Academic Council, UCEP suggested that the Senate urges the administration to carefully weigh the impact of the cuts on the SMI CalTeach program and, if cuts are inevitable, to insist that these be implemented in a measured way in order to allow the program to organize an orderly transition to a sustainable funding model.

IGETC for STEM Majors
During its May meeting UCEP reviewed the proposed modification to IGETC, "IGETC for STEM majors" received from ICAS. The Committee was in favor of the UC adopting this proposed path for transfer students. Given the multiplication of such paths and the fact that a similar path was approved recently, UCEP recommended that the formal proposal to the Division be accompanied with a clear description of the existing paths, the points in common with the proposed new one, and the manner in which the proposed adoption will help transfer students interested in the STEM field.

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP also issued views on the following:

- Copyright Recommendations for UC
- BOARS Transfer Proposal
- APMs 010, 015 and 016
- National Association of Scholars' "Crisis of Competence" Report
- Proposal to Establish the UCI School of Education

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy.

UCEP Representation
UCEP Chair Jose Wudka represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, and Academic Assembly, and regularly attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates. Chair Wudka also participated on the UCDC Governing Council and a group advising UCOP on the development of UCOE.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements
UCEP benefited from consultation and reports from Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination; Hilary Baxter, Associate Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination; and Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions Policy.

In addition, UCEP consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Academic Council and Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Jose Wudka, Chair (R)	John Yoder, Vice Chair (D)
Michael Dennin (I)	Gregg Camfield (M)
Nicholas Sitar (B)	Eileen Zurbriggen (SC)
Tamara Alliston (SF)	Nayan Shah(SD)
Begoña Echeverria (R)	Tim Labor (R)
Richard Weiss (LA)	Jon Rossini (D)
Tania Israel (SB)	Justin Riordan (Undergraduate student-SC)

Bob Anderson ((B), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio)*
Bob Powell ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio)*
Brenda Abrams, Senior Policy Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
2011-12 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 175, the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) considers and reports on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty, including salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. UCFW held nine in-person meetings during the 2011-12 academic year, and the major actions and discussions of ongoing issues are highlighted in this report.

UCFW has two key subcommittees with memberships independent of UCFW and with particular expertise in: (1) the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) including its policies and its investments (the Task Force on Investment and Retirement, TFIR); and (2) the University's health plans for employees and retirees (the Health Care Task Force, HCTF). These committees monitor developments and carry out detailed analyses of questions and issues in their respective areas and report back to the parent committee, UCFW, for further action. UCFW is indebted to the extraordinary commitment and skills of our subcommittee leadership, Helen Henry (TFIR), Shane White (TFIR Interim Chair) and Robert May (HCTF).

It is important to recognize that although this is the report of UCFW, the work done by the two subcommittees forms the basis of much of what is reported here. These subcommittees spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). Many of these consultants also regularly attend UCFW meetings and lend their expertise to our discussions. We are indebted to these consultants, and they are individually acknowledged at the end of this Report.

POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS: The 2009-10 academic year was dominated by an investigation into redesigning post-employment benefits (PEBs) in order to lower costs and enhance their long-term fiscal stability. This discussion and debate lasted well into the 2010-11 academic year. That December, The Regents adopted formally the Senate's preferred option of the final choices made available to them. That option leaves incumbent employees members of a largely unchanged UCRP, while new hires (after July 1, 2013) will be members of a "new tier" of UCRP whose plan documents are still being drafted. 2011-12 discussion focused on UCRP funding levels and employee and employer contribution rates. Because of the "contribution holiday" combined with the economic downturn of 2009, UCRP's funding ratio fell below federal requirements. The plan to fully fund UCRP required an immediate influx of cash as well as steep increases in employer contributions, which are expected to plateau at 18% of covered compensation – a rate higher than the plan's Normal Cost. Developing finance plans that would lower the rate and the duration of higher-than-Normal-Cost contributions continues to be a priority. Recent significant media and political attention to pension liabilities make this issue both high profile and highly contentious.

Also still to be finalized are long-term disability provisions. The PEB process identified UC's long-term disability provisions as ripe for revision. Human Resources

has begun mapping UC's different disability programs, and will bring possible revision scenarios to UCFW when they are ready.

The Division of Health Sciences and Services (HSS) proposed the creation of a defined contribution (DC) plan to augment recruitment and retention efforts for health sciences faculty, and perhaps general campus faculty in related biological sciences. TFIR requested additional modeling be done to more clearly illustrate the impact on UCRS, internal funding mechanisms and trade-offs, and to what degree UC competitiveness would be enhanced. The absence of a health sciences total remuneration study was again noted and decried (see below).

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS: As insurance costs continue to rise and as the University budget continues to shrink, lowering or slowing the growth of UC expenditures on health and welfare benefits has become a higher administration priority. Previously, the University worked with its insurance providers to devise a UC-only plan, HealthNet Blue and Gold, which now serves as the benchmark by which other plan contributions are determined. The first year of the Blue and Gold insurance program saw significant shifts in enrollment, and in some geographic areas, significant disparate impact. The second year has seen an expansion of the coverage areas and of the participating providers.

In 2011-12, UCFW and HCTF members were invited to participate in the Health Care Benefits Working Group (HBCWG), a body convened by the Office of the President to discuss other possible options to curtail University outlays in health and welfare expenditures going forward, including changing the subsidy rates to part time employees or for family coverage, reopening discussions of pay bands for employee premium tiers, and an investigation into self-insuring. Discussion on these issues will continue.

COMPLIANCE CONCERNS AND RISK ABATEMENT EFFORTS: Previously, UCFW welcomed Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca, Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services, and her message that compliance should be user-friendly. As a result, UCFW recommended, and the Academic Council endorsed, the creation of a joint task force to help see these initiatives to completion. The joint working group was empanelled in the spring of 2011, and undertook a systemwide audit of mandatory training courses and their development with the goal of simplifying the record keeping associated with various trainings, combining trainings where possible, and clarifying the responsible parties and units for each training. The work group also developed processess for amending trainings, and piloted them on a limited basis with the revised Conflict of Interest – Researcher training deck. The final report was submitted to the President and Provost in August 2012; it will be circulated for wide review after further administration vetting.

CASH COMPENSATION ISSUES:
Salary Scales: In anticipation of a 3% salary augmentation pool for faculty, discussion focused on how to allot the increase. UCFW, in keeping with its stated position of support for the salary scales, recommended that only the base salary be eligible for the 3% augmentation, and that off-scale and above-scale portions not be augmented. Various voices in the administration indicated that any increase, regardless

of the salary scales, had to be tied to demonstrated meritorious performance reviews. In order to find a path forward that all could agree to, a Faculty Salary Task Force was convened. Its report and recommendations called on the University to set new minimums for each rank and step, based on the average of each across campuses; that is, a campus that is below the new baseline will be required to meet the average, which those above it, will retain discretion. Over time, the average will rise, and the range of disparity at each step will shrink. Many remain concerned about off-scale salaries, though, linking them to prestige, not just competitive remuneration.

Health Sciences Compensation Plan (HSCP): Previous efforts to redraft the policy regulating the HSCP, Academic Personnel Manual (APM) section 670, were not endorsed by various administration officials, and so redrafting began anew. UCFW continued its negotiations with the administration, and a revised version was circulated for systemwide review. The revised HSCP was issued for implementation July 1, 2012.

UCFW renewed its call for a total remuneration study for health sciences faculty and staff, since their considerable portion of the University population was not included in the 2009 general campus total remuneration study. Securing data from competitors that is comparable in a meaningful way to UC, though, has proven difficult. Both the uniqueness of UC's HSCP and the complexity of its component parts, as well as similar obstacles among competitors, have made securing data or adequate proxies either impossible to devise or too expensive.

Alternate Compensation Plans: In 2009-10, the Office of Academic Personnel was charged to investigate compensation plans for general campus faculty, similar to HSCP for other disciplines, in such disciplines as business, engineering, and the biological sciences. A draft APM was circulated for management review, but it did not receive widespread support. As a result, a Negotiated Salary Plan Task Force was convened, and a three-year pilot plan was proposed for three campuses. The pilot goals are to gather and analyze data regarding graduate student and post-doctoral scholar funding impacts as well as the impact to off-scale salaries and covered compensation ratios.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS:

Task Force on Senate Membership: In 2010-11 UCFW reviewed the report and recommendations of the Task Force on Senate Membership. UCFW, like many respondents, was split in its reception of them. Some agreed with the findings that no significant changes to membership parameters should be made after all faculty are properly coded and assigned to the appropriate title. Others asserted that the Task Force did not deal with the underlying issue: that a significant portion of the faculty – namely in the health sciences, but also in specialists in Agriculture and Natural Resources – have insufficient voice, representation, and redress in the current system.

This year, the San Francisco division proposed to unilaterally expand its Senate membership by local fiat, asserting that standard procedures were unable to bring about a lasting and widespread solution. In response, the Academic Council established the Senate Membership Work Group to investigate and propose solutions to stated grievances that do not involve by-law amendments or Assembly action.

WORKING SMARTER INITIATIVE: In 2010, spurred partly by external financial considerations and partly by concern that UC was not following current business best

practices, the administration launched a Working Smarter Initiative designed to update out-of-date practices and to leverage system economies of scale, with the stated goal of saving the University $500M over five years by lowering recurring expenses. UCFW suggested, and the Academic Council concurred, that Senate participation through Shared Governance processes was needed to help inform the development of new practices and policies with an eye to user-friendliness and consequences to faculty that may not be apparent to administration project leads.

This year, UCFW consulted with Office of the President administrators to identify and propose redress for faculty concerns with shared service centers and preferred providers. Specifically, the Connexxus travel program and the UCPATH center were highlighted as having unintended consequences regarding faculty welfare. New best practices are being developed.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL REVISIONS: Several sections of the APM were up for review, and some new sections were proposed. UCFW opined on each of the following drafts:

- 010 (Academic Freedom), 015 (Faculty Code of Conduct), and 016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline)
- 035 (Affirmative Action and Non-discrimination in Employment)
- 133 (Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles)
- 190 (Whistleblower)
- 430 (Visiting Scholars)
- 668 (Alternate Compensation Plans)
- 670 (Health Sciences Compensation Plan)
- 700 series (Leaves of Absence, Presumptive Resignation)

CORRESPONDENCE: Beyond submitting opinions and recommendations on the topics above, UCFW opined on the following matters of systemwide import:

- Proposed Open Access Guidelines
- Faculty Diversity
- Phased Retirement (Staff)
- Salary Equity
- UCRiverside School of Medicine Development and Administration

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: UCFW is indebted to its consultants and guests, without whom the committee's work could not be done:

Academic Affairs: Provost Lawrence Pitts;
Academic Personnel: Susan Carlson, Pat Price, Nancy Tanaka, and Janet
  Lockwood;
Budget: Patrick Lenz and Debbie Obley;
Finance: Peter Taylor and Maria Anguiano;
Human Resources: Dwaine Duckett, Randy Scott, Gary Schlimgen, Michael
  Baptista, Mark Esteban, and Dennis Larsen;
Office of Loan Programs: Ruth Assily and Dan Sampson;
Treasurer's Office: Marie Berggren;
External consultants from Mercer, Deloitte, and Segal.

Finally, we are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Robert Anderson and Vice Chair Robert Powell.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2010-11
William Parker, Chair
J. Daniel Hare, Vice Chair
Yale Braunstein, UCB
Stuart Hill, UCD
Gopi Meenakshisundaram, UCI
Joel Aberbach, UCLA
Sean Malloy, UCM
Irving Hendrick, UCR
Joel Dimsdale, UCSD
Grayson Marshall, UCSF
Gayle Binion, UCSB
Suresh Lodha, UCSC
Helen Henry, TFIR Chair
Shane White, TFIR Interim Chair
Robert May, HCTF Chair
Ernest Newbrun, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties
Per Senate Bylaw 182, the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) is primarily charged with 1) considering and reporting on matters of international education referred to the Committee by the President of the University, the Academic Council, the Assembly, a Divisional or any Senate Committee; and 2) continuing review of the Education Abroad Program and its policies. As part of its charge, it consults with the University of California Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) on future program development, including modification of the programs of existing Study Centers, establishment of new Study Centers, and disestablishment of EAP programs. The committee also oversees the formal review of programs and advises the President on the appointment of Study Center Directors. UCIE met in-person three times and held one iLinc video conference during the 2011-12 academic year; the committee's key activities and accomplishments are highlighted in this report.

UCEAP Overview
UCEAP's enrollment peaked in 2010-11, with 4,808 students; it enrolled 4,684 students in 2011-12. However, one area of growth continues to be UCEAP's summer programs, which have increased from 850 participants in 2009-10 to 1,062 participants in 2011-12. At the same time, there has been a 15-20% drop in year-long enrollments. Enrolments at most campuses were stable, with Berkeley and Merced showing some growth, and Davis posting over 30% reduction in its enrollments. Budgetary goals for 2011-12 include continue reducing UCEAP's subsidy (by half yearly, down to zero by 2015-16); funding UCEAP's strategic initiatives (particularly scholarships and academic integration); continue to reduce UCEAP's program option fees (POFs); funding UCEAP's contingency reserve; and revenue sharing with the campuses. During this past year, UCEAP made progress on all of these goals with the exception of reducing POFs. With respect to revenue sharing, UCEAP was able to share $1M with the campuses this past year.

Against this backdrop, UCIE remains concerned about potential direct competition and conflict between EAP programs and campus-based programs. As one case in point, UCEAP developed, and UCIE approved, five faculty-led programs to commemorate its 50th Anniversary. After some push-back from the campuses, which often specialize in faculty-led programs, UCEAP has agreed not to develop any more of these types of programs for the time being. Another area of concern is the use of third-party providers by UCEAP.UCIE has observed that the majority of the new programs approved over the past two years have utilized third-party providers. While not criticizing this approach per se, nor questioning the quality of the third party providers, UCIE has been in discussion with UCEAP on the rationale for the use of third-party providers. In particular, UCIE is interested in learning how programs led by third party providers are different from other EAP programs, in terms of student learning and satisfaction; and their financial characteristics; their implications for faculty oversight; and other relevant dimensions. UCIE and UCEAP have agreed that this issue will be discussed in depth during the 2012-13 year.

Academic Oversight of UCEAP
UCIE approved the *Plan for the Academic Oversight of UCEAP* in May 2012; it is posted on the Senate's UCIE page under "Reports." The *Plan* responds to a need for reassessment caused in part by, in recent years, the decrease in the number of study center directors, and structural changes at UCEAP. The *Plan* revitalizes the central role of UCIE, while simultaneously

identifying the oversight structures within UCEAP. These include, but are not limited to, Associate Vice-Provost and Executive Director, Faculty-in-Residence, on-site faculty directors, visiting professors, campus faculty directors, faculty advisory committees, and non UC faculty academic liaisons. The *Plan* also lists the following new and/or expanded features of academic oversight: 1) Continued consultative relations with UCIE and the Academic Senate; 2) the establishment of a stable number of UC Faculty Study Center Directorships (between 8 and 10 FTE total); 3) an increased number of visiting professorships (from three to seven); 4) replacement of stateside Faculty Consultants with in-country Faculty Liaisons; 5) regular consultation with Faculty Advisory Committees (FACs); regular three- and ten-year faculty reviews of UCEAP programs; and 6) greater integration of faculty on campuses in the work of academic oversight and academic integration.

UCEAP Strategic Initiatives

Beginning in 2010-11, UCEAP engaged in a strategic planning exercise, which resulted in the following strategic initiatives: new program development, alumni engagement, scholarships, a total revamping of the UCEAP website, the creation of a new UCEAP business model, development of strategies for student management, the 50th Anniversary activities, international student recruitment at some Study Centers, and further development of academic integration (AI). Some deliverables emerging from these initiatives included the launching of an alumni engagement initiative; offering $500K in new scholarships; initiating a UCSB student ambassadors program; and developing an AI plan through establishing an AI Task Force. It is expected that the scholarships initiative will offer students $1,000 for summer programs, $2,000 for semester long programs and $3,000 for year long programs.

EAP Governance Committee

UCIE Chair Bhavnani and Vice Chair Craig participated in the EAP Governance Committee meetings this year. Discussions at the Governance Committee, chaired by Provost Patricia Turner, included budgetary developments at UCEAP (revenue sharing and General Fund allocation), the relationship between UCEAP and faculty led travel-study programs on all the campuses, and UCEAP scholarship initiatives.

UCEAP Program Development

In May 2012, UCEAP and UCIE agreed to a limit of five new programs per year. UCIE also instituted a two-stage program proposal process, whereby UCEAP will initially present new program proposals at a first meeting for an initial hearing. At the subsequent meeting, UCIE will make its final decisions on the disposition of the program proposal heard at the earlier meeting. This arrangement gives UCIE members the needed time to consult with their campus faculty colleagues, constituents and other experts. In the 2011-12 academic year, UCIE approved the following new programs: The Middle East Language and Culture program (with CIEE in Morocco); AMIDEAST Rabat Program and the IES Abroad Semester Program in Rabat (back-up programs to the Middle East Language & Culture programs, also in Morocco); the Language & Culture Program in Amman, Jordan (back-up program to Egypt); the Ben Gurion Semester Immersion program (Israel); the Multi-site European Program (London/Paris or Madrid/Rome); the Multi-site Thematic Summer Program at Hong Kong University; the Delhi IES program (India); and the Pune Summer Research/Internship Program on Contemporary India.[1] For more details on these programs, see Appendix A.

UCEAP Closures & Suspensions

---

[1] It should be noted that the India program approvals were carry-overs from the 2010-11 academic year.

During the 2011-12 academic year, UCEAP closed the Language and Culture Program in Bahia, Brazil; it instituted one-year suspensions on both the program at the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey, and the program at Adelaide University in Australia.

Study Center Directors
UCIE made recommendations on study center director (SCD) candidates for Japan and Shanghai.

2011-12 Formal Reviews
UCIE reviewed two programs in the 2011-12 academic year – South Africa and Scandinavia (Denmark & Sweden):
- *South Africa*: A UCIE representative participated in the formal review of South Africa. UCIE also submitted its comments on the review to UCEAP. Formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.
- *Scandinavia*: A UCIE representative participated in the formal review of Scandinavia. UCIE also submitted its comments on the review to UCEAP. Formal follow-up by UCEAP will take place in one year.

2012-13 UCIE Formal Review Committees
Members approved the following programs to be formally reviewed in the 2012-13 academic year: Costa Rica, Ireland (postponed from 2011-12), Italy, Paris Summer Language and Culture Program (three-year review & postponed from 2011-12), and the United Kingdom.

EAP's 50th Anniversary
UCEAP has organized and facilitated events and gatherings commemorating EAP's 50th Anniversary. Some of these events include(d) an alumni weekend (April at UCSB); a UCB academic conference with UC Berkeley's Center for Higher Education (in late October/November); the CIEE conference in Shanghai, China (fall 2012). At the January Regents meeting, Director Guinard also made a presentation on EAP's history/50th Anniversary.

Acknowledgements
UCIE wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its principal consultants – Associate Vice Provost and UCEAP Executive Director Jean-Xavier Guinard, UCEAP Faculty-in-Residence Ann Marie Plane, and UCEAP Regional Director Mary McMahon. In addition, UCIE wants to thank it representative from Council of Campus Director (CCD), Professor Michelle Yeh from UC Davis.

Respectfully submitted:

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair (UCSB)	Kalju Kahn (UCSB)
Ann Craig, Vice Chair (UCSD)	Giacomo Bernardi (UCSC)
Richard Kern (UCB)	Errol Lobo (UCSF)
Jeanette Money (UCD)	Robert Anderson (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
Edward Dimendberg (UCI)	Robert Powell (Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
A. Carlos Quicoli (UCLA)	Elizabeth Sciaky (Graduate Student Rep.)
Cristían Ricci (UCM)	Andrew Rawls (Undergraduate Student Rep)
Piya Chatterjee Yang Ye (UCR)	Todd Giedt (Senate Associate Director/Analyst)

Title	Host Institution/3rd Party Provider	Location	Duration	Special Focus	Start Date/Status
Arabic Language & Culture	CIEE	Rabat, Morocco	Fall;#Spring	Arabic language and area studies	Fall 2013
AMIDEAST Rabat Program	AMIDEAST	Rabat, Morocco	Fall;#Spring	Arabic language	Fall 2013 if needed
IES Abroad Semester Program in Rabat	IES	Rabat, Morocco	Fall;#Spring;#Summer	Arabic language	Fall 2013 if needed
Language & Culture Program in Amman, Jordan	CIEE	Amman, Jordan	Fall;#Spring	Arabic language	Fall 2013 if needed
Ben Gurion University Immersion	Ben Gurion University of the Negev	Beer Sheva, Israel	Fall;#Spring;#Year	Global Health, Sustainable Development	Fall 2013
Perspectives on the Global City	ACCENT International	UC Centers in London & Paris	Spring quarter	Tale of Two Global Cities; European Transformations: Madrid & Rome in Dialogue	Spring 2013
Global Business in Asia	University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	Summer	Asia as the Global Future; Global Business in Asia: New Horizons	Summer 2013
UC Explores New Delhi	IES	New Delhi, India	Fall;#Spring;#Year		Fall 2012
Contemporary India Internship or Research	Alliance for Global Education	Pune, Maharashtra, India	Summer	Contemporary Indian society, politics, economics, and culture	Summer 2012
University of Hyderabad	CIEE	Hyderabad, India	N/A		Active
Taiwan Language & Culture Summer Session	National Taiwan Normal University, Mandarin Training Center	Taipei, Taiwan	Fall;#Summer	Chinese language	Active
Language & Culture Program in Dakar	CIEE	Republic of Senegal, West Africa	Fall	Language & Culture; Francophone Studies; African Studies	Fall 2012

Title	Approval Date	Minutes Pg. #s	Year	Notes
Arabic Language & Culture	5/18/2012	3-4	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with University Mohamed V, Souissi and the Qalam wa Lawh Arabic Language Center. Spring option approved, but not being offered in 2013.
AMIDEAST Rabat Program	5/18/2012	4	2011-12	Approved as back-up to CIEE L&C Rabat program.
IES Abroad Semester Program in Rabat	5/18/2012	4	2011-12	Approved as a back-up to the CIEE L&C Rabat program.
Language & Culture Program in Amman, Jordan	5/18/2012	4-5	2011-12	Approved as a back-up program to the AUC program in Egypt.
Ben Gurion University Immersion	5/18/2012	5	2011-12	Year option added.
Perspectives on the Global City	5/18/2012	6-7	2011-12	UCIE specified a minimum GPA of 2.5.
Global Business in Asia	5/18/2012	7	2011-12	Multi-site, thematic summer program. 2 "tracks" were under consideration & approved, but only 1 is being offered Summer 2013.
UC Explores New Delhi	11/4/2011	3-4	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with Jawaharlal Nehru Univ. & Delhi Univ.'s Kamala Nehru College. Replaces former UCEAP Delhi program. Year Option not yet offered.
Contemporary India Internship or Research	11/4/2011	3-4	2011-12	The program is offered in conjunction with Fergusson College.
University of Hyderabad	11/4/2011	3-4	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with Univ. of Hyderabad's Study in India Program. UCIE approved an administrative affiliation with CIEE in Hyderabad so it can continue to offer Hyderabad University's Study in India Program (SIP). This arrangement will be reviewed in three years' time.
Taiwan Language & Culture Summer Session	11/3/2011	5	2011-12	This program replaces the provisional arrangement with CIEE at National Chengchi University.
Language & Culture Program in Dakar	11/4/2011	5	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with the Suffolk University-Dakar Campus. Program tracks include development studies for students with advanced French.

		Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Netherlands, UK			
50th Anniversary Faculty-Led Programs	N/A		Summer	See notes.	Summer 2012
Central European Studies	CIEE	Prague, Czech Republic	Fall;#Spring		Fall 2013
Brazilian Studies, Salvador	CIEE	Salvador da Bahia, Brazil	Fall;#Spring	Brazilian Studies	Spring 2012
European Transformations	ACCENT International	UC Centers in Madrid & Rome	Spring	Multi-site European program	Spring 2013

50th Anniversary Faculty-Led Programs	11/3/2011	5-6	2011-12	1) Food, Religion, and Culture in Egypt and the Middle East; 2) 21st Century Technologies and the Digital Divide: A European Perspective; 3) Jews in Germany from the Middle Ages to the Present; 4) A Journey Through Time: How Our planet Has Shaped Civilization; & 5) Religion, Secularism, and Civil Societies. Only the first 3 programs took place; intended to run only in Summer 2012.
Central European Studies	1/27/2012	2-3	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with Charles University. UCIE approved 2 tracks -- Film Studies & Central European Studies; UCEAP later cancelled the Film Studies track.
Brazilian Studies, Salvador	1/27/2012	3-4	2011-12	Offered in conjunction with Universidade Catolica do Salvador and Universidade Federal da Bahia. New Fall Option added beginning in Fall 2013-14.
European Transformations	5/18/2012	6-7	2011-12	Students can earn semester credit after completing an internship.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
2011-2012 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:
The University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) met three times in the 2011-2012 academic year to conduct business in accordance with its charge, outlined in Senate Bylaw 185, to advise the president about the administration of University libraries. Highlights of the committee's major activities are outlined briefly below.

Open Access
This year, UCOLASC dedicated significant time to crafting an open access policy for UC. The adoption of open access policies at Harvard, Princeton and other universities contributed to renewed interest among UC faculty in this issue. The main goal of the policy is to make faculty's work more available and a secondary goal is to change publishers' practices. This policy would make it possible for faculty to retain rights that they have previously given away to the publishers and UC. Based on the last attempt to pass a policy at UC, the committee agreed that such a policy must come from the faculty and be passed by the Senate. The committee thoughtfully debated the merits of having one systemwide policy versus ten campus specific policies, and concluded that having one unified UC policy that publishers are notified about would be preferable.

The current proposed policy was crafted in conversation with many constituencies. It has been extensively discussed and has the support of the Library and COLASC committees of all ten campuses, the California Digital Library, the University Council of Librarians, several graduate student associations, the Library Association of the University of California, as well as the University Committee on Academic Personnel and the University Committee on Research Policy. The University Committee on Academic Freedom and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare both communicated concerns that were discussed and addressed at UCOLASC's May meeting. UCOLASC replied by letter addressing these concerns in detail.

The proposed policy was sent out for systemwide review in August with a January 2013 deadline for comments. UCOLASC has requested that the Academic Council adopt this policy and forward it to the President for implementation as a presidential policy.

UC Press
In October, UCOLASC was joined by Allison Mudditt, the Director of the University of California Press, for a discussion about the UC Press and issues related to scholarly communication. The committee learned about the challenges faced by the Press which include declining books revenue and modest journal growth, escalating staff costs and high direct cost structure, large inventory build up, reduction in UC subsidy, lack of clear direction and the need to focus on growth and profit. The Press has proposed a new content portfolio with a major emphasis on scholarly monographs which will bring the Press's mission much closer to the academic mission. The sources of revenue for the

Press's scholarly publications are libraries, students and faculty, and UCOLASC encouraged consultation with faculty in the future. One concern for UCOLASC is that the proposed portfolio will not necessarily improve the situation with respect to who has to pay, since the libraries are a major source of revenue for the Press.

While it is not clear whether it would be viable for the Press to publish primarily in open access, UCOLASC would like to explore what role the Press could have with open access publishing at UC. The standard being discussed by UCOLASC with respect to commercial publishers may eventually need to be the model for the Press, but if a product is to be available in open access there needs to be some way for the Press to recover its costs. Although UC Press journals are not very expensive for CDL, it is unclear that open access will save money. With the understanding that open access is only one part of the equation, UCOLASC looks forward to future conversations with the UC Press about sustainable publishing models.

Update on Journal Negotiations
UCOLASC received regular updates on the status of journal negotiations from Ivy Anderson, Director of Collections at the California Digital Library. The UC negotiating team feels comfortable with where the discussions are going. A large number of negotiations are coming up in 2013 and to prepare the libraries will be performing a value analysis of all of the journals licensed systemwide using metrics developed by CDL. This will provide objective data with which to re-evaluate and potentially scale back large packages. A possibility is to make significant cuts to these packages in order to redirect those funds toward open access journals. The analysis will show areas of most and least use and value. CDL will discuss these issues with UCOLASC especially the impacts of any major cuts. Another important aspect of the negotiations is how high of a priority open access should be when entering negotiations.

Last year, UC began discussions with Nature about a transformative model, and UCOLASC encouraged CDL to replicate this with other journal publishers. The discussions with NPG continued until it became clear that UC and NPG were not moving forward with the proposed model. NPG was unwilling to produce a joint public statement because of their internal discussions and UC representatives agreed that there was nothing concrete to announce. As an alternative to a statement, UC prepared a letter with an update for people interested in what is going on but there was no plan to make an announcement about this update.

CDL Budget Planning Exercise
As a result of last year's change in the funding streams, each campus is allowed to retain the funds it generates and pay a tax to UCOP, and this will have an impact on CDL's budget. Through the funding streams process, the campuses will pay for CDL and therefore each campus' decisions about the allocation of funds will impact CDL's budget. UCOP asked CDL to prepare budget scenarios based on a reduction of 25% or an increase of 25%. It is important to note that UC's financial crisis has already led to a 20% reduction of CDL's budget over the past three years. The process included looking at what CDL provides to the larger community such as work with the Hathi Trust. Possible

scenarios include completely eliminating one time funding for collections if there is a reduction or restoring some funding for collections should funding increase. There is significant concern about cuts to CDL's budget in light of cuts to the campus library budgets. Information about CDL's target budget and the response to UCOP was not available in time for UCOLASC to discuss during this academic year.

Legislative Issues
This year, UCOLACSC monitored several pieces of federal legislation related to open access issues. UCOLASC wrote a letter opposing the [Research Works Act](#) (RWA) and CDL commented on this Act as well. UCOLASC's letter was approved by Council in February and submitted to the president. Over the course of several months, Elsevier and many major supporters eventually withdrew their support for the RWA, and this legislation was not moving forward at the time of UCOLASC's last meeting this year. A boycott of Elsevier, which had at least six thousand supporters, was thought to be a response to Elsevier's support of the Research Works Act. Notably, NPG opposed the Research Works Act.

A new version of the [Federal Research Public Access Act](#) (FRPA) was introduced this year, and UCOLASC wrote a letter supporting this Act. As of May, the status of FRPA was unclear although the White House had apparently expressed interest in the legislation. UCOLASC will continue to monitor FRPA and other relevant legislation at both the federal and state levels. UCOLASC's letter of support was approved by Council in February and submitted to the president.

Joint Meeting with University Librarians
UCOLASC met with the University Librarians in February to discuss common topics of interest, including open access and the CDL budget.

Campus Reports
UCOLASC devoted part of each regular meeting to member reports about issues facing divisional Senate library committees. In these discussions, faculty members touched on library budget and space issues..

Other Issues and Additional Business
In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCOLASC submitted views on the following:
- Copyright Recommendations for UC
- APMs 010, 015, and 016

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements
UCOLASC acknowledges the contributions of its administrative consultants and guests. The committee benefited from consultation and reports from University Librarians Convener Virginia Steel (UCSC), California Digital Library Executive Director Laine Farley, California Digital Library Director of Collections Ivy Anderson, and Librarians Association of the University of California President Mitchell Brown (UCI). UCOLASC

also occasionally consulted the Academic Senate chair and vice chair about issues facing the Academic Senate.

Respectfully submitted:

Christopher Kelty, Chair (SF)	Stuart Linn, Vice Chair (B)
Timothy Morton (D)	Roberto Manduci (SC)
Reynaldo Macias (LA)	Sholeh Quinn (M)
John Laursen (R)	Larry Armi (SD)
Lee Ann Baxter-Lowe (SF)	Laurie Monahan (SB)
Mary Murrell (Graduate student-B)	Kalie Wertz (Undergraduate student – SB)

Joel Primack ((SC); Chair, UCCC, *Ex-Officio*))
Bob Anderson ((B), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Bob Powell ((D), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, , *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Committee Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-2012

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) met ten times in Academic Year 2011-12, to conduct business with respect to its duties to advise the President and other University agencies on policy regarding planning, budget, and resource allocation as outlined in Senate Bylaw 190 and in the *Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units* (the "Compendium"). The major activities of UCPB and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

MONITORING AND MANAGING THE STATE BUDGET CUTS

UCPB monitored the deteriorating state and University budget situation with Vice President for Budget and Capital Resources Patrick Lenz, Associate Vice President Debora Obley, and Executive Vice President for Business Operations Nathan Brostrom, who joined each meeting to update the committee about the progress of budget negotiations in Sacramento, UC's advocacy strategies and efforts, contingency planning, and other UC-specific budget matters. Administrators also discussed their efforts to inform and educate the Regents about UC's cost-saving projects, options for adjusting cost drivers and revenues, and the critical need for new revenue to maintain quality.

UCPB members discussed campus and systemwide strategies for addressing cuts, implementing cost-saving measures, and raising revenue, including staff hiring freezes, cancelled faculty searches, delayed plans for new programs and facilities, program consolidations, and enrolling more tuition-bearing non-residents. The committee was concerned about the impact of layoffs, deferred maintenance, and unfilled faculty positions on the academic and research enterprise, and urged UCOP to communicate to the Regents specific examples of the damage incurred on campuses as a result of the cuts, even if it revealed evidence of declining quality. UCPB's view was that no systemwide program should be immune to cuts, but that cuts to UCOP should account for the importance of maintaining systemwide activities. UCPB supported the effort to find creative solutions for addressing the budget crisis, but opposed the suggestion that UC might solve the crisis by removing one or more campuses from State funding or by combining or consolidating academic programs that are duplicated across UC campuses.

BUDGET REBENCHING

UCPB monitored the evolution of the budget "Rebenching" proposal, the second phase of systemwide UC budget reform following the "Funding Streams" model adopted by the Regents last year. The UCPB chair served with other faculty and senior administrators on the Budget Rebenching Task Force, which discussed principles, and later specific models, for implementing rebenching before issuing a final report in June. The committee followed the development of the plan closely, and in consultations with Nathan Brostrom and Debora Obley, opined on specific details such as the implementation timeline, the treatment of centrally-funded programs, and whether to rebench existing base budgets or to rely on new revenue. UCPB strongly supported the main goal of rebenching, to develop a principled, transparent, and fair framework for re-

balancing the historical allocation formulas that determine the proportion of state general funds distributed to each campus. UCPB believes that rebenching will help convey a positive public message, insofar as it increases UC budget transparency and equalizes per student funding.

Although UCPB was frustrated, at times, with the pace of the development of the report and the timeliness of efforts to release it to the Senate, the committee was generally pleased with its core principles and recommendations—to fund all UC students of a given type equally regardless of campus; to increase the per-student funding of all underfunded campuses to the level of the most well-funded campus over six years; to set resident undergraduate enrollment targets sufficient to ensure the system as a whole meets its Master Plan obligations; to create incentives for campuses to meet those enrollment targets by penalizing a campus that falls below its target by its per-student state funding times a multiplier; to support UC's research mission by providing more funding per student for Ph.D. students than undergraduates, and to expand Ph.D. programs at the newer campuses over time, as money becomes available.

The UCPB chair and another Academic Council member who served on the Rebenching Task Force authored a brief guide to rebenching that sought to answer common questions, and outlined next steps and remaining issues about rebenching.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

UCPB discussed the need for an enrollment management plan to complement the rebenching project, noting that the Funding Streams reform has removed UCOP from its control over enrollment management, and increased the financial inventive campuses have to displace resident undergraduates with non-residents. UCPB felt it would be critical, therefore, to establish a clear process in which UCOP will work with campuses to set undergraduate enrollment targets, and enforce those targets, to ensure that UC meets its Master Plan obligations. UCPB gained assurances that UCOP will have a central role in enrollment management conversations and will determine a systemwide enrollment level through an iterative process beginning after the vote on Proposition 30 in November.

▪ *Anderson School MBA Program Conversion*

UCPB discussed enrollment management in the context of the proposed conversion of academic programs from State-supported to self-supporting status, motivated by the proposal to convert the UCLA Anderson School of Management's "daytime" MBA program. The focus of the committee's discussions was how such conversions would be treated under rebenching. UCPB was unable to get a definitive answer from the administration about how students in a state-supported program that converts to a self-supporting program would be counted for enrollment management and rebenching purposes. UCPB assumed that UCLA would not retain the State money currently provided to Anderson's MBA students after the conversion reduced the number of students considered state funded under the rebenching model. This view seemed to be partially confirmed in a memo from UCOP to UCLA indicating UCOP's expectation that UCLA would continue to have unfunded students to justify retaining the funding. Later, however, UCPB heard administrators state that campuses converting programs to a self-supporting model will be able to shed funded students and still keep the state funding they had been receiving for the students enrolled in that program, even without increasing resident enrollment targets.

▪ *Enrollment Management Resolution*

In July, UCPB approved a resolution regarding enrollment management under rebenching. The resolution states that UCOP should play a central coordinating role in negotiating enrollment targets, enforcing the rebenching model provisions, and deciding how State funds released by programs converting to "self-supporting" status will be reallocated. It also resolves that systemwide goals should guide these efforts; that students in self-supporting programs will no longer count toward enrollment targets; and that the Compendium should be updated to outline a process for reviewing the conversion of state-supported programs to self-supporting status. The Academic Council declined to endorse the resolution, as it appeared to overlap with another statement on enrollment management; however, it later endorsed that document outlining principles and recommendations for enrollment management under rebenching, which incorporated several key concepts and specific clauses from UCPB's resolution.

▪ *Budgeted Enrollment Formula*

UCPB sought more information about the formula UCOP and the State use to determine the per-student marginal cost of education and to calculate the number of "funded" or "unfunded" students. UCPB was concerned that the rebenching model calculates the average per student State subsidy as a residual, based on what the State provides divided by the existing number of students, rather than on what is needed to educate a student at a UC level of quality. UCPB believes it is critical to define the real cost of a funded student and wants to be able to understand and explain the formula for determining the number of State-funded students. Moreover, the ability to communicate the real cost of educating a student at a UC-quality level, compared to what UC receives from the State, will help the University explain the increase in non-resident enrollment to the public. UCPB encouraged UCOP not to wait until after the November election to determine the actual number of unfunded students and the base year for budgeted enrollment.

FACULTY SALARIES AND RESTORING UC COMPETITIVENESS

UCPB discussed issues related to faculty salary competitiveness with Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Susan Carlson, Provost Lawrence Pitts, and Nathan Brostrom. UCPB emphasized that competitive total remuneration should be UC's top budget priority; that quality will decline if UC is unable to meet the challenge of competitive recruiting and retention; and that UC should do everything it can to restore the integrity of the merit system by bringing the salary scales back to competitive relevance.

▪ *Report of the Joint Task Force on Faculty Salaries*

In April, UCPB opined on the report of the joint Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries, which recommended a new multi-year plan for maintaining faculty salary competitiveness based partly on a plan in use at UC Irvine. UCPB favored using a portion of any increased funding for salaries to implement "Step 1" of the plan, which recommended moving the official systemwide scales to the median of the nine general campus averages for each rank and step, to help address the unacceptably low base salaries in the current UC salary scales. However, UCPB did not advocate a mandate to implement "Step 2," which would move faculty advancing to a new rank and/or step, at a minimum, to the average salary of their peers at the new rank and step on that campus. UCPB noted that the plan would not be viable without new revenue. In May, the Academic Council sent a letter to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing these and other Senate views.

- *APM 668 (Negotiated Salary Program)*

UCPB opposed APM 668, a UCOP proposal to allow general campus faculty to supplement their income with non-state resources such as grant funds, endowment earnings, and professional degree supplemental tuition. UCPB warned that the policy could slow momentum for fixing the scales; reduce the faculty role in merit and promotion cases while giving additional authority to administrators; exacerbate existing salary inequities and create new inequities; lead departments to favor some kinds of research over others; create distinctions among faculty based primarily on their ability to generate revenue rather than on their research and teaching accomplishments; and create incentives for faculty to seek more lucrative grants and do certain kinds of research only for its higher salary potential. UCPB added that a Negotiated Salary Program could help recruitment and retention problems in specific disciplines such as the biological sciences, and recommended that UC consider a narrower program tailored specifically for faculty in those disciplines. The Academic Council sent a letter to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing these and other Senate views. UCPB later expressed shared governance concerns when the Provost indicated an interest in implementing a version of APM 668 as a 5-year pilot program at several campuses, despite the Senate position.

UC ONLINE EDUCATION PROJECT (UCOE)

UCPB took an interest in the UC Online Education Project and received regular updates from UCOE leaders regarding the UCOE business model, marketing plan, and various academic policy issues. The UCPB chair also served on a joint advisory committee on UCOE and worked with the chairs of UCEP and BOARS on proposed regulations related to the admission and enrollment of non-matriculated students into UCOE courses. UCPB expressed several concerns about the project, particularly the reliance of the business model on the enrollment of significant numbers of non-matriculated students willing to pay up to $1,400 per course, and the plan to offer most of the courses six to nine times per year. UCPB wanted UCOE to focus on developing a quality program, and therefore felt it was advisable for UCOP to grant UCOE a one- to two-year moratorium on its loan repayment obligation. UCPB will monitor the continued viability of the business model as the non-matriculated student recruitment effort proceeds, and will participate in ongoing conversations about a proposal to modify the UCOE loan repayment schedule.

INDIRECT COST RECOVERY

The Indirect Cost Waiver Policies and Practices Workgroup invited UCPB to comment on its draft recommendations concerning the University's policies and practices around indirect cost (IDC) recovery that may be hindering UC's ability to recover the full cost of research. UCPB supported efforts to increase UC's ability to recover the full cost of research by increasing its negotiated IDC rates, and by limiting the number of IDC waivers, insofar as these efforts did not damage the research enterprise. UCPB also warned that a stricter anti-waiver policy could encourage campuses to reject projects at the margin that would benefit the university; and that certain fields and disciplines could be disproportionately affected by a stricter anti-waiver policy.

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES (ANR)

UCPB discussed budget issues concerning the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) and the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES). UCPB advocated for a more transparent funding model for ANR, and for maintaining shared governance principles regarding the ANR budget and other matters through the Senate's established committee structure. Professor Chris van Kessel represented UCPB on ACSCANR, the Senate's new special committee on ANR. UCPB believes it can play a positive role in addition to that being played by ACSCANR, in reviewing UC's total agriculture/natural resources budget portfolio, helping to address a shrinking pot of discretionary funding for ANR, which accounts for a large proportion of UCOP's discretionary spending, and analyzing different funding models being discussed for ANR. UCPB also received conflicting information about the ANR/AES budget from sources within the Office of the President, which prevented it from determining precisely how much UC is spending on these programs. The Budget Office is working with AES campuses to verify and refine their budget data, and has promised UCPB a report about how the AES budget has changed on its host campuses over ten years compared to the campus as a whole, along with historical ANR budgets over the same period.

NATIONAL LABORATORY ISSUES

The Senate chair asked the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) to consult UCPB on the finance plan for a proposed second campus in the Bay Area, so that UCPB could advise Council about potential benefits and risks. The details of this plan evolved over the course of the year and have not been resolved definitively. LBNL leaders joined UCPB in October to discuss potential sites and financing options for the campus, and indicated that LBNL's favored plan would leverage UC's debt capacity to finance a $300 million construction cost with debt service paid from the lab's overhead during the period of DOE occupancy. UCPB questioned using the debt capacity of the entire system for the project and urged that the debt guarantees be ironclad. In December, the UC chief financial officer reported to UCPB that the President had asked the CFO Division to investigate options for funding the second campus in a way that would not risk the borrowing capacity of the campuses, which eliminated the possibility of using UC's highly-rated pooled credit vehicles. In May, the CFO Division reported that it had been considering an LBNL-based debt credit vehicle that would pledge only revenues generated at LBNL, but that it had decided the plan would be too costly. The plan now being considered would fund the second campus with UC-based Limited Project Revenue Bonds, and protect the greater University from any default risk with a debt service reserve fund, and a credit enhancement insurance premium acting as an additional reserve fund.

In addition, the UCPB vice chair represented UCPB on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI). Discussions at ACSCOLI of direct interest to UCPB included ACSCOLI's recommendation that the fees generated from UC's management of the national laboratories this year be used to support systemwide research projects identified through the Laboratory Fee Research Program, and not redirected for general funding purposes.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

➢ Graduate Student Representative Erik Green encouraged UCPB faculty to disseminate Teach the Budget curriculum materials to their students, to inspire activism regarding the budget crisis and cuts to higher education. He also briefed the committee on a plan developed by members of a UC Riverside student newspaper editorial board to eliminate up-front tuition

and the current financial aid system and require UC graduates to pay 5% of their income to UC for 20 years.

➢ Rachael Goodhue, chair of CCGA and chair the Special Committee on Academic Graduate Student Support (CAGSS), joined UCPB to discuss CAGSS' draft report. UCPB expressed support for the recommendations to increase the competitiveness of graduate student support by modifying systemwide policy around net stipends and Non-resident Supplemental Tuition.

➢ Dwaine Duckett, vice president for human resources, and Gary Schlimgen, director of pension and retirement programs, described the process and timeline for new employee and employer contributions to UCRP and the implementation of the new UCRP tier; a draft study exploring the feasibility of offering a Defined Contribution Plan option for new policy-covered staff hires within UC Health; savings generated from the family member verification project; and the work of a Healthcare Benefits Work Group that was considering options for changing the design of UC's health care plans to control rising costs.

➢ John Stobo, senior vice president for health sciences and services, discussed challenges threatening the profitability of the UC medical centers, and options for increasing efficiencies and generating more revenue that will help ensure the medical centers' continued financial success and ability to provide excellent medical education and patient care.

➢ Cathryn Nation, associate vice president for health sciences and services, discussed the recommendations of the Health Sciences Work Group of the Budget Rebenching Task Force.

➢ Grace Crickette, UC's chief risk officer, discussed alternative risk options UC was pursuing to reduce costs—a captive insurance organization, and an employer "self-insurance" program that would take advantage of existing UC and non-UC healthcare centers.

➢ Peter Taylor, chief financial officer, described a proposal in the Governor's budget that would have allowed UC to use its more favorable credit rating to refinance the GO bond debt service payments owed for UC capital projects—increasing UC's flow of unrestricted money, and providing more flexibility and control over how UC can use the money.

LEGISLATION

On behalf of UCPB, Chair Chalfant contributed views to the Academic Senate legislative analyst regarding several bills, including SCA 22, a proposed state constitutional amendment that would limit non-resident enrollment to 10% at each UC campus, and other bills proposing various restrictions on public employee pensions and salaries. UCPB was also briefed on legislation passed that will grant collective bargaining rights to graduate student researchers and a bill that would give the Legislative Analyst's Office authority to define accountability metrics and goals for higher education in California.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

➢ UCPB sent views to CCGA supporting a proposal to reconstitute the UCI Department of Education as a School of Education. Council later approved the proposal.

➢ UCPB met with John Crawford, UCORP chair, to discuss an external review of the UC Observatories. UCPB later sent a memo to the Academic Council citing the Observatories as

a "crown jewel" of the UC system, which enhances UC's international visibility and prestige, while noting that UCPB did not have enough information to advise the Senate or the Office of Research about its current or future budget. This reflected a general pattern in such reviews, noted previously, and remains a source of frustration for the committee that is not specific to the UCO review.

➢ UCPB discussed a proposal from senior administrators at UC Berkeley for a new University governance structure that would delegate more decision-making autonomy to campuses and campus-based governing boards.

➢ UCPB discussed an Academic Senate Memorial asking the Regents to take a formal position in support of ballot measures and legislation that increase state revenues and/or prioritize funding for public higher education.

➢ UCPB reviewed an updated report the Office of Institutional Research first produced for the Committee in 2009-10 that tracks the expansion of academic and non-academic salary and FTE growth over time in proportion to enrollments.

INTERACTIONS WITH UCOP ADMINISTRATION

On the whole, UCPB enjoyed fruitful, informative, candid dialogue with UCOP administrators who responded to UCPB requests with timely, informative data. The Budget Office provided thoughtful, informative presentations about the state budget situation, UC's budget allocation process, and various budgetary reform projects. Other UC leaders shared high level updates and observations about UC's pension obligations and debt programs, contingency scenarios for UC's budget expectations, and various other topics. For their part, UCPB members argued forcefully and effectively for budget action based on principles, asked thoughtful, probing questions and challenged administrators to do more to communicate UC's chronic under-funding and demonstrate the real consequences of state de-funding on student fees, enrollment, and programs.

UCPB REPRESENTATION

Chair James Chalfant represented UCPB at the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, Academic Planning Council, the Provost's Budget Advisory Group, and the UCOE advisory group. Vice Chair Jean-Bernard Minster represented UCPB on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI). Chair Chalfant, Vice Chair Minster, Marilyn Westerkamp and Erik Green represented UCPB on the Academic Council Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support. David Lopez served as UCPB's representative to the UC Education Abroad Program Governing Committee. Elizabeth Deakin represented UCPB on the joint Senate-Administration Task Force on a Negotiated Salary Plan for the General Campus. Chris van Kessel was UCPB's representative to the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture & Natural Resources (ACSCANR), Theodore Groves represented UCPB on the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee, and Gary Leal represented the committee on the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2012-13

In 2012-12, Jean-Bernard Minster (UCSD) will take over as UCPB chair and Donald Senear (UCI) will be vice chair. UCPB will continue to monitor the state's fiscal situation and its impact on the UC budget, the rebenching effort, enrollment management, UCRP funding, and the online

education project. The Committee will help UCOP and the Senate confront difficult short-term and long-range budget planning choices resulting from reduced state funding. UCPB will continue to advocate for budget planning that maintains the quality of education, research, and service throughout the 10 UC campuses, for the importance of competitive faculty total remuneration, and for a strong research enterprise to ensure the future quality of the University of California. UCPB will analyze opportunities for achieving local and system-wide budget efficiencies; assess the degree to which local budget committees have access to information and input into budget decision-making; and work with other Senate committees on issues of common interest and concern.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE & TENURE

ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Privilege & Tenure met twice during the year and deliberated by email to carry out its duties under [Senate Bylaw 195](#) to advise on general policies involving academic privileges and tenure and to maintain statistical records on grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases. The committee was not called upon to constitute any special hearing committees as provided for in Bylaw 336.A. In addition to deliberating and opining on specific issues as described below, the committee took advantage of the opportunities presented at both meetings for extensive consultation with Cynthia Vroom, the Office of General Counsel's designated attorney advisor to committees on privilege and tenure, for consultations with the systemwide Senate leadership, and for in-depth exchanges of information on privilege and tenure procedures and practices, including the form and frequency of interactions with the administrations, in their respective divisions.

The committee deliberated at length on the effect of Bylaws 335.B.6 and 336.B.4. These Bylaws limit the period in which a grievance or a disciplinary action may commence to three years from time when the grievant or the administration knew or should have known of the conduct in question. By comparing local experiences and interpretations, the committee learned that the Bylaws have been interpreted differently in relation to the introduction of older evidence in cases originating from conduct within the designated time period. After extensive discussion, the committee recommended that the 2012-13 committee solicit detailed input from the divisions and develop recommendations as to the admissibility of older evidence in disciplinary and grievance proceedings that arise from conduct within the defined period but where it is alleged that the conduct has continued or been repeated over a longer period.

Noting the small number of grievance cases reported in the annual statistics, the committee devoted significant attention to issues related to informal resolution of cases without formal proceedings and evidence. Members expressed concern that faculty members, especially those in non-tenured positions, may not be well informed of their rights. The committee urged the 2012-13 committee to take up this matter and consider formal action.

The committee formally opined on the following:

- Recommended that Bylaw 337.A be amended to clarify the distinction between disciplinary proceedings and early termination based on non-performance. The proposed amendment was submitted for Senate review and enacted by the Assembly in June 2012.
- Declined to recommend to the Provost what specific administrative sanctions should be imposed for failure to comply with the University policy that requires all employees to sign a

revised version of the patent agreement. The committee's letter also informed the Provost that divisional committees would consider grievance claims arising from such actions.

- Recommended that APM 150 be amended to clarify the rights of non-Senate faculty and timelines for notice and hearings in early termination proceedings under Bylaw 337. Rather than propose intent language, however, the committee asked the 2012-13 committee to draft specific APM language that would accomplish this purpose.

- The committee suggested extensive revisions to guidelines prepared by the Office of General Counsel for reimbursing faculty legal expenses in cases where a faculty member is found innocent of research misconduct after an investigation triggered by a whistleblower compliant. Academic Council used these comments as the basis for its response to the Office of General Counsel.

- Without objecting to the proposed revision, questioned the need for revising APM 010 as proposed by the Provost; supported the proposed revision of APM 015; and opposed the proposed revision of APM 016.

- Generally supported the recommendations of the Faculty Salaries Task Force while urging the Provost to develop detailed guidelines for the treatment of off-scale components of salary in the event of increases in the salary scales.

- Recommended that the ascending order of severity of disciplinary sanctions contained in APM 016 be revised as follows: censure, salary reduction, withdrawal of emeritus status, suspension, demotion, dismissal.

The committee wishes to acknowledge the expert advice, assistance, and support provided by Cynthia Vroom, Office of General Counsel, and Academic Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker."

Respectfully submitted,

David Brundage, Chair (UCSC)
Robert Hillman, Vice Chair (M)
Vern Paxson (B)
Philip Kass (D)
R. Anthony Reese (I)
Francesco Chiappelli (LA alternate)
Victor Lippit (R)
Duncan Agnew (SD)
Jeffry Lansman (SF)
Sarah Fenstermaker (SB)
Onuttom Narayan (SC)

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH POLICY
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research, for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures, and for advising the President on research. During the 2011-12 academic year, UCORP met eight times, seven times in person and once via videoconference. This report briefly outlines the committee's activities.

RESEARCH POLICY ISSUES:
1. Multi-Campus Research Unit (MRU) Guidelines in The Compendium
   In continuation of a project begun in 2009-10, the Academic Council charged the 2010-11 UCORP to undertake a revision of The Compendium section on MRUs. That UCORP worked to disentangle the many types of research entities, a complex project in which they were assisted by the Research Grants and Program Office (RGPO) in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS), led by Mary Croughan and aided by Kathleen Erwin, who provided detailed information about extant multi-campus research entities. The 2010-11 UCORP then drafted guidelines for MRU administration; those guidelines were approved by the Academic Council.

   The 2011-12 UCORP was tasked to translate the guidelines into policy language for inclusion in the revised Compendium. Senate Associate Director Todd Giedt was instrumental in this drafting process, leaving the committee to make final edits only. The final round of editing sought to ensure that the revision would match new multi-campus research funding procedures initiated by ORGS as well as that the revision would be compatible with new oversight mechanisms (see item 2 below).

2. Task Force on Principles, Process and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments (PPA)
   Both the Compendium revision process and the recent change in centralized research funding administration illustrated the need to clarify how the University makes its research investment decisions. To codify the process and bring transparency to it, the joint Senate-administration Task Force on Principles, Process, and Assessment of UC Systemwide Research Investments (PPA) was formed. PPA membership consisted of UCORP as a committee of the whole, the campus Council of Vice Chancellors for Research, again as a committee of the whole, and relevant ORGS personnel. The task force met monthly throughout the winter and spring, and UCORP further deliberated during each of its winter and spring meetings.

   Participants agreed that systemwide research funding and investment decision-making process would include a Portfolio Review Group consisting of campus administrators and Senate faculty, and would be convened by the Vice President, ORGS. The PRG is to consider the breadth and depth of research efforts, looking to fund important scientific and academic research that is not traditionally market-supported as well as newly emerging research fields and

projects designed to have an immediate impact on public welfare and knowledge. The PRG will also assess the efficacy of incumbent research programs and projects, relying on competitive evaluations such as the Multi-campus Research Programs and Initiative (MRPI) review committees' findings, annual reports, and external trends.

RESEARCH PORTFOLIO:

1. University of California Observatories (UCO)

   The University of California Observatories (UCO) was one of the three MRUs not competed in the initial MRPI funding process in 2010. Instead, due to the scale of astronomy projects and the long-term nature of astronomy investments, UCO was reviewed by a high-level external review team that took into account traditional academic review materials as well as a report produced by a UC Astronomy Task Force, composed of internal stakeholders and charged to set goals and priorities for Astronomy and Astrophysics research in the UC system. UCO Director Bolte again visited UCORP to provide additional background to members first-hand and to discuss broadly the scale and long-term nature of astronomy projects.

   UCORP found significant room for improvement in UCO operations and opportunity for greater integration of UCO into the larger UC research portfolio. UCORP also suggested a clearer UCO strategic plan, replete with budget projections, contingency plans, and systemwide contextualization of projects and priorities. As a result of the external reviewers' recommendation and UCORP's findings, a new UC advisory board was proposed by ORGS to oversee business operations at UCO; the precise charge of the new group and its relation to the current scientific advisory board is still under discussion.

2. California Institutes of Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs)

   Governor Gray Davis initiated the California Institutes of Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs), and UC won the bid to host and administer them in 2001. Part of UC's administration includes five-year reviews, modeled on the academic reviews to which UC MRUs are subjected. To that end, this year UCORP opined on the first academic review of the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society (CITRIS). UCORP awaits issuance of the second external review findings for the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (CalIT2) as well as the first review of the California NanoSystems Institute (CNSI). UCORP reiterated its concern with the length of time required to complete each review and the lack of alignment between the review materials submitted.

3. Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR)

   Last year, the Academic Council created the Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR), comprised of representatives from impacted divisions, UCORP, and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). Vice Chair Mike Kleeman represented UCORP on ACSCANR and kept the committee abreast of developments, including the invitation from Vice President Allen-Diaz to include two Academic Senate Members on ANR's Program Committee charged with (a) creating the process by

which long term research priorities are identified and (b) administering the process of choosing short term award recipients within that larger context.

4. Department of Energy National Laboratories
   UCORP is also represented on the Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI). UCORP, citing both the continued oversubscription of the lab fee RFP and the perceived disproportionate cuts already made to the research enterprise, lauded the administration decision to dedicate lab fees to research projects exclusively once again this year. ACSCOLI also monitored the establishment of second campus for the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and still unresolved issues relating from the conversion of the Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos labs to LLC management.

UCORP INITIATIVES:

In 2009-10, implementation of the furlough program and relative low prioritization of the research aspect of the University mission by the Commission on the Future (COTF) led the 2010-11 UCORP to continue the work of the COTF's Research Strategies Workgroup (RSW) effort to develop a Research Mission Statement for the University of California. Then Vice Chair Crawford led the effort, consulting with COTF RSW co-Chair Mary Croughan, now an executive director in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies (ORGS) in the Office of the President. This year, Chair Crawford incorporated the feedback of the 2011-12 membership, vetted the draft with administration stakeholders, and presented the revised statement to the Academic Council. The Council endorsed the statement, and UCORP is working to promulgate it widely.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW PARTICIPATION AND CORRESPONDENCE REPORT:

In addition to the above, UCORP responded to requests for review of several policies and white papers on a range of topics with systemwide import:

- Academic Personnel Manual Revisions to sections 430 (Visiting Scholars) and 668 (Negotiated Salary Plan (proposal)),
- Committee on Academic Graduate Student Support,
- Faculty Diversity Working Group Report,
- Modules for Mandatory Training Programs,
- Open Access Publishing, and
- Online Education.

UCORP REPRESENTATION:

The Chair or, when not available, the Vice Chair, or another committee member represented UCORP on the following systemwide bodies during the year: Academic Assembly, Academic Council, Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues, Academic Council Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Academic Council Committee on Academic Graduate Student Support, the joint administration-Academic Senate Work Group on Graduate Student Issues, the Technology Transfer Advisory Committee, and the Academic Planning Council. Throughout the year, UCORP's representatives provided updates on the activities of these groups.

REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

.

VII. **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**
  A. **UCR&J Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 110 [ACTION]**
    ▪ **Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair**

UCR&J Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 110

Following advice from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Academic Council recommended by a unanimous vote at its March 27 meeting an amendment to Bylaw 110 to create a provision for a *pro tempore* appointment of a substitute Secretary/Parliamentarian for a single meeting of the Assembly when the Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Assembly of the Academic Senate is unable to attend a scheduled meeting or to fill a vacancy until an election prescribed in Bylaw 15 is held.

Background

The Secretary/Parliamentarian is unable to attend the June 12, 2013 meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. UCR&J was asked for informal advice regarding procedures for appointing a substitute Parliamentarian when the Assembly's Parliamentarian is unable to attend a scheduled meeting. Bylaw 15 requires: "The Academic Council shall appoint a Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Senate, subject to ratification by the Assembly, for a three-year term." Bylaw 110 discusses how to fill vacancies for the offices of Chair and Vice Chair, but is silent on the Secretary/Parliamentarian. After considering several options, UCR&J proposed the following amendment to Bylaw 110. At its meeting on March 27, 2013, the Academic Council unanimously approved the recommendation.

Proposed amendment

> **110. Officers and Consultants of the Assembly** [Additions underlined; deletions stricken]
>
> > A. Chair, ~~and~~ Vice Chair and Secretary/Parliamentarian
> >
> > 2. Vacancies. If the office of Chair is vacant, the Vice Chair becomes Chair. If the office of Vice Chair is vacant, or if both offices are vacant, the Academic Council shall make pro tempore appointments until the corresponding offices are filled by election at the next Assembly meeting. If the office of the Secretary/Parliamentarian is vacant, the Academic Council shall make a pro tempore appointment until the office is filled by election as prescribed by Bylaw 15. Such elections shall be for the remainder of current terms. If the Secretary/Parliamentarian is unable to attend a scheduled meeting of the assembly, the Academic Council shall make a pro tempore appointment of a parliamentarian to serve during that meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 110.

  B. **UCOC Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128.C [ACTION]**
    ▪ **Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair**

Proposed Amendment to Bylaw 128.C

Following advice from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, the Academic Council recommended by a unanimous vote at its March 27 meeting that Bylaw 128.C be amended as proposed

by the University Committee on Committees to remove ambiguity in its language prohibiting the at-large chair of a standing committee of the Assembly from serving simultaneously as a member of the corresponding committee in a division.

Background and Justification

Senate Bylaw 128.C. states: "The Chair of each of the above committees shall be an at large member, who is a former, but not a present member of the corresponding Divisional committee." In Fall 2012, the University Committee on Committees learned that the individual it had appointed as chair of a standing committee of the Assembly was also the chair of the corresponding committee in a division other than the division of which the individual was a member. UCOC asked the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction for informal advice to clarify whether the unusual circumstance that the individual was not a member of the division for which they served as divisional committee chair provided an exception to Bylaw 128.C. UCR&J concluded that it did not. However, acknowledging that the Bylaw is ambiguous, UCR&J recommended that UCOC propose an amendment that would clarify its intent, thereby enabling Assembly to make its intentions clear. UCOC now recommends that Bylaw 128.C be amended to state expressly that a chair of a standing committee of the Assembly may not be a member of the corresponding committee of any division.

Proposed amendment

128. Membership of Standing Committees of the Assembly[Additions underlined; deletion stricken]

C. The Chair of each of the above committees shall be an at large member, who is a former, but not a present member of the corresponding ~~Divisional~~ committee **of any division**."

ACTION REQUESTED: Amend Bylaw 128 as recommended.

C.   **CCGA Recommendation to Approve New Degree Title**

According to Senate Bylaw 116.C, "The Assembly shall consider for approval proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees received from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and requiring approval by the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval. Proposals approved by the Assembly shall be submitted to the President." Accordingly, CCGA recommends approval of a new Professional Masters of Technology Management (MTM) degree title and program at UCSB.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Professional Masters of Technology Management (MTM) as a new degree title offered by the University of California; forward recommendation for approval to the President.

March 28, 2013

ROBERT POWELL
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

Dear Bob:

Following its March meeting, CCGA voted (8-0-2) to approve the UC Santa Barbara (UCSB) proposal for a new Professional Masters of Technology Management (MTM) degree program. This program will leverage existing strengths in engineering and technology innovation at UCSB with the goal of nurturing exceptional and innovative technology leaders. The MTM program is intended primarily for students interested in non-academic careers; has a stronger focus on practical training as opposed to theory; and will include a PDF. The design and intent of the proposed program is to provide an alternative to the M.B.A. for early-career technical students. The coursework is designed to take advantage of the strong quantitative skills of the technical student, allowing for a rapid pace in numerical content, with extra attention on addressing gaps in their training.

While several new Professional Masters programs are beginning to appear in other Engineering colleges within the UC system, the proposed plan for UCSB is distinct in several important respects. UCSB is one of only two UC campuses without a business/management school (along with UC Santa Cruz, and not counting UCSF). Most UC campuses now have significant research and degree activities in areas relating to Technology Management and Entrepreneurship, offering either a professional M.B.A .or some other formalized management curriculum. Seven of the ten UC campuses now have professional schools of business or management. UC San Francisco offers a combined D.D.S.-M.B.A. through a partnership with the University of San Francisco, and has recently launched an entrepreneurship program for M.D.s. Of the two remaining campuses, UCSB stands alone without an academic department or degree program in this area. UC Santa Cruz recently established a program called "Technology and Information Management" within its Baskin School of Engineering, and now offers master's and doctoral degrees in that discipline (with some similarity to the unit and degree proposed herein). UC Berkeley has just launched a new set of fee-bearing professional degree programs under the title of "Master of Engineering". UC Irvine will launch a new Master of Engineering Management degree in this fall; other UC campuses are reportedly planning similar degree programs within their respective engineering programs.

Consistent with CCGA practices, external program reviews were obtained from experts in the field including two from within the UC system and three from outside. Overall, the committee members agreed with the reviewers that this is a very strong proposal and that this new program should be implemented. However, in the discussion in CCGA, members identified a few issues worthy of special attention on the part of the proposers which were adequately addressed by the program.

I am enclosing CCGA's final report on this proposal. CCGA has now completed all steps in its review and we commend it to you. However, the MTM degree represents a new degree title at UCSB. As you know, CCGA's approval is usually the last stop of the Academic Senate side of the systemwide review and approval process except when the new degree title (for a particular campus) must be approved by the President, under delegated authority from the Board of Regents (SOR 110.1). According to Academic Senate Bylaw 116.C., the Assembly of the Academic Senate (or the Academic Council if the Assembly is not meeting within 60 days of CCGA's approval) must approve new degree titles. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions pertaining to this review.

Sincerely,

Ruth A. Mulnard, DNSc, RN, CNRN, CIP, FAAN
Chair, CCGA

Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
        Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Santa Barbara Division Chair
        Gale Morrison, Dean, Graduate Division
        Prof. Bob York, Director, Technology Management Program
        Prof. Divy Agrawal, UCSB Representative to CCGA
        Prof. Jutta Heckhausen, CCGA Lead Reviewer
        Hilary Baxter, Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Programs and Coordination
        Todd Giedt, Academic Senate Associate Director
        Clare Sheridan, Academic Council Analyst

Enclosure

D.   Academic Council [ACTION]
- **Robert Powell, Chair**
  1. **Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2013-14 Assembly**

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 Mary Gilly of the Irvine division for the 2013-2014 Vice Chair of the Assembly. Professor Gilly was selected as the Council's nominee at its March 27, 2013, meeting. The 2013-14 Chair-elect is Professor William (Bill) Jacob of the Santa Barbara division. Professor Gilly's qualifications and personal statement are as follows:

MARY C. GILLY
The Paul Merage School of Business
University of California, Irvine

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

Assistant Professor to Professor of Marketing Management, University of California, Irvine, July 1982 to present.
Director, Ph.D. Program, The Paul Merage School of Business, July 2004 to June 2006.
Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, Graduate School of Management, July 2002 to June 2004.
Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, University of California, Irvine, January 1994 to July 1998.
Visiting Associate Professor of Marketing, Madrid Business School, Madrid, Spain, September 1991 to August 1992.

EDUCATION

B.A.   Trinity University
M.B.A.   Southern Methodist University
Ph.D.   University of Houston

RECENT SENATE SERVICE

Chair, Chair-Elect, Secretary, Irvine Division, Academic Senate, 2011-2013.
Council on Academic Personnel, 2007-2010, Vice Chair, 2008-2009, Chair, 2009-2010; UCAP, 2008-2009
Special Senate Committee on Diversity, 2007-2008.
Council on Privilege and Tenure, 2004-2006.
School of Business Dean Search Committee, 2003-2004.
Graduate Council, 1999-02, Sub-committee on Courses 1999-00, Chair, Spring 2000, 2000-01.
Representative to the Academic Senate, 1989-91, 1998-00.

RECENT AWARDS

Williams-Qualls-Spratlen (WQS) Multicultural Mentoring Award of Excellence, 2011.
School of Business Faculty Service Excellence Award, 2000, 2003, 2010.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Cross, Samantha N.N. and Mary C. Gilly (2012), "Bridging Cultural Divides: The Role and Impact of Bi-National Families," *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, forthcoming.

Griffiths, Merlyn A. and Mary C. Gilly (2012), "Dibs! Consumer Territorial Behaviors," *Journal of Service Research,* 15 (May), 131-149 (lead article).

Gilly, Mary C., Mary Wolfinbarger Celsi and Hope Jensen Schau (2012), "It Don't Come Easy: Overcoming Obstacles to Technology Use Within a Resistant Consumer Group," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 46 (1), 62-89.

Celsi, Mary and Mary C. Gilly (2010), "Employees as Internal Audience: How Exposure to Advertising Affects Employees' Customer Focus," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 38 (4), 520-529.

Schau, Hope Jensen, Mary C. Gilly and Mary Wolfinbarger (2009), "Consumer Identity Renaissance: The Resurgence of Identity Inspired Consumption in Retirement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36 (August), 255-276.

Cron, William L., Mary C. Gilly, John L. Graham and John W. Slocum, Jr. (2009), "Pricing Decisions and Income of Professional Service Providers: A Focus on Gender," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109 (May), 93-105.

Statement of Challenges and Priorities for the Senate
March 1, 2013

Even with the passage of Proposition 30, the main challenge facing the University of California continues to be the impact of reduced state allocations on our budget. While Prop 30 offers the UC some breathing room, the campuses must look for new ways to reach our goals with less state support.

Under pressure to send reform signals, some politicians are making statements that threaten academic freedom and the quality of the University of California. With little appreciation of the knowledge generation and mentoring roles of UC faculty, our "workloads" (defined by these detractors as classroom teaching) are being questioned. As scholars, we educate the educators when our scholarship influences what professors around the world teach in their own universities. As well, we educate future educators through our mission of doctoral education. The Senate plays a key role in explaining how research enhances our teaching and the value of our scholarship to Californians, and indeed, the world. While advocating for affordability and access, we must not allow the quality of the UC to erode in pursuit of projected efficiencies.

My year on the Academic Council has revealed several near term issues facing the University of California. Uncompetitive faculty salaries and benefits, increasing student/faculty ratios, inadequate graduate student support, online education, enrollment management and implementation of rebenching all have important implications for UC faculty. The Academic Senate must be a strong advocate for faculty interests in these issues. As well, I am sure that currently unforeseen concerns will arise where the Senate must be prepared to act swiftly and decisively. Communication with Senate representatives must be continuous so that we are not left out of the conversation.

In addition to seeking input from the divisional senates and systemwide committees, I will look for constituencies that share our priorities on issues that arise. For example, the Composite Benefits Rates problem was satisfactorily resolved in large part because the Senate joined forces with the campus VCRs and Chancellors to halt the rush by OP administrators and allow input from the campuses. On any given issue, our priorities may align with students, with alumni, with EVC/Ps, etc. I will seek out collaborators who will strengthen the Senate's voice in protecting and enhancing academic quality. Shared governance is a tradition and strength of the University of California, and my commitment is to ensure that the Senate's viewpoint is consistently clear and strong.

My Senate leadership has primarily been at the divisional level, although I have served on UCAP. As well, I have served in administrative roles, such as the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice Dean in my school. Thus, I bring a good understanding of campus concerns to the role of Vice Chair. My year as the Irvine Division Chair has given me a glimpse of the systemwide Senate. That experience has enabled me to appreciate the diversity of the campuses within the UC and I will work hard to work for the goals shared by all the divisions. I know I still have much to learn about UC committees, UCOP, and the Senates of the other nine campuses, but I am eager to take on that task.

California is the innovation engine of the world. Keeping it so depends on the University of California's continuing dedication to diversity of thought reflected in our curricula, students, faculty and leadership. The creativity fostered by the UC in all arenas of scholarship must be the priority of the Academic Senate. I would be honored to work with Bill Jacob to represent the University of California system if I am chosen to be Vice Chair.

VIII.   UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]

IX.   PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X.   UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI.   NEW BUSINESS